

the view that maintaining good relations should entail turning a blind eye to the outrageous actions committed by Turkey. Given the generosity the United States has shown toward Turkey, we have every right to attach some conditions—particularly such a basic condition as allowing the delivery of aid to a neighbor in need. I believe such a condition should be a basic requirement for any recipient of U.S. aid, and I think most Americans would agree.

Armenia is a small, land-locked nation dependent on land corridors through neighboring countries for many basic goods. Armenia has been one of the most exemplary of the former Soviet republics in terms of moving toward a Western style political and economic system. The Armenian people respect and admire the United States. There are more than one million Americans of Armenian ancestry. The bonds between our countries are strong and enduring. But the people of Armenia face a humanitarian crisis which is not the result of any natural disaster but the deliberate policy of its neighbor to choke off access to needed goods from the outside world. I believe the exertion of U.S. leadership can play a major role in easing tensions and promoting greater cooperation among the nations of the Caucasus region. Enforcement of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act must be an important component of those efforts.

Mr. Speaker, last year I founded the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, which I co-chair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. We now have 49 Members from both parties and all regions of the country. The support for the Armenian people is strong in this Congress, and we will continue to challenge the pro-Turkish lobby here in Washington and, if necessary, the administration, to fight for stronger ties between the United States and Armenia.

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

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

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

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

WHY WE MUST RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, today we have been discussing the minimum wage, and the reason that we have been discussing the minimum wage is that since the last time the minimum wage was increased in 1989, it has fallen 45 cents of real value. Employers that were paying the minimum wage in 1989 are now paying 45 cents less in real value than they were paying back then.

The fact of the matter is that the minimum wage is 27 percent lower than it was in 1979. That means that those families, those individuals that go to work every day at the minimum wage, are poorer now than they were in 1989 and in 1979. Those families, those individuals, need a raise. To argue that putting these people back to where they were in 1979, in 1989, is going to somehow put people out of work or destroy jobs is ludicrous. In fact, what has happened is that employers have been benefiting now for more than a decade of the decline in the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that we have to increase that minimum wage is because we are trying to continue to encourage people to choose work over welfare, but work should pay, work should pay a livable wage, and we have an obligation to see to it. The minimum wage is a basic tenet of this country of recognition of the dignity of work, of recognition of the dignity of those individuals who go to work every day and try to earn a living for themselves and for their families. I would hope that we would raise that minimum wage for those individuals.

But we must also understand that when we raise the minimum wage, we reduce the burden on the American taxpayer who is having to subsidize those very same low-wage jobs where employers refuse to pay the minimum wage or above the minimum wage.

□ 2115

Because when in fact we keep the minimum wage as it is today, we increase the subsidies to these same workers because they are eligible for food stamps; because if you work full time at the minimum wage, you are not above the poverty level, and if you have children or a spouse, you are clearly not above the poverty level, so the Federal Government digs into its pocket, into the taxpayers' pocket, and puts money on the table for AFDC, puts money on the table for food stamps, puts more money on the table for housing allowances, more money on the table for the earned income tax credit. Why? Because many employers choose not to pay the minimum wage, even when they can afford to do so.

But the Republicans now will offer an amendment tomorrow that is even more insidious. It will take those employers who are paying the minimum wage today and exempt them from paying it in the future. It will have the potential of uncovering up to 10 million

Americans who are currently eligible for the minimum wage today from not receiving it in the future: Women who work in sweatshops making garments for American citizens, the clothes on your back; the people who work in the fields of this country to put food on your table; the people who wait on you when you sit down to a table in a restaurant, who spend the whole day working on their feet and tending to our needs and our demands and our desires. They would be uncovered. They would have the benefits of the minimum wage reduced or repealed to them.

It is argued very often that this is going to destroy employment in those industries like the retail industry; that somehow retailers who do not want to pay the minimum wage, saying they cannot afford paying the minimum wage, would lay many workers off.

It is rather interesting that those people who make their living by making investments in various segments of our economy, Salomon Brothers, one of the largest investment banking companies in this country, says that they believe that many retailers, especially discounters, would benefit from an increased minimum wage due to the enhanced purchasing power that it would create for many low-income consumers.

Then they go on to recommend that if you are going to make an investment in stocks right now, they would recommend the Fred Myer Corp., the Food Lion Corp., the Home Depot Corp., Sears, Roebuck, & Co., and Wal-Mart. They would recommend some of the very same companies that are now fighting the minimum wage, because they say that these companies in fact receive an economic benefit, because Salomon Brothers recognize, as Henry Ford did, if you did not pay a decent wage to the workers of America, they could not buy the products they are making. That is why he paid them \$5 a day.

Other manufacturers and industrialists criticized him roundly, but he recognized that if you expect people to buy your products at Wal-Mart, if you expect people to buy your products at Sears, if you expect them to dine out at Denny's if you expect them to participate in the American economy, they have to earn a livable wage. These people are entitled to it. They are entitled to it.

But what we see is after months, after months of beseeching the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH, and the Republicans to bring the minimum-wage bill to the floor, they have finally agreed to do it, because 80 percent of the people in this country support the minimum wage. Then they want to put an amendment in order to take it away from up to 10 million Americans. It is not fair and it is not right. It ought to be rejected.

THE FACTS ABOUT THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLINS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] for offering us an object lesson this evening in the politics of symbolism and in the Washington shuffle, for my friend, the gentleman from California, has many gifts, among them an eloquence and a trust always in the role of government.

But there are a few questions worth asking. For example, Mr. Speaker, if this were such a good idea, if the inflation tables that my friend, the gentleman from California, just brought forth as some sign of economic erosion, if that were so true, why then, 18 short months ago, when the roles in this Chamber were reversed, why then did not the gentleman from California, or under the old order, the Speaker of the House, or under the old order, the former majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri, now the minority leader, why, with the liberals in control of this Chamber and firmly ensconced at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, why did they not then offer an increase in the minimum wage? Why this new-found outrage? Why this Washington shuffle?

It is a question worth asking, because once again, Mr. Speaker, as I stand in this well, I am absolutely confounded, not by the so-called gender gap that many of the media mavens and self-appointed potentates inside this Beltway would tell us about, but about the very genuine credibility canyon, a huge gulf that separates the rhetoric from the reality of the left, because there is a clear difference between the words uttered tonight and the tone of the action demanded tonight from that which this same administration proffered less than 2 years ago.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, let us see what the President said, in his own words. Time Magazine, February 6, 1995, even in the wake of the historic shift in this Chamber, President Clinton: "It," referring to raising the minimum wage, the President's own words, "It is the wrong way to raise the incomes of low-wage earners." These are the words of the President of the United States, who has, once again, waffled and changed his mind.

Indeed, the chairman of the President's own Council of Economic Advisors, Joseph Stiglitz, wrote this. It appears in his 1992 textbook on economics:

Only about 10 percent of people in poverty work at jobs that pay at or near the minimum wage. Thus, the minimum wage is not a good way of trying to deal with the problems of poverty.

That is what Professor Stiglitz said. Chairman Stiglitz has gone the other way.

Empirical data that exists of families in poverty: Out of every four families in poverty, only one-quarter, one out of every four families in poverty, would be eligible for an increase in the minimum wage. Families in poverty ineligible for an increase in the minimum wage, three out of every four, or 75 percent. We must understand, further, that indeed a minimum-wage increase should be retitled "The Job-Killer Act of 1996."

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important to realize that as the Democrats focus on minimum wage, they are completely ignoring the job cycle. I am going to read some statistics on that. But it is real interesting to me to listen to some of the comments that have been made from the other side of the aisle tonight that are just totally off-the-wall. One speaker from North Carolina said that we need to increase the minimum wage to \$5.25 an hour in order that people can pay for shelter, food, and transportation. That is \$10,000 a year.

I do not know what it is like in Arizona, where you live, but I know in Georgia you cannot do it on \$10,000 a year. The complete representation that there are people making minimum wage and they are the sole breadwinner of the family is totally off base. The statistics are as follows: 66 percent of the people making minimum wage are part time. Thirty-nine percent are teenagers. Only 2 percent are over 30 years old, but those who start working today for a minimum wage on a national average will be making \$6.05 an hour a year from now.

But that minimum wage is the opportunity wage. It is the salary that you start with when you are unskilled and you move your way up the ladder. I started working for \$1.60 an hour at the International House of Pancakes when I was a student. I started making a minimum wage later on at \$2.50 an hour working construction. But in both cases, I was the raw product. I needed the training.

I asked some teenagers, inner city teenagers in Georgia recently who were up here, I said, I know all of you guys are going to be looking for jobs this summer. Let me ask you a question. You are probably going to work on a construction crew, maybe in a yard maintenance crew, maybe in a restaurant. Let us talk about a restaurant. How many of you know how to work a buffing machine? None. How many of you know how to work a cash register? None. How many of you know how to replace a bag of milk into a milk cap for a restaurant? None. None of you know that. You don't have much experience. They said, no, I guess we don't.

I said, I think you have a lot of experience. Here is where your experience is: You know how to say, "Yes, sir,"

and "No, ma'am." You know how to show up on time. You know how to work hard and stay a little bit later, and put in that extra effort, and maybe when you finish your job, go over and help the other person finish his job. That is your experience, and that is what the employer is looking for.

He will teach you to you how to run the cash register and the buffing machine, but he is going to hire a heck of a lot more of you if he can get you for \$4.25 an hour versus \$5.15 an hour. Here were some high school students who understood that simple economic principle, that they wanted the job. Hey, the salary sounds great, but if you do not make it, it is like yourself, you are an athlete, you had an opportunity to play pro football.

Mr. HAYWORTH. No, I was recruited as right tackle, I ended up as left out. I want to be accurate with respect to my athletic career.

Mr. KINGSTON. It was the team's loss, I am sure. But I know in your situation if you had made pro football, you would have made \$200,000 or \$300,000 a year. That was a great salary, but you did not get the job. It is just like these students, the \$5.15 an hour is great, but if the job does not exist anymore, it does not matter.

Here are some statistics that have been put out by the Employment Policies Institute, which is a nonpartisan institute. In your home State of Arizona, increasing the minimum wage is estimated to cost 8,900 jobs that will be gone. In my State of Georgia, 18,000 jobs are at risk; Kentucky, 12,000; California, 63,000; Montana, 2,800; Ohio, 28,000; Texas, 60,000. This is economic data. This says these are the numbers of jobs that will be lost.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if I might inquire of the gentleman, and first of all an observation, I am glad the gentleman's first job was at the International House of Pancakes. Had it been at the Waffle House, you might be in line for a job with the administration, considering the fact that they waffled on so much of this.

But when so much attention is paid to California, electoral vote-rich California, let us put it in perspective so the campaigner-in-chief can understand full well, for the benefit of our friend at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue; could the gentleman find the figure on how many jobs? I know almost 9,000 jobs in my home State of Arizona, but since it takes the mention of the big C. California, to get the attention of my other friends busy electioneering, tell us how many jobs would be lost in the State of California, if you have that information?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker. Again, I am going to say it again, because this is not from the Republican Study Committee, this is from the Employment Policies Institute, which is nonpolitical, nonpartisan, the increase in the minimum wage in California will cost 63,100 jobs, 63,100 less jobs in the State of California by increasing the minimum wage.

You know what is so interesting, as I hear the champions of increasing the minimum wage talk, under the pretense of compassion for the minimum wage worker, what is the bottom line thing?

□ 2130

There is an undercurrent here. You know what it is? It is arrogance. You know what it is really saying? "You do not have the capability to get a raise yourself. You need me in Congress to increase your salary because you are too incompetent. We know you are going to be trapped at the minimum wage forever because you do not have the ability to move yourself up the economic free enterprise ladder."

That is what the theme is that we are hearing from the Democrats. They are basically saying this entire section of the population is not passing through the minimum entry wage but that they are stuck there permanently, and there is a high degree of arrogance in this debate that never even gets mentioned.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I think my friend from Georgia again is absolutely correct, for it is the fundamental irony that there is a supposition or a presumption emanating largely from the liberal side of this Chamber which would purport that those with entry-level jobs in the work force, the youngsters of whom you spoke earlier from your hometown of Savannah, Georgia, or people, young people living in the east valley around Mesa or Scottsdale, Arizona, or throughout the Sixth District of Arizona, that somehow once they take a job they are destined to be trapped at the very lowest rung of the economic ladder.

Yet what we have found time and again, if people show up on time, if they work hard, if they do a good job, that is simply the entry level. They climb the rungs of the economic ladder. To somehow dismiss that, and always rely on the worst-case scenario or supposition that people are chained inexorably and always to the lowest rung of the economic ladder, betrays either the arrogance of which the gentleman spoke, the arrogance of the alleged competence of big government and a bureaucracy, or a fundamental misunderstanding of business, that productivity and hard work and old-fashioned gumption, a phrase my friend from Georgia may use from time to time, old-fashioned gumption will be rewarded with an increase based on an increase based on an increase in productivity.

Let me yield to my friend again.

Mr. KINGSTON. When I was earning the minimum wage and my fellow workers were earning the minimum wage, we never, never once thought about writing our Congressman to get a raise. What we thought about doing was working a little bit harder, staying a little bit longer, getting the job done a little bit faster, and there through the capitalist system, we got paid.

It is too bad that our friends on the other side of the aisle seem to hate capitalism and seem to hate and have a true contemptuousness for free enterprise. But let me tell you, now some of them are very shrewd, and here is why.

One other component that is missing from this debate is the fact that many States, such as Hawaii, such as New Jersey, have a State minimum wage already that is higher than the existing Federal minimum wage. The Federal minimum wage is \$4.15 an hour. Hawaii's minimum wage, State minimum wage, is \$5.25, and New Jersey's is \$5.05.

What is happening, when businesses are looking to move a plant to Hawaii or to New Jersey, they say, "Well, that entry level salary is a little bit high, I think I can do better moving to another State," and then New Jersey is losing them. So what happens is we have got these States saying, "Yes, we need to increase the minimum wage because we are at a competitive economic disadvantage because of our own State's policies." We are not hearing that in here, so this is not altruistic. We need to get the cards face up on the table about that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Indeed, if the gentleman will yield, I could not help but notice the frequent citation of alleged poll numbers, and just the inherent retail action not of sound economic policy but retail politics at work here.

Again, and I know the gentleman preceded me by a term here in Washington, but I cannot help but be struck by the false symbolism and the legislating for a therapeutic effect, a symbolic effect that in essence, as we have seen time and again, as we see in reports from the Progressive Policy Institute, as we read in the comments of the President's own Chairman of Economic Advisers, ultimately will kill jobs.

It is an incredible irony. Small wonder then that I refer to this alleged minimum wage increase as the job killer act of 1996.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. KINGSTON. In fact, I think the gentleman from California said this will actually help the middle class from having higher taxes. It is kind of like "Hello, is anybody home in there?" Because I do not follow that. If I go into a fast-food restaurant today and they cannot squeeze out any more jobs, then my french fries and hamburgers and Coca-Colas are going to go up, along with the goods and services I get from everywhere else, from health care to groceries. The middle class, one more time, will get stuck with this.

I want to kind of bridge this. As we are talking about the middle class, maybe we should talk about welfare reform, since we have a lot of news in there today. We have two different approaches on welfare reform, from the conservative point of view and from the liberal point of view.

We have a President who promised to apparently extend welfare as we know it, and President Clinton currently has

vetoed two welfare reform bills, and to date I think has now endorsed a bill that allows welfare benefits for felons. So as I said, the President seems to want to extend welfare as we know it.

I hear over and over again from middle class people that they are tired of the giveaway programs when they are out working 40, 45, 50, 55 hours a week and more, busting their tails, and then they have got able-bodied people who refuse to work because of the generous welfare benefits.

The President vetoed a bill that required able-bodied recipients to work 20 hours a week. As I go to the civic clubs in Georgia, I say, "How many of you worked 20 hours a week and provided for your families?" Not one hand goes up. And I think I will ask the gentleman from Arizona, can you make it at 20 hours a week in Arizona?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Of course not.

Mr. KINGSTON. Certainly not. And do you think it is unfair to ask able-bodied welfare recipients to work 20 hours a week?

Mr. HAYWORTH. It is not unfair at all. In fact, it is the beginning of true compassion.

Mr. KINGSTON. And that is what I am hearing from the middle class. They are saying if somebody is desperate, let us help them out. We are Americans. We are compassionate. But if they are just lazy and they are refusing to work, why should I put in my overtime to pay him to sit on the porch?

Mr. HAYWORTH. As my friend from Georgia points out, oftentimes in Washington-speak we hear of the safety net for those in society who truly are unfortunate, for those who through circumstances beyond their own control, with physical challenges, with economic traumas that exist, who truly need a safety net. But the sad fact is, by failing to end welfare as we know it, this President again has ensured that the safety net becomes a hammock for the very people who should be at work.

Indeed, as the gentleman from Georgia is well aware, again in this election season, last Saturday the President of the United States chose to talk about real welfare reform that is being instituted in the great State of Wisconsin under Gov. Tommy Thompson. But the interesting thing is that President Clinton, while granting a couple of waivers to Wisconsin for revolutionary changes in that system, when Wisconsin wants to make further changes, he endorses the general concept but he has yet to come across with the real waivers. I champion our colleagues on this side of the aisle from Wisconsin who earlier today challenged the President of the United States to extend those waivers needed to take the next rational step in real welfare reform in Wisconsin.

But of course, as my friend from Georgia knows, it was the plan of this new majority to go one better than all of that, to allow States not to apply for some waiver from those who would be

seemingly omniscient or omnipotent here on the banks of the Potomac, here within the Washington bureaucracy, but instead be free to solve the problems themselves.

I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I hate to interrupt you when you are on your 10-dollar-word roll here.

Mr. HAYWORTH. That is correct. I will yield some time to drive up the price.

Mr. KINGSTON. What they want is a Medicaid and Medicare waiver and a welfare waiver is when a State says, "We want to take the poverty resolution program back in our own hands without having Washington mandate it," I want to make sure that people understand that that is what we are talking about.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

Mr. KINGSTON. The Governor from Wisconsin says, "We have a new plan. We want the waivers from Washington so we can implement it."

Mr. HAYWORTH. It is really the game of "Mother, may I?" Or perhaps translated, "Uncle Sam, may I?" "Washington bureaucrats, may I?" "May we make those changes?"

Well, a legitimate debate can continue on the role of the Federal Government, but when we have adopted policies that continue to concentrate power and authority in Washington, in the hands of bureaucrats instead of in the hands of duly elected officials, then we have serious problems. So it is really the wrong question for States to have to ask "Mother, may I?" or "Uncle Sam, may I?"

In fact, the change should be that those States should be free and empowered to do the right thing in their own way. And we are joined by our good friend from California, Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for his very articulate demonstration or description of what Federal Government should not do, and that is to impose on the American people at every level of life. What I think is ironic is the fact that there are a few things that the Federal Government should do that it is not doing, and one of those things is the defense bill that we have just put on the House floor.

I can recall, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement in the Committee on National Security, asking the services to come into my office along with my Democrat counterpart, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON]. Ike and I sat there and asked the services, under the Clinton administration's budget, whether or not they had enough basic ammunition, enough bullets to fight the two-war scenario that they have to fight if America is going to be secure; that is, perhaps to be engaged in a war in the Middle East, like the one against Saddam Hussein, but to have enough ammunition and enough supplies to take on, for example, the North Koreans, if

they should take advantage of a war in the Middle East to come down the Korean Peninsula.

So we asked the people who are in charge of the ammunition supply if under the Clinton administration's budget they had enough basic ammo, enough bullets to fight what we are going to require them to fight. And the Marines, the Marines always being candid, said, "No, frankly not, Congressman." So we asked them for a list of what they needed, and they came up with an inadequacy, a requirement of 96 million M-16 bullets that they were short under President Clinton's defense budget for the job that we will call on them in time of conflict to do.

So here is an administration that is getting into every aspect of people's lives, but the one aspect that the Constitution charges them to be concerned about and to carry out, which is to defend the country, they are not doing. I was absolutely amazed when we got this list of everything from basic M-16 rounds.

In fact, the gentleman, my friend from Arizona and my friend from Georgia, may have seen me carrying around an empty ammo pouch, a U.S. Marine ammo pouch to symbolize the M-16 bullets. They are short howitzer rounds and down to that basic M-16 bullet.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield a little bit?

Mr. HUNTER. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. KINGSTON. Being an expert on defense, one of the things we hear quite often is Americans under U.N. command. Last year, as I recall, we passed a bill that said Americans would not serve under U.N. command or wear U.N. uniforms. Was that vetoed?

Mr. HUNTER. That bill was vetoed.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thought it was vetoed. So here we have a President who has vetoed Congress, which on a bipartisan basis said no more Americans serving under U.N. command.

□ 2145

Mr. HUNTER. That is right. The President vetoed the bill. One of the articulated reasons was that he did not like that inhibition on what he thought were his Commander-in-Chief powers.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask you another question, if I may. Now, in terms of globe trotting and playing police officer of the world, what about the War Powers Act? Have you strengthened that in your bill, or weakened it, because I share the concern. We are in Somalia without a mission. We are in Haiti, the mission is still undefined. We are in Bosnia. We have a mission for each month of the year.

So what is happening in your bill on the War Powers Act, which says that the President cannot commit American troops overseas for more than 90 days without congressional permission?

Mr. HUNTER. Actually there is not a substantial revision of the President's powers, because most of the President's

powers come under the Constitution. The President is the Commander-in-chief of the Armed Services.

So if you are worried about the Marines having enough ammo, you can go to Congress and you can get enough ammunition. That is what the Marines did. If you are worried about the safety record of the planes that have been crashing recently, you can come in and ask for the safety upgrades, which the Clinton administration had not wanted to fund, but we did under the Republican leadership.

But if you want to have a Commander-in-Chief who is not going to lead your young Marines and soldiers out from a new adventure every 3 or 4 weeks, you are going to have to change one thing, and that is the Commander-in-Chief. So the only answer for the American people for that one is to get a new Commander-in-Chief.

But on that point, it is true that if you ask the Commandant of the Marine Corps, he told us that the young Marines today have a higher personnel tempo; that is they have to leave their families more often and go out to some part of the world under this President's foreign policy, that at any time since World War II. You have more people leaving home, being deployed for long periods of time, than at any time since World War II.

Mr. KINGSTON. Now, you mentioned the Commander-in-Chief. Is the Commander-in-Chief a member of the military?

Mr. HUNTER. Well, funny you should bring that up. I saw something that I thought was an April Fool's thing. Today there was an article in the paper that said that the President was asking for protection under the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act from being sued civilly. I thought that was one of those things that they were bringing out a kind of an April Fool's thing, kind of a satire. But I understand it is true, that he is actually saying that he as Commander-in-Chief qualifies for the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act, since he is in the military, because he is the head of the Armed Services, and therefore this lawsuit in Arkansas cannot touch him. I was amazed.

Mr. KINGSTON. Which lawsuit is that? There are several.

Mr. HUNTER. The lawsuit, I understand it is, what, a sexual harassment lawsuit by a young lady in Arkansas. But to me that is not what is the jarring point of this. To me what is the jarring point of this is that the President would invoke the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act when he is not a soldier or a sailor, and in fact when he at one point made that statement that he loathed America's military.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Indeed, if my friend from California would yield, I will include in the RECORD a story that appeared in this morning's Washington Times by Brian Blomquist, and to set this in perspective, Mr. Speaker, for those who joined us in the Chamber tonight and for those who join us nationwide and worldwide via C-SPAN, let me

read and quote directly from the article that appeared in this morning's Washington Times on the front page by Brian Blomquist.

President Clinton has provoked a furor by asserting in legal papers that as Commander-in-Chief, he is in the military and a sexual harassment lawsuit against him must be postponed until his active duty is completed.

The chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs is gathering signatures from other Congressmen to send a letter to Mr. Clinton criticizing his latest defense in the lawsuit brought by former Arkansas employee Paula Corbin Jones.

In papers filed a week ago, Mr. Clinton seeks to defer the lawsuit under the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act of 1940 which grants automatic delays in law suits against military personnel until their active duty is over.

Mr. HUNTER. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Let me finish this one sentence. It is worth reminding folks: "Mr. Clinton maneuvered to avoid military service in 1969 during the Vietnam War."

I will end the statement there and include the entire article at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, May 22, 1996]

CLINTON DODGES SUIT, SAYS HE'S IN MILITARY

CRITICS FUME AT COMMANDER IN CHIEF

(By Brian Blomquist)

President Clinton has provoked a furor by asserting in legal papers that as commander in chief he is in the military and a sexual-harassment lawsuit against him must be postponed until his active duty is completed.

The chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee is gathering signatures from other congressmen to send a letter to Mr. Clinton criticizing his latest defense in the lawsuit brought by former Arkansas employee Paula Corbin Jones.

In papers filed a week ago, Mr. Clinton seeks to defer the lawsuit under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940, which grants automatic delays in lawsuits against military personnel until their active duty is over.

Mr. Clinton maneuvered to avoid military service in 1969, during the Vietnam War.

A petition filed May 15 says, "President Clinton here thus seeks relief similar to that which he may be entitled as commander-in-chief of the armed forces, and which is routinely available to service members under his command."

The petition was filed before the Supreme Court by Clinton attorney Robert S. Bennett. Mr. Bennett said the criticism is misleading because the 1940 legislation is a minor element of Mr. Clinton's claim that he should be immune from civil suits while in office.

"If you read [Mr. Clinton's 24-page petition] through the first time, you would miss" any reference to the law, he said.

The petition cites the law as an example of when a public official—say, a servicemen on active duty who is being sued by his wife—can argue that the legal action must be delayed, Mr. Bennett said.

"The president is on duty 24 hours a day, and you could literally tie up a president in lawsuits all the time," he said.

Mr. Bennett acknowledged Mr. Clinton's petition does argue that if the 1940 law is applicable to a sergeant, it should be applicable to the commander in chief. But "we're not pushing that argument," he said.

Mrs. Jones is suing Mr. Clinton for sexual harassment, contending she was approached

by an Arkansas state trooper in 1991 during a trade show at a hotel and asked to go to Mr. Clinton's suite.

She says she went and engaged in small talk with Mr. Clinton, who was then Arkansas governor, before he exposed his genitals and asked her to perform a sex act.

The Supreme Court could decide as early as next month, or as late as September, whether to accept the case, Mr. Bennett said.

The claim on behalf of the president ignited immediate fury from veterans and their advocates.

"You are not a person in military service, nor have you ever been," House Veterans Affairs Committee Chairman Bob Stump, Arizona Republican, wrote in a letter he is sending to Mr. Clinton.

"Bill Clinton was not prepared to carry the sword for his country, but has no hesitancy in using its shield if he can get away with it," said J. Thomas Burch Jr., chairman of the National Vietnam Veterans Coalition.

Mr. Stump and Rep. Robert K. Dornan, California Republican, called Mr. Clinton's legal tactic "a slap in the face to the millions of men and women" who have served. Their letter was circulated to members of Congress last night. Mr. Dornan is chairman of the House National Security Committee's military personnel subcommittee.

The two congressmen urge Mr. Clinton to "take the honorable course" and withdraw the military-service argument.

"By pursuing it, you dishonor all of America's veterans who did so proudly serve," their letter said.

Federal law defines a person in military service as any member of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force or Coast Guard, or any officer of the Public Health Service detailed by proper authority for duty with the Army or Navy.

The law does not explicitly include the commander in chief. Article II of the Constitution gives the president authority over the military as commander in chief.

But the president is a civilian, not a military officer, which wartime Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt recognized, according to the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress.

In 1950, the Surrogate Court of Dutchess County, N.Y., was asked to rule on a claim by Roosevelt's survivors, who sought tax benefits on the grounds that he died in the military.

The court rejected the claim, stating unquestionably that the president is a civilian.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield, I appreciate him yielding. This is one of those things where even though the gentleman who is in the White House is of another party, you hope when you read a story like that, that it is not true, that he has not tried to do this, because the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act was passed for one reason, and that was because GI's, like Audie Murphy, were going over to foreign theaters and were expected to go because we were on the verge, we were getting into World War II, and we knew people would be leaving for 1, 2, 3, 4 years at a time. Some of them might never come back.

The last thing that you wanted for a veteran who was overseas fighting in Europe or later on in Asia or in other places was to have a lawsuit filed against him in American courts while he was off fighting in the jungle some-

place, and since he was unaware of it, have that lawsuit basically turn into a judgment for lack of response from the soldier or sailor who did not even know it was being filed, and have that judgment end up taking away his farm or his house or something else.

It was meant to give relief to America's fighting men who were overseas fighting for their country, and women, I might add. So people like the women who were ferrying planes for Jackie Cochran's WASPS in World War II, the women who took planes back and forth to Great Britain, had the same type of relief.

So for a sitting President of the United States, who is surrounded by lawyers, who never stepped a foot overseas during the conflict in which he said he loathed the military, for him to cloak himself in an act that was designed to keep basic American soldiers from losing their farm while they were off fighting and were not available to answer a court summons, is absolutely a misuse of this act.

Here is a President who has got wall-to-wall lawyers. My gosh, I am sure the American Trial Lawyers will lend him a couple, since he saved their back on a number of occasions. I just hope, there are some times you say "I do not care if he is Democrat or Republican. I just hope he did not do that." I hope this is a farce, that this is not true, that somebody pulled an April Fool's joke on this reporter.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from California. I would share his sentiments. But, as with many occurrences in the last few days, the last few months, the last 3 years, it is not an April Fool's joke, it is the absolute truth.

I would like to pause at this juncture to salute my colleague from the great State of Arizona, the dean of our delegation, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, BOB STUMP, who is one of the workhorses here on Capitol Hill. "Stumper" is not a show horse. He is the dean of the Arizona delegation, who came to this institution under the other party's label, but who as a clear, common sense conservative, has been unwavering in his support of our Nation's defense, unwavering in his commitment to improving the lot of the Nation's veterans, and who stands here not, not to try and heap scorn or abuse on the office of the Presidency, but to make very clear that while it is not the job of Congress to pass judgment in a legal proceeding, a civil proceeding in a court of law, it is important for the Congress of the United States to speak out when a law that is intended for active duty personnel is co-opted, is twisted, is turned, for the convenience of a civilian Commander in Chief, by the gentlemen in the so-called legal profession whose job it is to search out technicalities.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield just briefly, there is no one more qualified to raise this question, because the great BOB STUMP that you just

spoke of, who is a dear friend and one of the finest people in this House, and is pure gold with respect to national security and veterans issues, BOB STUMP left his family at the age of 17 in World War II and joined the United States Navy, probably the youngest sitting Member in this body or the other body to have joined the military.

That is what this law was for. The Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act was for the BOB STUMPS of the world, so when they went off for 2 years or more, they would not lose their farm because of a lawsuit that they did not even know about which came to a judgment while they were gone. He is the kind of guy that this law was passed for, right where we are standing in this body, in those very dramatic years just before Pearl Harbor.

So it is appropriate that the dean of the Arizona delegation, BOB STUMP, and I might add another very fine person and a very fine Member of this body and a very excellent pilot also, a former Member of the United States Air Force, ROBERT DORNAN, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on National Security, who is joining Mr. STUMP in this challenge to the way the President has misapplied a basic act that was meant to protect people who went off to serve their country.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I wanted to kind of go over to another topic. While we are on the legal profession and revising things, if we may, I want to talk about our criminal justice reform efforts, to keep the streets of America safe. It gets back to the same thing of twisting the laws and using it as a vehicle, rather than using it for its intended purpose of justice.

But about 2 years ago, I had a call from a family telling me that a man who raped their daughter was about to get out of prison. Here were the circumstances. Their daughter actually is a grown woman. She was giving her 3-year-old a bath one day, the doorbell rings, and she does not answer it. The next thing you know, the back door gets kicked in and a man comes in, and here is a woman with a 3-year-old bathing the 3-year-old. And the rapist says, "You cooperate with me and the kid doesn't get hurt."

Needless to say, she cooperated. But, fortunately, they found out who the man was and they arrested him and so forth, and he was sent to jail for 10 years. Well, as it turns out, 3 years later, he is getting out. The family was calling me because they had been put on notice he was about to get out of prison.

One of the things that we had done to make our streets safe is to require truth in sentencing, so that thug rapists like this gentleman, and, frankly, I think 10 years is a light sentence, but if he served the sentence for 10 years, he serves 10 years. Our Republican bill gives States money for new prison construction as long as they have truth-in-

sentencing laws, which I think is one of the keys to have our streets of America safe. Because I am very concerned about the American middle class, and particularly the women who are home alone many hours, or who are out by themselves, and are subject to these attacks of rape. I believe that we need to continue those efforts as a party.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would share the sentiment of the gentleman from Georgia and make one amendment to that in terms of oft times when we get into the style of debating here on the floor, we refer to each other as a gentleman. I dare say this rapist does not qualify as a gentleman. He qualifies as a convict, as a sexual predator, and one who should not be back out on the streets to assault that family again, or any other family.

Well, not only do we need truth in sentencing, we need truth in government. Good people can disagree from time to time on philosophical approaches. But as a newcomer to this body, and I am so glad to have friends like the gentleman from California, who has spent some time here, who has come here rallying around the cry of strong national defense and a true notion of fiscal conservatism and a commitment to protect this Nation's borders, but I would like to ask my friend from California, in the wake of his time in this Chamber, has he ever seen a time when the debate has ranged so far from honest philosophical disagreements to epithets and name calling and playground taunts, and to be charitable and, quite frankly, to adhere to the rules of the House and basic decorum, a departure from fact, as we have seen in the wake of the frustration of this new liberal minority in response to the positive agenda of our new majority?

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for placing the question so well. I will tell you what I think has been the biggest faux pas, the biggest mistake, the biggest blunder that liberals have made on the floor this year and have made in speeches throughout the country, and this goes all the way from the White House right down to the people that run the political operations at the grassroots, and that is the liberals have constantly said and they have constantly misstated the fact with respect to what Republicans are trying to do, to rescue the Medicare problems that we have in this country and the Medicare program from bankruptcy.

What I guess bothers me the most is the idea that you had an American President whose own cabinet members helped to bring about a report of the Medicare Trust Fund that said Medicare is going broke. We have got to do something about it. So Republicans came in with a plan that increased Medicare spending some 40 percent over the next number of years, but increased it from about \$4,700 to about \$6,200, increased it substantially, yet cut out waste, cut out fraud, cut out abuse, and offered a range of options to our senior citizens.

In an issue that was that sensitive and that important to the American people, and particularly our moms and dads and our grandmothers and grandfathers, the decision was made at the White House just not to tell the truth, to tell a lie. So when we increase Medicare spending 40 percent, the gentleman at the White House, Bill Clinton, right down to the grassroots level of liberal leaders in this country, would say, almost in unison, almost chant, "This is a cut, this is a cut, this is a cut." And we would get up and say "Wait a minute. We are increasing Medicare spending. We are increasing Medicare spending. Is that a cut?" They said, "We do not care where you are going, that is a cut."

□ 2200

And they scared literally millions of senior citizens.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And, indeed, to revise the numbers in the wake of negotiations with the Senate, indeed it has been our goal to raise Medicare spending per beneficiary beyond \$4,700 this year to upwards of \$7,300 in the revised plan, working in concert with the new majority in the Senate. So we have even added more.

But what we have tried to do is restrain the rate of growth in the program to more than twice the current inflation rate, which we think is being prudent because it adds again as much as the current rate of inflation even while offering free market solutions.

And, again, as the gentleman from California points out, we are constantly met by what seems to be the sloganeering and a perverse catechism, if you will, or a chant and mantra that these are cuts, these are cuts; they are coming for seniors. And, again, nothing could be further from the truth.

But there is another development, and I would be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. HUNTER. You know what this is like? This is like the Democratic leadership yelling fire in a theater that is crowded with senior citizens, making them stampede toward the door. It is absolutely unconscionable.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I believe the analogy is apt, and I believe there is a new development which we should share with the American people, reported first by our good friend from Texas, BILL ARCHER, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, a gentleman who has his finger on the pulse of economic activity in this country, a gentleman who wants to bring about meaningful reform to our system of taxation that currently absolutely penalizes people who succeed, and this is the development.

I am sad to say this is really the message that can only be borne with a certain amount of trepidation and fear, and it is this: Those self-same trustees on a bipartisan basis now report to us, though the White House has yet to formally release this report, they now tell us that the hospital fund for Medicare is in debt in excess of \$4 trillion.

So, in essence, what has happened, to draw on the history of ancient Rome, we have a lot of folks pulling out their fiddles to play while the program is going up in flames, all because of the cynical manipulation and electioneering that some of this Chamber would do to try and succeed in the next election instead of trying to truly save the program for the next generation.

And, indeed, to the credit of those media outlets, oftentimes referred to by this gentleman in the well and others as the liberal media, even *The Washington Post*, even *The Washington Post*, on its editorial page, referred to the shameful scare tactics of the left as *Mediscare*, *Medigoguary*. It is unconscionable.

Again, I suppose it comes down to this fundamental difference, and perhaps this is where philosophy comes back in, because it is a philosophical division that is borne of the practical application of political power, or the absence thereof on the left, and it is this: Today we are confronted by a minority in this body, in the wake of the historic shift in attitudes, that is so jealous of the power it once wielded, that so yearns for that political power that it will say anything, claim anything, scare anyone in its pursuit of power, and yet try to conceal the fact that now Medicare is already operating at a deficit to the tune of \$4 plus billion this year.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Glad to yield to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. My mom and dad are on Medicare, and probably your parents are, if you are fortunate enough to still have your parents. The fact is it is a 1964 Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan. I would like my parents to have all the options available in 1996. If they want to have a medical savings account, if they want to have a managed care plan, if they want traditional Medicare, if they want a physician service network, I want them to have that option and I want that health care to be there for them tomorrow.

Our plan increases their benefit from \$5,000 to \$7,000. And we need to move in a direction where they do have a choice, they do have options, but the program is protected and it is there not just for their generation but for other generations that follow.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think the point is very well taken.

My friend from California.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield, I want to bring up one other subject for just a minute, if the gentleman will indulge me.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Gladly.

Mr. HUNTER. We had a number of Armed Services hearings this year, or national security hearings in the Committee on National Security, and we had the Joint Chiefs before us, and we had the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Clinton's Secretary of Defense, Bill Perry, before us. I asked all of them a ques-

tion to lead off the hearing, and I tried to keep fairly consistent and put it to them early on in each hearing, and I asked Mr. Perry, Dr. Perry, Bill Clinton's Secretary of Defense, this question: Do we have the ability in the United States to stop a single incoming ballistic missile coming into one of our cities? And the answer that is on the record for everybody to read is, no, we do not have the ability to stop a single incoming ballistic missile.

Now, I think it is kind of significant that he would say that this year, because after the gulf war, when we had so many of our soldiers who were injured by the Scud missiles that Saddam Hussein launched at us, people in this Chamber and people in the Senate went into a frenzy, and we immediately passed a resolution that said we shall have a defense against a limited ballistic missile attack against the United States by 1996.

We said that right after the gulf war in 1992. Well, it is now 1996 and we have nothing to defend the American people against incoming ballistic missiles.

Now, it is true that the Russian empire, the Soviet empire has been broken up, and Belarus and Kazakhstan and the Ukraine and Russia are not separate states, but the Russians still maintain a very strong strategic system. They have ICBM's, SS-18's, they have SLBM's which are their missiles launched from submarines, and, of course, they have their bomber aircraft. But many other nations are now developing missiles.

We live in an age of missiles. The Chinese are developing long-range missiles. Some of them are targeted at American cities. We raised a fuss over China intimidating Taiwan just before their elections. Remember, the Chinese started shooting missiles over Taiwan to scare them. One of the Chinese diplomats said to one of our diplomats, we hope the United States does not decide to back Taiwan too strongly. We think that they will prize Los Angeles more than they will Taiwan.

Now, that was a direct threat of a missile attack. And perhaps a missile attack would never come from China, but the fact that they were using the threat of a missile attack that we know we cannot defend against as a means of pushing their foreign policy and keeping us from protecting our friends is a very dark day in American diplomatic history.

The North Koreans now are building what is known as a Taepo Dong II missile. We have seen pictures of it. Our intelligence people know about it. It has between a 4,000- and 6,000-kilometer range, and a kilometer is about a thousand meters. That means that that weapon system, with a light load, a biological weapons load or a chemical load will be able to reach Hawaii and Alaska, which, the last time I looked, were part of the United States.

We are not doing anything under this President to build a defense against incoming ballistic missiles. So on the de-

fense bill last year, and the gentleman in the well from Arizona, who is a great supporter of national security, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], both supported very strongly the Republican position that said to the President build and deploy by the year 2003, it is about 7 years, and it will take about that long if we start right now, a defense against a limited attack of nuclear weapons, of ICBMs. Ballistic missiles.

Well, the President vetoed the defense bill and he vetoed it for two stated reasons. One was the reason Mr. KINGSTON spoke of; that he wanted to reserve the right to turn American troops over to the United Nations in time of conflict when he wanted to do that; and, second, he vetoed it because he did not want to build a defense against ballistic missiles.

So we have repackaged that directive that we think is very, very important. And I think this is just as important. It is as important that we recognize that we live in an age of missiles, as when Billy Mitchell taught us in the 1920's by sinking those battleships with aircraft, that we lived then in an age of air power. There was a major constituency in Washington, DC, with its head in the sand that said, we do not ever want to believe that we have moved out of the age of naval power. We do not want to accept that we live in the age of air power.

They wanted to court-martial Billy Mitchell, and we did court-martial him, I believe, in 1925.

Mr. KINGSTON. He had one vote for him.

Mr. HUNTER. He did have one vote and that was Douglas MacArthur. And, incidentally, I was trying to tell that story today, and our good friend CHARLES BASS looked up and said, "I know. He is my uncle." So we do have among us the great nephew of Billy Mitchell, CHARLIE BASS.

Mr. KINGSTON. And what Billy Mitchell was trying to accomplish was to show that America was not prepared.

Mr. HUNTER. Precisely.

Mr. KINGSTON. And he did it at the risk of his own military career. And I think history will show that he had his heart in the right spot.

But I find it appalling, as somebody who is on the east coast near a Trident submarine base. The gentleman is telling me that a ballistic missile can be dropped in Saint Marys, GA, and we cannot do anything about it? I want to hear him say that again.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is asking the question that many Americans have asked or believe they have answered for themselves and believe that we can defend against an incoming ballistic missile attack.

I have had a focus group where my constituents said, yes, we think we are defended. Why would not our Government defend us against ballistic missiles? And we had to tell them no, you are not defended.

So the answer is no. And Mr. Perry was very honest. The Secretary of Defense is honest when you ask him a direct question. He said no we cannot stop a single incoming ballistic missile coming into an American city.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I just think this is a vital point to bring up, and I thank the gentleman from California in bringing it up.

In all candor, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Secretary of Defense for being equally candid to tell us that today we are vulnerable to a missile attack from anyone anywhere in the world, a rogue nation, a leader gone mad, one of the folks or one of the nations which we would feel would be our conventional adversary, if you will. We are unprepared.

I would simply remark that Mark Twain said it first and said it best. "History does not repeat itself, but it rhymes." And here we have a parallel in our history where we need to be warned not to scare people but to alert people to a threat to our common defense, and one that we have the technology to solve if we but bring the willpower to solve it.

And the executive branch, quite frankly, this administration, as custodian of our foreign policy and as custodian of our defense policy has been lackluster at best. Indeed, I recall a breakfast sponsored by my good friend from California during our transition, before I ever took the oath of office in this House, when I asked Dr. Perry what was the rationale for this Government even thinking of supplying nuclear reactors to the outlaw nation of North Korea. And the secretary replied to me, oh, you need a better briefing on that.

No briefing necessary to know that it is not in the interest of the United States of America to supply any nuclear reactor to an outlaw nation like North Korea. It defies common sense, it defies logic and it is part of the ill-advised circumstance foisted upon the American people who, unfortunately heretofore, have been unaware of the danger in which we find ourselves if we fail to provide for the common defense.

My friend from California is absolutely right, and before the American people, Mr. Speaker, jump to a conclusion that we are talking about some sort of boondoggle in the billions upon billions of dollars, I would yield again to my friend from California to talk about some interesting estimates that we have received in reference to building a system that is leaner and keener with new technologies. What are the estimates we have now?

□ 2215

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is absolutely right. We can build a missile defense system for less than 1 percent of the annual defense budget. I might add, the annual defense budget has been reduced by \$100 billion under what it was when Ronald Reagan faced down the Soviet Union in the 1980s. But for

roughly \$5 billion, that is the estimate of Dr. Perry, Mr. Clinton's Secretary of Defense, we can build this defensive system; \$5 billion is less than our Aegis destroyer program. It is less than our submarine program. It is less than our bomber program. It is less than our F-22 program. And it is the only thing that will stop incoming ballistic missiles. We need that system.

The Defend America Act that the gentleman is cosponsoring, that Mr. KINGSTON is cosponsoring and that Mr. SPENCE, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. LIVINGSTON, chairman of Appropriations, and our Speaker NEWT GINGRICH are sponsoring, will be on the floor shortly. Every single Member of this Congress, especially those who all signed on to the Defend America Act after Desert Storm, after the Scud attacks, should sign onto this bill and vote for it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Indeed, we should point out, as the gentleman from California is well aware with his knowledge of international policy, of foreign defense spending, that this President has committed to help Israel construct a defense mechanism, to put in place a defense mechanism against ICBM attack which begs the question, with all due respect to the nation of Israel, if it is important for that nation, is it not also important for the country which the President took the oath of office to support, uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, should not this country also have that missile defense?

Mr. HUNTER. The difference between the gentleman who is standing in the well and a member of the Knesset is that he can say, the gentleman from Israel can say, my President is defending me against missile attacks, and you have to tell your constituents, my President is not defending me against missile attacks.

MORE ISSUES OF CONCERN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to touch on some issues that we have not really gone over tonight, but I do want to make sure Mr. HAYWORTH got in his last comment on missile defense.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Well, I thank my good friend from Georgia.

It is simply this, Mr. Speaker. I believe those watching this debate tonight in the United States of America need to take a very clear-eyed, sober-minded approach to providing for our common defense and to understand that we are vulnerable to intercontinental ballistic missile attack. This is not scare tactics. This is something, believe me, we wish were otherwise, but we need to take steps today to ensure that we provide for the common defense and that we do not always look

to that legitimate role of the Federal Government, providing for that defense, as the place where all the job cuts and the reductions come to reinvent government as some would state it.

With that, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, before we totally leave the missile area, I just wanted to flesh out the question the gentleman from Arizona asked about how we are treating Israel with respect to building a missile defense as opposed to our own people. The Israelis are surrounded by Arab neighbors who want to launch ballistic missiles at Israel. In 1987, the Israelis were trying to develop a fighter, a craft called the Lavi aircraft. A number of us on the armed services program signed a letter that I drafted and CURT WELDON signed it, a number of Members who were still, HAL ROGERS of Kentucky signed it, a number of members who are on the Committee on Armed Services today, and we said to the Israelis, do not build a fighter aircraft because a lot of nations make fighter aircraft.

But there is one thing that no western nations build, and that is a defense against incoming ballistic missiles. We think that your program, your co-production program with the United States should not be fighter aircraft, it should be a defense against missiles. And the reason we think that is because we think in the near future, we wrote this in 1987 to Mr. Rabin, we said we think in the near future you will be attacked with Russian made ballistic missiles coming from a neighboring Arab state. And it was somewhat prophetic. We predicted the state might be Syria. It ended up instead coming from Saddam Hussein. But they were attacked by Russian-made ballistic missiles coming from another country.

The Israelis are very practical people. They live on a little postage stamp of land. They are very vulnerable. And they realize that they live in an age of missiles. When their Billy Mitchells tell them something, they act. So they said, we need a defense.

So they started, they embarked upon the production of the Arrow missile defense program. That is a defensive missile that when an incoming missile is launched at one of their cities will go up and intercept that missile and destroy it.

This President has signed on wholeheartedly in speeches to leaders in Israel to people that support the existence of the Israeli State, he has said, and properly so, I stand foursquare behind your program to defend against incoming ballistic missiles that might hurt people in Israel.

All we are asking him to do with the Defend America Act is to sign on for the same program for Americans. We want basically the same thing that we