The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONTRADICTIONS IN NATIONAL SOCIAL PROGRAMS

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 as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, our last debate today was very instructive when you combine the last debate of the day, which was a debate about whether or not our great Nation will feed legal immigrants by allowing them into the food stamps program, and you combine that debate with the debate we had earlier about making permanent a tax cut which will provide for the richest people of the Nation further tax relief. The tax cut is equal to four times the size of the budget of the entire Department of Education. It is more than three times as large as the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Department of Transportation.

When you look at that combined with the fact that next week we are going to be discussing the reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Act, that replacement of the old Aid to Families With Dependent Children, we are looking in America at sort of contradictions. Let us add to that the fact that earlier today we debated the placement of a cap on the farm subsidies act, the farm bill.

□ 1730

The farm subsidies were created in the same spirit that the Aid to Families with Dependent Children was created. It was created in the same spirit as food stamps were created. They were created on the assumption that there are certain Americans who need help. We need a safety net for them. The safety net is there for people who need food, and food stamps were a way to administer and process our assistance to people who need food.

Sometimes there are desperately poor people, most of them are desperately poor, and sometimes they are not so poor, but people who are caught in a temporary situation, where their income falls short and they are unemployed. Even some middle income people unemployed have taken advantage of the food stamp program. If they happen to be legal immigrants, however, we cut them off. In a Nation with plenty, we do not want to give food to legal immigrants.

At the same time, the farm subsidy program is overly generous and has been greatly abused, and the vote we took today was a vote to put a cap on farm subsidies for farmers. Let us forget about the complications of farm corporations, the fact that the agriculture business is not a business of small farmers anymore, but there are often many large corporations benefiting from the farm subsidies.

But it was not supposed to be a program to benefit anybody except those who were at risk of falling through the safety net, so earlier today we prided ourselves on voting to put a cap, to instruct the conferees who are considering the bill now to put a cap on the farm subsidies at $175,000. That is per year, my colleagues. $175,000 per year. That would be the cap. Right now there is no cap, so some get much more than that.

As I progress with this statement tonight, I am going to read some of the examples of the kind of benefits that are being received by America's farmers, who are, after all, not working. They do not have to put in any special volunteer work to do this, to do anything, in order to qualify for the safety net program for farmers. The farm subsidy program is a safety net program for farmers. The food stamp program is a safety net program for hungry Americans.

Legal immigrants, by the way, as one of the speakers pointed out, legal immigrants are allowed to fight in our Armed Forces, and a large number are out there in the Armed Forces right now, and more are being encouraged to enter our Armed Forces. In fact, the recruiting process of our military is such that they are making a special effort to reach immigrant communities. They have set up a large recruitment center just one block from my office in the 11th Congressional District in Brooklyn. They have set up a recruitment center at a place which is a transportation hub for immigrants. Large numbers of people who are immigrants, mostly immigrants from the Caribbean, come through this hub, and they have made an effort to reach them, in particular to get them to sign up for the military. They will reach their quotas faster, because a large percentage ever the people who are now signing up for our military are immigrants.

These people can know go off and fight for America, they can go off to meet our military needs, and yet they are not able to qualify for food stamps. I think one of the speakers previously pointed out that they could not, even if they are soldiers. Some of our soldiers are paid so low that they do qualify, their families do qualify for food stamps, but not if they are legal immigrants. They are soldiers. They can fight and die, but they cannot receive food stamps.

Those are contradictions which I do not think we ought to be content to live with. The American spirit ought to try to wrestle with greater fervor against some of these contradictions. We have, on the one hand, a very generous spirit, which leads us to send food throughout the world. We are feeding people all over the world with surplus American food.

Certainly, long before we were able to bring the Taliban down in Afghanistan, we were delivering food to Afghanistan, and we sometimes dropped food from airplanes. We understand the need for food, the power of food, and yet the contradiction here is we are not willing to feed legal immigrants within our own borders.

That contradiction will be further highlighted next week when we debate the Temporary Assistance for Families in Need bill. We approach families in need in this country with great contempt, and yet those people who are in need are certainly worthy of some help, worthy of being caught up in the safety net. They are falling in the safety net that is designed for them as much as for anybody else. I will talk a little bit about that.

If we have to talk in military terms, we will talk in military terms. We are all concerned about the fight against terrorism. We are all concerned. The first line of defense is, of course, to deal with the people who have attacked us and to confront them head on and to hit them where their bases are and to break up their whole conglomeration of evil and terror, and I applaud the President for moving in that manner.

I do not consider myself a hawk. I would generally be called a dove. But I think when we moved against bin Laden and the stronghold bin Laden had in Afghanistan, it was the right move. But in order to do that, we move with human beings, and many of those human beings are people who are the sons and daughters of folks that we hold in contempt back in America when we do the Temporary Assistance to Families in Need.

In other words, I am saying that a large number of the people who go off to fight our wars are poor people, and for us to take a position that we have contempt for them and we want to harass them and drive them off the welfare rolls and force them to go to work for less than minimum wage through ''workfare'' programs, what we are doing is attacking the people who are providing the foot soldiers, the foot soldiers to keep America great, to keep America free, to fight our battles.

I am going to talk a little later about the fact I have done an analysis of who dies in the wars, who died in World War I, who died in World War II, and who our casualties in Vietnam were. They were mostly poor, from the urban centers and from the rural areas. They were mostly poor soldiers, our foot soldier class.

We do not like to think of classes in America. We say there is no class warfare in America. That is an accurate statement. There is no class warfare, because the poor do not have any advocates. They do not have anybody to fight for them, so it is not warfare. There is no warfare. The rich are in control thoroughly, and the tax bill that we passed today is just one more

indication of how thoroughly they control our American democracy.

Yes, you can have a democracy where the people vote against their own interests, or you can have a democracy where people act against their own interests, because those who do not vote are acting against their own interests. We know even in presidential elections, something close to 49 percent of the people do not go out to vote. If in our presidential elections, our most important elections, you only have 51 percent of the people voting, you can imagine how that falls down as you go down to the Senate, the House, local State and elected officials.

Those who do not vote have nobody to blame in the final analysis but themselves in a democracy, but their actions are part of a process by which the majority interests are not served in a democracy. A democracy allows a minority to usurp their prerogatives and to act in their interests. The tax bill that was passed today is an example of that.

The tax cuts represent the worst kind of priorities. What we do here in Washington and in the House is always an important thing involving priorities, how you set priorities, how you make use of available resources.

When I get back to my district, like during the period where we had a long work period, in my district I am constantly confronted by people that have special questions about what are you doing down there that makes any difference to me? Why are you not doing something to relieve my particular problems here?

Senior citizens are upset by the fact that in New York City now the Department for the Aging is cutting Meals-on-Wheels. They are proposing to close down some services for senior citizens, to make them pay a greater share for their lunches. They want to know what are you doing in Washington for me?

Well, the problem in New York is probably partially a problem of deep budget cuts because of a great loss of revenue caused by the fact that the World Trade Center was the heart of our financial districts and the financial district was a great generator of tax money, of revenue. So the folks in New York, senior citizens, are suffering from the budget cuts because of the fact that bin Laden and the al Qaeda terrorist network chose as a target a piece of America that happened to be in New York City.

He was not attacking New York City or senior citizens in the communities of Brooklyn. He does not care about the senior citizens in Brownsville and in East New York or Flatbush. He does not care about the people of New York. The terrorists and the people who attacked the World Trade Center were attacking the United States of America, but the suffering is disproportionately being borne by the people of New York City at this point.

Yes, we are getting a large amount of money to rebuild the Trade Center. The President has promised more than $20 billion to rebuild and take care of the reconstruction and the removal of the wreckage and to help the businesses in the financial area. But there is no program that seeks to deal with the loss of revenue. There is no program offering New York City any assistance for the great loss of revenue which leads to the cuts in senior citizens programs or the loss of revenue which leads to the cuts in education, the school budget.

Now, that is not a phenomenon unique to New York. All over the country we are having problems with our school budgets. We have documented that in our Committee on Education and Workforce, that the majority of the States are cutting school budgets, cutting their aid to education, and localities are finding the necessity to cut aid to education.

So, what does it have to do with us here in Washington? We could, instead of giving a huge tax cut to the richest people in America, we could give more aid to education. I just said before that the tax cut that we voted, that the majority of the House voted, I certainly voted against it, along with most of the members of the Democratic Party, we voted against it, but we are outnumbered here, so the House voted for a tax cut which is four times as large as the budget for the entire Department of Education.

That is significant, that at a time when we are forced to make cuts in our school budgets, we get no more aid from the Federal Government than we get during prosperous times. One would say, well, there is the old adage about education being the responsibility of the States, the responsibility of localities, so why do you keep bringing up education as a Federal responsibility?

Well, education is our number one national security issue. We are a high-tech society. Our military is high-tech. Our ability to defend ourselves and to bring down the terrorist network in Afghanistan or anywhere else depends on high technology.

Even in small matters, and I do not want to invade the territory of the military experts, but even in small matters, which are not so small, I guess, even in matters which are detailed in terms of our performance on the battlefield, we are losing more men and women, more of our combatants on the battlefield, through human error in this war than we have as a result of enemy engagements.

We just lost the lives of four Canadians because of human error. One of our planes fired into a Canadian group just yesterday, and, if you hear all the different explanations for it, it was really human error. The pilot was not given an order to fire, because they were checking out the area. The information his headquarters had was greater than the information he had, and he panicked and fired, and human error cost four more lives.

We have lost a number of other lives as a result of human errors. It is not grounds for a detailed analysis of the war, but it is just one more indication of the fact that a high-tech army, high-tech military, will require more and more well-educated people in order to minimize human error. So even in the matter of combat, education becomes very important.

□ 1745

But the infrastructure which produces the weapons and the whole system that keeps our economy strong and allows us to afford a first-rate military is all dependent on education. So here we are at a time when education is suffering, and we are extending the tax cut to the richest people in America; and that is a part of the great contradiction. We have what I referred to in an earlier rap poem that I read a few weeks ago; we have great angels in America who understand our particular point, our pivotal point in history at this point. They understand that we are the key to civilization, which we are. Whether civilization goes forward and realizes its full potential or rolls backward and is caught up in the jaws of people like bin Laden who say that all the folks who want to roll back history, take away freedoms, oppress women, have no use for democracy and votes.

Mr. Speaker, the world is governed by more governments that are not democratic than are democratic. The world has leaders in power who have contempt for women, who have contempt for minorities. We are not in such good shape if we look over the entire Earth and we look at what is happening in terms of the leadership and the governments and those in control. We are at a pivotal point; and we are leading the charge for a more civilized world, a world where everybody has a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, where we are in favor of equal rights for all. As I said in my poem, ''Let's Roll, America'' a few weeks ago, we can sing the high hallelujah note, because all of our races and women can vote. We can celebrate that.

In every language of the Earth, to the country of all nations, we have proudly given birth. All of the languages of the earth, those immigrants that some people want to deny food stamps for, they are part of what we have created. We have created a nation where all languages are spoken. We have created a nation where all of the people of the Earth aspire to get here and be a part of it.

I do not subscribe at all and do not have any patience for the notion that Americans are the objects of great anger, that people despise us. That is ridiculous. Throughout the world, most people, ordinary people, the vast majority of people, they envy us perhaps, and they admire us more so than despise us. There is a leadership out there that feels that it is on the spot. They do not produce for their people. They use the resources of their nations to

make the rich richer. They do a lot of things that lead them to want to see America removed from the scene because we are examples of how a government and a nation can work for all of the people, all of the people.

We are an example of how you create a consumer market by being just, by having fair wage laws, by having working conditions, benefits, pension plans, all of which work and really do not swindle the people and that works. There is a lot of business leaderships and military leaders and government leaders across the world who hate that because they like to see those kinds of components of a government and of a civilization not displayed because they do not want to offer it to their own people.

So we are not hated in the world. The majority of the people, the ordinary people very much admire Americans because we are what I call ''great angels.'' I said in the same poem, ''Let's Roll, America'' was the name of the rap poem that I did a few weeks ago, and I said at that time that the Olympics are forever. We will win all the races. We are great angels of tomorrow, with magic mongrel faces. We are a mixture of people but, most of all, the spirit of the great angels is there. The spirit of the great angels is there in competition with the spirit of what I call the giant Scrooges.

The giant Scrooges are always on stage here. The giant Scrooges are in command here in the House of Representatives. They have the majority. They can pass a tax bill which makes it impossible for Social Security to be secure over the next 25 to 50 years. They are the ones who combined, in a bipartisan move, to lock the box and make certain that Social Security would not be threatened. But what this tax cut does is threatens Social Security.

Those seniors back in my district who are worried about food stamps, who are worried about their centers being closed and the lunches that they have at the senior citizen centers, the rate that they pay will be going up, and they are worried about the Meals-on-Wheels programs being shut down. They have bigger worries if the Republicans continue to insist on a pattern of tax cuts that make it impossible to balance our budget, that drive us into deficit. All of this has to be looked at together. The same Republicans who would terrorize and harass welfare mothers, the mothers of the foot soldiers who go off to fight our wars, those same people insist on creating bigger and bigger tax cuts for the rich. They are jeopardizing in the process, they are jeopardizing Social Security, something that every senior considers to be most basic.

The last thing that they will tolerate from me is a statement which tells them that I am a Democrat, I cannot do anything about the forward march toward threatening Social Security, or privatizing Social Security. They do not want to hear from any elected official who says they cannot protect Social Security. And we must understand that there would be a revolution here in this Nation if we continue to threaten Social Security.

The kind of incremental threats that are woven into the Republican tax cuts are hard to get people, it is hard to get people to understand. But in just 1 year, the surplus projections for the next decade have declined by $4 trillion as a result of the Republican tax plan. They have broken the lockboxes by spending trillions of Social Security and Medicare trust funds on other things. The Republicans shamelessly will try to escape blame by pretending that the war on terrorism has caused a $4 trillion loss. Simple arithmetic will tell us that it has not been the case. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the war on terrorism costs $10.2 billion this year. That is a tiny fraction of the unprecedented deterioration and the position of the budget in terms of the surplus.

Where did all the money go? The bulk went to fulfilling Republican campaign promises to pass tax breaks for wealthy contributors to the Republican Party. According to the Citizens for Tax Justice, 37.6 percent of the benefits of the final tax bill will go to the top 1 percent of the income earners in this Nation. Mr. Speaker, 37.6 percent of the benefits of the tax bill will go to the top 1 percent of income earners. These are the giant Scrooges who want to more and more enrich the rich.

We now know that the money for these tax breaks comes from payroll tax contributions that every worker makes to Social Security and Medicare. In the final analysis, that is where the money is. Willy Sutton used to say when he was asked, why do you rob banks, and he would say, that is where the money is. Where do you get the money to balance the budget if you are going to give huge tax cuts? You get it from Social Security and Medicare, because that is where the money is.

Our Leader GEPHARDT has called for a bipartisan summit to work out a blueprint for how America will get itself out of this mess. As it stands, the extending of the tax cut will further raid the Social Security and Medicare trust funds which the Republicans claim not to touch. We need a bipartisan truth commission to tell the truth about what the real threat to Social Security is and how the tax cut becomes a threat to Social Security, and a tax cut becomes the problem behind the problems that the people in my district are complaining about. You cannot have some relief on education expenditures coming from the Federal Government if the relief that might have been there is being poured into a tax cut.

The Federal Government, at a point in history like this, when we not only have great budget cuts in education in New York City, but across the whole country, we should have some relief for the States and for the local governments, and that relief has been proposed in our education legislation. We propose that the Federal Government take on the full responsibility for special education. If we took on the full responsibility for, not full responsibility, but that we live up to the original legislation on special education which said that the Federal Government would pay 40 percent of the cost, and right now we are paying something like 10 or 11 percent of the cost of special education. If we were just to assume the 40 percent costs for special education instead of pouring our money into tax cuts, take a portion of that, a relatively small portion and put it into special education, we would free up funds at the local level to be spent on education in some other way.

Forty percent of the cost, instead of 11 percent of the cost, means that local education agency would be able to take that money and fill in some of these budget cuts that are resulting, not only in New York, which has suffered probably more than most big cities because of the 9–11 attack which took away our taxes, our revenue to pay for education, but across the country. One gesture like that would be beneficial to education right across the board.

In addition to that, the President should go ahead and fund title I. They promised to begin the process by, increase title I by adding to the title I fund in each year until within 5 years we would have twice as much funding in title I as we presently have. But right away, despite that promise, the President backed away in his budget that was sent to Congress. Two items live up to our promise to fund special education by going all the way to the 40 percent and increase the funding for title I, and we would bring a great deal of relief already to the education budgets out there that are suffering right now.

So it all relates, Mr. Speaker. I hope that I am not confusing any of our colleagues. We have had a discussion about the tax cut and what the impact of that is. We have had a discussion about the farm bill and setting a cap, putting a cap on farm subsidies. We are going to have a discussion next week, and preliminary discussions are taking place right now, and all of the committees, the committees of jurisdiction, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Education and the Workforce are discussing the temporary assistance to families in need. We had a discussion, of course, earlier here today on food stamps for immigrants. It all relates.

I think that the challenge of leadership in America nowadays is not a challenge of knowing the facts; it is a challenge of how we put it all together once we get the facts. Probably the challenge of leadership anywhere in the world is understanding the complexities of the world and understanding how one thing relates to another, and being able to provide some leadership which will make use of the

existing resources so that everybody benefits.

The great angels of tomorrow we are. As Americans, one side of our personality says we are great angels and we want to do the right thing for everybody, including the people in this country, and then beyond that, to provide help for other people throughout the world. That is one part of our spirit. The other part of our spirit is demonic. It is giant Scrooges. People who want to take food stamps away from legal immigrants; people who want to give welfare recipients, a family of three, I think in Wisconsin they get less than $300 a month for a family of three. That is considered a successful program for welfare recipients, aid to families in need.

□ 1800

All of these things are related. Setting priorities and determining how does our great wealth get utilized to push civilization forward is a great question. It is there in all of these issues. They do relate very much.

I want to make certain that I make it clear that the class problem is at the heart of the way we make decisions in America. We do not have class warfare, we hate to bring up the whole issue of class, but class is very much a problem.

There is among the giant Scrooges, there is also contempt for the poor. The giant Scrooges are people who have contempt for poor people, just as Scrooge did in Charles Dickens' novel. They have great contempt for poor people.

The giant Scrooges of America have a lot of racism also woven into that. The harshness with which we treat people on welfare, the way the law is formulated, is partially due to the perception that this is thought that this is a program mostly for minorities. If we treated farmers in the same manner, we could say, well, it is people who want to make certain that the taxpayers get their money's worth; people who are frugal, who have respect for the taxpayers and want to make certain that we spend money wisely. If that was the case, then why do we not apply the same standards to farmers or to the farm subsidy program that we apply to welfare recipients?

We will be reauthorizing the temporary assistance to families in need, and in that bill we say nobody, no matter how needy, they can only have assistance from the Federal Government for 5 years. The 5-career limit has been imposed. We say it has been very successful. It has made people more conscious of the fact that they need to go to work and get off welfare.

There may be some truth to that. Why do we not impose a 5-year limit on the farm subsidy program? Why did we not impose a 5-year limit on the farm subsidy program a long time ago? Why do we have unlimited amounts of money being paid out in the case of the farm subsidy program when we have very paltry amounts being paid to families who are in need under the TANF, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Act?

If we are considering frugality and the best use of taxpayers' money, what motivates us to pay $20 to $22 billion out to the farm community when less than 2 percent of the people of America are farmers? What is going on as we set our priorities?

And why do we pay 40 percent of the farm subsidy money, why do we pay most of the farm subsidy money to 40 percent of the farmers, so that 60 percent of the farmers get nothing? Family farms who are really poor in that 60 percent get zero, while 40 percent of the agricultural businesses, I will not call them farms, in America are receiving most of the money.

If we are only concerned about the best use of our taxpayers' money, why do we let the farm program continue to rob us blind? In addition to the subsidies, there are also farm home loans, special loans for farmers, disaster loans for farmers. Less than 2 percent of the population walks away with a great part of the budget. What is going on in terms of our priority-setting?

If we are great angels of tomorrow, as I think some of us are, the great angels would want to make certain that we use our resources across-the-board to help the greatest number of people. Why can we not have a prescription drug benefit for senior citizens, and save some of the money from the abuses in the farm subsidy program in order to finance a program for prescription drug benefits? What is going on here? Why do we let the Scrooges prevail?

Evidently, the same Scrooges, giant Scrooges who are in charge of our tax cut program, are also funneling money to a small percentage of the farming businesses. I might not object to the farm subsidy program if we could guarantee that it went to the poor farmers, but we admit that it is going to farmers who are getting large amounts of money.

In fact, we consider it a victory today that we voted for a motion to instruct the conferees that was prepared by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH). The gentleman's motion was to instruct the conferees who are considering the farm bill now to put a cap on the program, accept the Senate proposal for a cap; that is, an amount, a limit on the amount of money that farmers can get. We, I think, voted for a cap of $175,000 per year, $175,000 per year. That would be the cap. We consider that a victory. How wonderful it is that we have put a cap of $175,000 on a subsidy that farmers can get.

It is a safety net program. It is a handout, if we want to get into the slang that is used by the Scrooges when they are considering giving $300 to a family of three on welfare; it is a handout. They hand it out with great contempt, and they complain about it, and they look for ways to push a person off the welfare rolls who is maybe getting $300 a month. We can see how much that adds up for a year.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) wrote a letter to all his colleagues. If we want to talk about bipartisan cooperation, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is a Republican.

''Dear Colleague: You have received letters from many Members supporting limitations on farm subsidy payments. Some farms now receive millions of dollars. On Wednesday, I will offer a motion to instruct House conferees on the farm bill, H.R. 2646. It will direct them to accept the farm subsidy caps added to the legislation in the Senate. The caps will limit farmers to $225,000 in subsidies per year; if they have a spouse, $275,000 per year.

''The purpose of subsidies since the beginning has been to protect family farmers. Unfortunately, about 82 percent of all subsidies now go to just 17 percent of the farmers. By providing unlimited subsidies, we have encouraged huge corporate farm operations to get bigger and bigger, squeezing out family farmers.

''You may have heard from some farm and commodity groups in opposition to this idea, but make no mistake about it, they do not speak for the majority of farmers and ranchers. Last year, 27 of the Nation's land grant colleges from all the Nation's regions came together to poll farmers and ranchers on their opinions of the farm bill.

''On the issue of farm payment caps, there was enormous consensus: Nationwide, 81 percent of farmers and ranchers agreed that farm income support payments should be targeted to small farms. Limiting subsidies to any particular farmer will help traditional-sized family farms.

''Please consider supporting the motion to instruct on Wednesday,'' et cetera, et cetera, by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD this letter from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) to his colleagues.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 15, 2002.

PROTECT FAMILY FARMS!
CAP FARM SUBSIDIES!

DEAR COLLEAGUE: You have received letters from many members supporting limitations on farm subsidy payments. Some farms now receive millions of dollars.

On Wednesday, I will offer a motion to instruct House conferees on the farm bill (H.R. 2646). It will direct them to accept the farm subsidy caps added to the legislation in the Senate. The caps will limit farmers to $225,000 in subsidies per year ($275,000 with spouse).

The purpose of subsidies, since the beginning, has been to protect family farmers. Unfortunately, about 82% of all subsidies now go to just 17% of the farms. By providing unlimited subsidies, we've encouraged huge, corporate farm operations to get bigger and bigger, squeezing out family farmers.

You may have heard from some farm and commodity groups in opposition to this idea,

but make no mistake about it—THEY DO NOT SPEAK FOR THE MAJORITY OF FARMERS AND RANCHERS!

Last year, 27 of the nation's land grant colleges from all the nation's regions came together to poll farmers and ranchers on their opinions of the farm bill. On the issue of farm payment caps, there was enormous consensus. Nationwide 81 percent of farmers and ranchers agreed that farm income support payments should be targeted to small farms.

Limiting subsidies to any particular farmer will help traditional-size family farms. Please consider supporting the motion to instruct on Wednesday. For additional information, please contact me or Dan Byers on my staff at 5–5064.

Sincerely,

NICK SMITH,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want my constituents at home to understand that the great angels who care about fairness, who want to see our resources spread to all the people, do not come necessarily in just certain parties. I have criticized the Republicans for their actions, but the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is a Republican.

A large number of people are offended by the fact that the giant Scrooges take over, and they are shameless in the way they use the taxpayers' money. If there is ever a program which shows us what the giant Scrooges are doing in the mismanagement of America's resources, it is the farm subsidy program.

I have indicated, I think, before on this floor that there is a special group called the Environmental Working Group, and they have done us all a great service to let Members really see how outrageous the farm subsidy program is.

Again, the farm subsidy program is supposed to be a safety net program for small farmers, for the poor. All of our safety net programs are designed to help people who cannot help themselves. After all, this is a capitalistic economy. Farming is a business. Do we want to have socialistic supports for the agribusiness when we do not have socialistic supports for any other business? Farming is a business.

It is okay, it is part of our credo, to take care of those who are in danger in some way of falling through the safety net. We wanted to support family farms and keep our farmers, family farms, out there, not have them all migrate to the cities and turn over the whole agricultural production to great corporations, big corporations. That is an objective that I certainly concur with. It is in the spirit of the great angels of America.

But the Scrooges have taken over, and long ago, for years now, it has been totally out of hand. I am talking to rural Congressmen, I am talking to big city Congressmen. We all deserve to be able to tell our constituents a better story than ''This is necessary to keep the food prices cheap in our supermarkets.''

It actually keeps the prices higher, Mr. Speaker. It keeps us in a situation where we are paying more than we would pay if capitalism were to go to work in our farm, in the agricultural business.

But in addition to not violating the tenets of capitalism, which I do not take exception to. I think we have a capitalistic economy. There are a lot of socialistic elements in it. When we apply those socialistic elements, I do not complain. I do not think we should be stuck in a rut, that capitalism is so great that it cannot learn from some other forms of economic production.

We have capitalism in the banking industry that helped bail out the savings and loan associations. That socialism in the banking industry recently came to the aid of some of our big investing groups, so we have across the world capitalist economies like Korea and others who have taken steps to have the government intervene to prop up businesses.

Those are socialistic elements of economic dealings that make sense, they are pragmatic. We bailed out Mexico when they were about to go under by intervening with $20 billion in loans. So it is not automatically an evil to have socialistic actions being taken in the economy. But if we do that, at least we ought to have an end game which produces fairness.

This Environmental Working Group, they created a website on the Internet, so Members can go and see every person, family, or business in America that gets farm subsidies. Members can find out who they are, where they are located, and exactly how much they are getting, or how much they were getting in the year 2000. It is http://www.ewg.org/farm/. Members can look in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and get the website address, and go to the website and find out exactly what farmers are getting State by State, county by county.

What Members will find is that whereas the State of Wisconsin, and I am going to take Wisconsin as an example because next week we are going to hear a lot about Wisconsin. When we start discussing the reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Act, we are going to talk about Governor Thompson, who had the model program, it has been cited as a model program, in Wisconsin. Governor Thompson did such a great job until President Bush asked Governor Thompson to come to Washington and head the Health and Human Services Agency, because he has a model program.

Well, in Wisconsin, their program might have been a few degrees better than the New York City program under Mayor Rudy Giuliani. Rudy Giuliani, who performed so magnificently during the crisis precipitated by the attack on the World Trade Center, has more contempt for poor people probably than any leader in America. The workfare program in New York City was one of the worst. But I think the present administration admires the Giuliani program even more than it admired Governor Thompson's program.

Governor Thompson's Wisconsin program, the model program, is a program that provided less than $300 a month for a family of three, less than $300 a month. The Governor of Wisconsin, Mr. Thompson, who is now Secretary of Health and Human Services, saved money by pushing people off the welfare rolls. The caseload went down. He saved money.

He did not put that money back into the program to provide more money for education or transportation, or in some way benefit the recipients who needed help in getting more training, more education, in order to get jobs.

□ 1815

He used the money instead for other kinds of activity. He did what we call supplanting. He supplanted money meant for the poor. He moved it about in the budget until he could free up money so he could use it for other State projects. That is what we are saluting in Washington right now as a model program. He took money from the poor and used it for other State projects and that is supposed to be wonderful.

He has minimum programs to allow people to get education. Vocational education is permitted under the TANF program; higher education is not. If someone wants to go to junior college, community college, become a hygienist or a technician of some kind, the kinds of jobs that are available that pay decent salary, that have a future, they cannot do that under the program that Governor Thompson put forth and has now become the model for Federal programs. Cannot do that.

The same Governor Thompson in the State of Wisconsin, according to the record, has never raised his voice against farm subsidies. If Governor Thompson is a hero because he pushed those terrible people off the welfare roll, and sent them out to get a job, he wants to make the best use of the taxpayers money, then I ask him to tell us, tell us, Secretary Thompson, why do you not deal with the farm subsidy abuses in Wisconsin?

I have a list of the top 100 farm subsidy recipients in Wisconsin. Again, like Wisconsin, like every other place, the poorest farmers are not getting the money. It is the top 40 percent who get all of the money, just about.

The first 100 recipients, according to amounts, the first top recipient Dane County Growers. That is a corporation in Edgerton, Wisconsin. They get $457,646 per year, the annual amount they received in year 2000.

Let us go down to some individuals and skip over what looks like corporations. Jeffrey M. Hahn, Cambria, Wisconsin, $268,998.57. This man, of course, would be against the cap that we just passed because the cap that is being proposed by the Senate is $225,000. He is getting $268,998.

What do these people have to do to get the taxpayers' money? Do they have to do volunteer service? This Congress, under the leadership of the Republicans a few years ago, voted to

make people in public housing do 8 hours of service per month because they are recipients of subsidized housing. The law now says, as a result of an amendment passed on this floor when the Republican majority votes, that a person has got to do 8 hours of public service if they are in a publicly subsidized housing development, public housing. Do we make any of these recipients of these large amounts of money do public service? What is it that we are getting in exchange for this? It is supposed to be a program for people who need it very badly; but if someone is getting year after year $400,000, $200,000, are they needy, really?

When we go down the list all the way, there are people getting $170,394 per year. Again, the welfare recipient in Wisconsin will get $300 a month times 12 months. That is $3,600 for a family of three; but in Wisconsin, the man whose 100th on this list, down at the very bottom in terms of the first 100 recipients, Mr. Thomas P. Sayre, Jr., Edgerton, Wisconsin, is getting $157,227. What is the criteria in America for giving somebody $157,227 of tax payers money versus giving a family of three $3,600?

The list that I am referring to is as follows:

EWG FARM SUBSIDY DATABASE—TOP 100 RECIPIENTS OF FARM SUBSIDIES IN 2001 WISCONSIN

Rank name	Location	Farm Subsidy Total 2001
1 Dane County Growers Ptrn	Edgerton, WI 53534	$457,646.10
2 Metcalf Farms	Janesville, WI 53546	454,011.85
3 Hamp Haven Farms	Reedsville, WI 54230	453,442.97
4 Wilks Brothers	Union Grove, WI 53182	398,193.39
5 Weeks Farms	Sharon, WI 53585	395,499.43
6 Kippley Farms	Waunakee, WI 53597	351,146.14
7 Bolton Farms	Burlington, WI 53105	336,608.86
8 Roger Rebout & Sons Farm	Janesville, WI 53545	324,424.02
9 Noble Grain Farms	Burlington, WI 53105	323,642.02
10 John E Walsh and Sons	Mauston, WI 53948	307,842.42
11 Kuiper Family Farms	Union Grove, WI 53182	302,465.26
12 Steinacker Farms Inc	Hortonville, WI 54944	293,647.02
13 Horizon Farms	Janesville, WI 53545	292,665.30
14 Oneida Nation Farms	Seymour, WI 54165	276,977.24
15 Jeffrey M Hahn	Cambria, WI 53923	268,998.57
16 Falkers Farms	Viroqua, WI 54665	267,386.17
17 Rossi Grain Farms	Bristol, WI 53104	266,540.81
18 Gunderson Grain Farms	Waterford, WI 53185	259,442.55
19 Hawkins Farms Inc	Bristol, WI 53104	254,481.46
20 Riley Brothers	Mauston, WI 53948	253,606.67
21 Hartung Farms	Arena, WI 53503	247,256.02
22 Keske And Keske	East Troy, WI 53120	245,384.58
23 Twin City Farms	Beloit, WI 53511	244,416.83
24 Mullikin Farms Partnership	Janesville, WI 53546	234,826.38
25 Emmert & Sons	Baldwin, WI 54002	232,827.87
26 Bach Farms Llc	Dorchester, WI 54425	228,155.79
27 Furseth Bros Real Estate Partners	Stoughton, WI 53589	225,066.67
28 Gorton Farms	Racine, WI 53406	223,020.94
29 Huntsinger Farms	Eau Claire, WI 54702	220,761.30
30 Riesterer Farms	Milton, WI 53563	219,778.57
31 Dempsey Farms Partnership	Eagle, WI 53119	212,660.50
32 Timothy Robert Leidig	Prairie Du Sac, WI 53578	211,268.76
33 J-r Farms	Waunakee, WI 53597	210,231.22
34 Schroeder Farms Partnership	De Forest, WI 53532	206,742.08
35 Luanne M Prochnow	Menomonie, WI 54751	203,117.53
36 Ronnie Prochnow	Menomonie, WI 54571	203,117.50
37 West Bros	Rice Lake, WI 54868	202,831.88
38 Paul Olsen	Wautoma, WI 54982	202,808.29
39 Reichling Farms	Darlington, WI 53530	202,426.82
40 D & S Farms	Shullsburg, WI 53586	201,940.38
41 David Olsen	Berlin, WI 54923	201,673.25
42 Wysocki Produce Farms Inc	Bancroft, WI 54921	200,647.60
43 Larry C Sahm	Chippewa Falls, WI 54729	199,963.03
44 Tab J Wiegel	Darlington, WI 53530	199,955.71
45 Runyard Grain	Oconomowoc, WI 53066	198,840.88
46 Borzynski Brothers Properties	Franksville, WI 53126	198,396.38
47 Brenengen Family Farms	Trempealeau, WI 54661	197,598.17
48 Randall S Shotliff	Evansville, WI 53536	195,306.68
49 Jerome J Laufenberg Inc	Alma Center, WI 54611	194,668.65
50 Thunder Branch Acres Inc	Darlington, WI 53530	193,454.39
51 Henderson And Erickson	New Richmond, WI 54017	191,719.41
52 Kevin L Klahn	Brooklyn, WI 53521	188,835.33
53 Robert J Miller Jr	Oconomowoc, WI 53066	188,290.95
54 Halleen Farms	Woodbury, MN 55125	187,491.67
55 Heartland Farms Inc	Hancock, WI 54943	187,243.77
56 Jay R Sorensen	Pleasant Prairie, WI 53158	187,096.48
57 Kenneth L Russell	Barron, WI 54812	184,458.18
58 Trelay Farms Inc	Livingston, WI 53554	184,218.80
59 Mike Berget	Darlington, WI 53530	183,920.50
60 Kelly Farms	Sun Prairie, WI 53590	183,810.75
61 Blue Star Dairy Farms Ptrn	De Forest, WI 53532	182,942.62
62 Lentz Farms Inc	Ridgeland, WI 54763	182,440.04
63 Meyer Dairy Grain Frm Inc	Chilton, WI 53014	180,882.47
64 Triple K Farm	Hartland, WI 53029	179,927.34
65 Vasby Farms Inc	Cambridge, WI 53523	177,594.63
66 Kau Farms	Eagle, WI 53119	177,005.21
67 Elmer Weis	Kenosha, WI 53142	175,011.91
68 James G Reu	Fort Atkinson, WI 53538	174,322.56
69 Henry Thomas	Menomonie, WI 54751	174,294.01
70 Triple S Farms	Monroe, WI 53566	173,911.97
71 Douglas Farms Inc	Janesville, WI 53545	173,090.12
72 S&I Farms	Hammond, WI 54015	172,376.00
73 Charles Pearce Farms, Llc	Walworth, WI 53184	172,008.24
74 Michael J Zimmerman	Beaver Dam, WI 53916	171,708.55
75 Patrick J Place	South Wayne, WI 53587	170,394.80
76 Howard & Floyd Wileman Farms Inc	Edgerton, WI 53534	170,108.57
77 Fenrich Farms Inc	Evansville, WI 53536	169,859.30
78 David Rieck	Elkhorn, WI 53121	169,537.06
79 ShaferOs Acres	Rosendale, WI 54974	168,963.26
80 Thomas P Sayre	Edgerton, WI 53534	168,386.57
81 Debra L Zimmerman	Beaver Dam, WI 53916	167,410.55
82 Jack Sauer	Darlington, WI 53530	166,905.83
83 S&S Grain Farms	Rio, WI 53960	166,884.62
84 Gary A Larson	Elk Mound, WI 54739	166,488.26
85 D&D Partnership %dan Dumke	Markesan, WI 53946	166,482.98
86 B Frms Inc	Marshall, WI 53559	164,882.07
87 Steven J Voda	Janesville, WI 53546	164,003.13
88 J G & L Reynolds	Genoa City, WI 53128	162,913.35
89 Malchine Farms Inc	Waterford, WI 53185	162,760.42
90 William Overbeck	Sturgeon Bay, WI 54235	162,235.49
91 Stephen Schwartz	Shullsburg, WI 53586	160,392.01
92 Custer Farm Inc	Chippewa Falls, WI 54729	160,265.59

EWG FARM SUBSIDY DATABASE—TOP 100 RECIPIENTS OF FARM SUBSIDIES IN 2001 WISCONSIN—Continued

Rank name	Location	Farm Subsidy Total 2001
93 Walter Farms, Inc	Elkhorn, WI 53121	160,200.95
94 New Age Custom Farming Llc	Prairie Du Sac, WI 53578	159,963.83
95 Robert C Traiser	Osceola, WI 54020	159,280.25
96 Edward H Montsma	Fond Du Lac, WI 54937	159,213.90
97 Larry V Pravechek	Luxemburg, WI 54217	158,312.30
98 David R Faschingbauer	Bloomer, WI 54724	157,905.30
99 David A Sayre	Edgerton, WI 53534	157,227.54
100 Thomas P Sayre Jr	Edgerton, WI 53534	157,227.17

Source: USDA. Compiled by EWG.

I would ask Governor Thompson to give us the answer. If he is a great advocate for the best use of the taxpayers money, why has he never spoken out against the farm subsidies that are clearly being abused in Wisconsin, and I cited Wisconsin only because Governor Thompson is from Wisconsin and he happens to be the man who is pushing now for an even more regressive and even more punitive bill than we have presently, a law that will give no room to breathe for people on welfare in terms of they must get a job but we do not want to give them an education, a chance to get an education.

The present law will not allow anybody to go for a single day to an institution of higher learning. Vocational education is all they can do. Once we had in New York City, and the Federal Government did not prohibit it, a program which allowed people to go to junior college, 2 years of junior college while they were on welfare in order to get their education, complete it to the point where they could become a tax payer.

Study after study has shown that once people get even a degree from a junior college or from a senior college, once they get into that realm, they pay back far more to the tax rolls than they ever received as welfare recipients. It is common sense and yet the Federal law now forbids any State to allow people to go in an institution of higher learning. They have to be vocational education only; and yet the jobs that are needed are the nursing job, the dental hygienist job, the jobs in information technology. They are all in an area which requires about 2 years of college.

If we want to give a person a chance to get off welfare, to not receive a safety net subsidy, then let them go all the way to the point where they can get a decent job. That is not allowed under current law.

So I am trying to make it understood to my constituents, to the constituency of others; and I think that when we have our debate next week on temporary assistance to families in need we will find out, needy families, we will find out whether there are any advocates for the poor.

Are the Democrats going to advocate for that group out there that has nobody here to speak for them? They are far more than 2 percent of the population.

Farmers are very well organized. The farmers have great, giant scrooges among them who did their homework years ago. The Department of Agriculture is the second largest agency in the Federal Government. Why at this time in America, when the population producing agricultural product is less than 2 percent of the population, why is the Department of Agriculture still the second largest agency in the Federal Government?

Somebody has done their homework very well. Those Scrooges know how to organize. Those Scrooges know how to take from those in need and make certain that they always have subsidies greater than they should be getting, farmers home loans, disaster for farmers, et cetera.

If there are Members of Congress listening who represent poor people, as I do, I am sure they are telling them what I tell them, that in America, people have the same opportunity. People have got to organize. People have got to come out and vote. Forty-nine percent of the American people who are not voting are the answer to all these problems.

The great angels of America need them. Those people have the spirit of wanting to spread our wealth and our know-how and our system of government throughout the world. They want to combat terrorism. They want to make certain that civilization is not subject to all these dark and negative forces that are seeking to pull us down, the al Qaeda network and the people who think women ought to be treated like cattle and the people who have great contempt for democracy and do not want everybody to have a vote, the people who are stealing their countries blind, all of the resources of the country going to the hands of a few.

There are forces out there which are in numbers greater than we are, and the only way we are going to conquer those forces is to have our own forces released. The great angels of America have to overcome the giant Scrooges. The giant Scrooges are always pressing to give our resources to the smallest number of people, and that is no way to keep America great.

A nice way to defend our interests. Our interests have to be defended because we are generous. We are willing to use our know-how and our constitutional civilization to the advantage of every American, willing to use our constitutional civilization to the advantage of people all over the world.

''Let's roll, America. Set the tracks of destiny straight. Don't look back but close the gate, toast the past but change the cast. In every language of the earth to the country of all Nations we have proudly given birth. At the Olympics of forever we will win all the races; we are Great Angels of tomorrow with magic mongrel faces.

''Let kindergartners take a poll, full baby bellies is our favorite goal, usher in the age of soul.''

''America, let's roll.''

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF APRIL 17, 2002

The following general leave statement by Mr. BEREUTER was inadvertently placed under the motion to recommit offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. It should have been placed under the motion to instruct conferees offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan for H.R. 2646, on page H1382.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, this Member rises in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees on the issue of payment limitations which the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) has offered.

It is clear that strong payment limitation language would improve the integrity of the farm program payments and help to retain public support for these programs essential to rural areas. Making this change will also help prevent the overwhelming consolidation of farms that has resulted in a decrease in small- and medium-sized family farm operations. The savings achieved from this provision could then be directed to other worthwhile agricultural programs.

A survey conducted by 27 land grant universities found that 81 percent of the agricultural producers across the country supported placing limits on support payments thereby directing dollars to where they are actually intended. Furthermore, a 2001 General Accounting Office report found that in recent years, more than 80 percent of farm payments were made to large- and medium-size farms. In 1999, for instance, 7 percent of the nation's farms—those with gross agricultural sales of $250,000 or more—received about 45 percent of the payments. With Congress facing so many spending priorities, we must demonstrate to our constituents that we are using taxpayers' money more efficiently.

It is important to note that this motion to instruct expresses support for redirecting these funds to agricultural research and conservation. Our choice is clear—we can continue to funnel millions of dollars to some of the wealthiest farms or we can make an investment in the future of agriculture which will benefit all producers and all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this Member strongly supports the motion to instruct and encourages his colleagues to vote for it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to: