

face people who you have already arrested 10 or 12 times. But that is the situation we are in.

This program also cuts out a lot of Federal bureaucratic jobs. There again that is a constituency that some people want to protect but I think most people in America want to see a reduction in the bureaucracy. The way it does this is give block grants back to the States.

We hear so much about the 100,000 police officers that the President's program allegedly handles. But, in fact, for most it only pays for 25 percent. After that, the municipality is stuck with the cost for these additional police officers.

What our program says is, "Look. You may want to put money into the police officers but you may need new communications equipment, you may need new police cars, and if you do, we want to give you that option, because we here in Washington don't have the answer for every 39,000 of the cities across America." We feel that people on the local level know better. We have passed that today.

It will go to the Senate, it will have further debate, they will amend the bill, it will come back to us, as will some of the other bills in the Contract With America, but we are working to fulfill our commitment with the American people.

We are going to start next on welfare reform and national security prohibiting American soldiers from being under U.N. command.

□ 1825

Refining our military so that it is not too expensive, not wasting money but effective and able to meet the challenges of the world.

There are a lot of things in our Contract With America, things like legal reform, helping senior citizens by letting them stay in the workplace longer and not having to penalize them on their Social Security. There is also family reinforcement, \$500 per child tax credit. These things will help make America great again.

But in addition to this, Mr. Speaker, we are not stopping with the contract. We are going into the appropriations process. The President's recently introduced budget adds another \$1 trillion to a \$4.8 trillion debt. We cannot afford that. Already the third largest expenditure on the national budget is the interest on the national debt. It is about \$20 billion each and every month, and that is money that is gone forever. We need to reduce the deficit so that we do not year after year continue to add to the size of the debt.

I will say quickly it is a Democrat and a Republican problem. It got there that way. And I will say that many of the items in the contract, as I hope our budget ideas will be worthy of bipartisan support, because we need to do this together as Democrats and Republicans so that we can represent the best interests of America.

#### REPUBLICAN DEFENSE CHOICES—A PRESCRIPTION FOR DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening as a member of the International Relations Committee and as a mother of a small child. Throughout our lives, we are confronted with tough choices. As a Member of this body, I am constantly faced with tough choices.

The Republicans came up with a program that included their tough choices. The Contract With America is a political platform of tough choices. I respect that they presented us a program of tough choices. I just happen to vehemently disagree with the choices that they've made.

When I sit down in my car, before I start the engine, I check my side mirrors and my rear-view mirror. But when I set out on the road, I'd better have my eyes fixed on what is in front of me. Or else, my experience on the road could be a disaster for me and for everyone else trying to share the road with me.

Well, that's kinda like what the Republicans have done with H.R. 7, now H.R. 872, the national security plank of the Republican contract.

They've made some tough choices, but I must stop right here and say that their choices could be disaster for the world.

Yes, they strapped in their seatbelts, but they want to take us backward, not forward. They have revved up the engine, stepped on the gas, but the car is in reverse. And they're looking at the world from the rear-view mirror.

This is a prescription for disaster.

The Republicans are rushing, as a part of their contract, to penalize the poor, discriminate against legal immigrants, pander to the rich, and—what brings me here this evening—through the National Security part of the contract, they add insult to injury by also asking this House to invest scarce dollars in yesterday's boondoggle.

The Republicans have chosen to look through the rear-view mirror—as if blinded by the light of the future—they chose to look behind instead.

Why in the world do we need to go back to star wars? We have already spent \$36 billion on missile defense, \$20 billion more are in the works. Isn't that enough? And they don't even define the threat, anyway.

This is the same party that says that Government is too big. This is the same party that says that kids don't deserve to eat subsidized lunch in school; that pregnant women don't need to have subsidized nutrition so that they can give birth to healthy babies. This is the same party that said that we don't have enough money to put 100,000 cops on the streets, but Government spending for an elaborate and controversial missile defense in space is OK.

Rather than asking for money for star wars, the Republicans could have asked for money to clean up the contaminated bases that coexist with our communities.

Rather than asking for star wars, the Republicans could have looked at ways that we could constructively engage with the rest of the world through multilateralism and collective security.

And, finally, they could have looked at promising weapons systems that bear more relation to the type of defense we need for our future, based on a forward looking projection of U.S. global interests and the U.S. global threat. Instead, the Republicans have jerked their knees so far into the past that this bill, just like many of the other contract bills, just flat out lacks credibility.

Tomorrow, we will debate the so-called National Security Revitalization Act. The choices will be made perfectly clear.

We can go back to yesterday's boondoggle and revive star wars, but only at a critical cost.

This bill does not provide for us a forward-looking vision of the world and the U.S. role in it.

This bill does not provide us with a rationale of a cooperative relationship with the rest of the world.

Unfortunately, this bill does not even leave jingoism behind.

And finally, this bill just makes some bad choices for the millions of moms like me who care about the world and the country that we leave for our children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DICKS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### IN DEFENSE OF THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of a bill that has saved money for U.S. taxpayers and has expanded economic opportunity for millions of Americans. In short, a bill that has been the key for securing the American dream for thousands of working families for more than 60 years.

I join a long, bipartisan list of supporters who have come out in favor of this act. In fact, the original sponsors were two Republicans. The President who signed the bill into law was a Republican. And since its birth, Republicans including Ronald Reagan have supported this act.

But today it is under fire, and I am proud to come to the defense of an excellent piece of Republican legislation—the Davis-Bacon Act.

To be sure, the time has come to update and reform this venerable act. But in no way has the time come for us to abandon an act which has so admirably fulfilled its mission of benefiting America.

What, exactly, does Davis-Bacon do? The reality is often obscured by the rhetoric of those who wish to abolish the act. The act does nothing more than say that for Federal contracts, contractors must pay workers the prevailing wages for their local area.

Contrary to what some on the other side say, this law does not require all workers to be paid prevailing wage. Those who are enrolled in a recognized apprentice program, receive a training wage that can be as low as 40 percent of the prevailing wage.

Davis-Bacon ensures that when the Federal Government comes into our districts, that cut-rate, low-wage, low-skill contractors do not take the jobs that should rightfully go to our constituents. Outrage over such occurrences is what impelled the Republican legislators who created this bill to draft their legislation.

In fact, Davis-Bacon recognized we had fly-by-night contractors coming into New England from other parts of the country stealing jobs away from the local economy. We are talking about making sure that when the Government contracts for a building, taxpayers get a quality product, and that will only happen if we hire quality labor.

Some argue that Davis-Bacon drives up the cost of Federal projects. Those who make such an argument are not looking closely at the crucial question of productivity. A well-trained worker simply produces more each hour than does an ill-trained, poorly paid worker.

This act simply guarantees taxpayers that their tax dollars will go to the best workers, not to the cheapest. That their tax dollars will go to open opportunity, not to shut people out of opportunity. That workers of all ages and races will have an avenue into the middle class, and not have the road to progress blocked.

Remember, we are talking about workers and working families in our districts. We are talking about middle-class families trying to stay independent. We are not talking about extravagant paychecks here. We are simply talking about paying people a living wage.

For a bricklayer or stonemason from Woonsocket, RI the prevailing wage for building construction is \$19.90 an hour. Considering the state of our economy and the weather in Rhode Island, a bricklayer from Woonsocket would be lucky to work 30 weeks a year, or about 1,200 hours a year, for a total of \$23,880 a year. That's it. Nothing more.

For a bricklayer or stonemason from Bristol working on highway construction the prevailing hourly wage is

\$18.35. Once again, at 30 weeks a year this comes out to just over \$22,000 a year.

For a bridge construction project in East Providence, the operator of a forklift would be paid \$17.34 or \$20,808 a year.

For a welding machine operator from Providence working on a sewer line project, Davis-Bacon means being paid \$14.62 an hour or \$17,544.

What does the Republican Party have against paying a worker \$17,544 a year? Mr. Speaker, how can a Congress that is talking about valuing work, that is talking about helping the middle class, propose the elimination of Davis-Bacon?

I urge my colleagues to look closely at this issue, to listen carefully to their constituents who are worried about economic insecurity, and ask themselves if pulling away this support for people makes families more secure? A careful look will show that repealing Davis-Bacon will put people in danger of slipping back, of losing ground, of losing hope.

I urge my colleagues to join me in saving Davis-Bacon.

#### THE NATIONAL SECURITY RESTORATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will take up the National Security Restoration Act.

The goal of the Contract With America is to make sure that if aggressors threaten us, our Armed Forces will be strong enough to fight and win. The bill would keep our defenses prepared for a worst-case scenario of two major regional conflicts occurring at about the same time. It would keep us prepared for a variety of possible circumstances around the world. We saw how effective defensive systems such as the Patriot missile were in Desert Storm. This bill would provide for the development of systems to protect our country and our allies from attacks with weapons of mass destruction. We are committed to implementing this type of system at the earliest practical date.

Despite reduction and shortfalls in defense funding, the President has deployed U.S. forces on more peacetime and humanitarian missions per year than ever before. At the end of last year, over 70,000 United States personnel were serving in places like Iraq, Bosnia, Macedonia, the Adriatic Sea, Rwanda, Haiti, and Cuba. And yet, the President has requested cutting defense spending to \$10.6 billion below 1995 levels.

Even though we still have the best armed forces in the world, we keep seeing readiness decline, because all the peacekeeping efforts are being funded with military readiness funds. As Sen-

ator JOHN WARNER noted, "That's been the cookie jar into which the hand dips to get the needed dollars when we elect to send our troops here, there, everywhere in the cause of freedom or otherwise."

□ 1840

We are not going to allow a return to the hollow forces of the Carter administration. One of the most egregious things that needs correction right now is military pay is nearly 13 percent lower than pay for comparable civilian jobs. Close to 17,000 junior enlisted men and women have to rely on food stamps.

A real commitment to quality of life for military personnel is necessary for morale and is the right thing to do.

The National Security Restoration Act has the following: It establishes an advisory commission to assess our military needs. It commits the United States to speed up the development and deployment of missile defense systems to protect U.S. territory and U.S. troops in battle. It restricts deployment of U.S. troops to missions in our national interest. It demands U.S. troops be commanded by U.S. commanders and not placed under foreign commanders. It reduces the cost to the United States of U.N. peacekeeping missions and demands the U.S. Mission to the U.N. press for reforms in the notorious U.N. management practices. It tightens controls and reporting requirements for the sharing of U.S. intelligence information with the United Nations. It expresses the sense of Congress that firewalls be restored between the defense and discretionary domestic spending for the upcoming budget years, and it reemphasizes the commitment of the United States to strong and viable NATO alliances, urging the emerging Eastern European democracies be assisted in the transition to full NATO membership.

Mr. Speaker, we have been working hard to keep our Contract With America. In the contract we promised we would make sure no U.S. troops are forced to serve under foreign command, and that we restore the necessary part of our Armed Forces to keep our defenses strong and maintain our credibility around the world. We are keeping our promises.

#### ANOTHER ST. VALENTINE'S DAY MASSACRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Happy St. Valentine's Day, America, and happy St. Valentine's Day to my wife, Laurie, in Michigan.

On this St. Valentine's Day we debated a crime bill, but justice was not done on the crime bill we debated today. In fact, what happened today is