

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

provide and are providing for the people of Israel. Nothing more, nothing less.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Again, it begs the question, with all due respect, if it is good enough for the nation of Israel, is it not good enough, should we not be prudent enough to provide the same sort of missile defense for the people of the United States of America?

Mr. HUNTER. Absolutely.

Mr. KINGSTON. Now, if the gentlemen would like to stick with me, I want to switch gears and talk about a few things.

First, I do think that it is absolutely appalling that people in St. Mary's, GA; Jacksonville, FL; Brunswick, GA are not protected from a missile attack to the nuclear submarine in St. Mary's. I am glad that the two of you are working on this. I am proud to cosponsor the bill. I hope that we can protect, shore up our security so that parents around the land do not have to worry about this.

I do want to switch gears. I have a letter from Mr. George Renshaw who ironically lives in St. Mary's. I want to quote him. He said, I never felt so strongly about Congress as I do now. All of you have amazed me. I see you many times on the House floor. Keep up the good work. By the way, I am an ex-Democrat.

I thought that was just a little good, positive feedback.

Mr. HUNTER. Is that one of your relatives?

Mr. KINGSTON. It may be, if not, certainly a friend.

I also wanted to apologize to the people from New Jersey. The other night the gentleman from New Jersey was talking about Medicare cuts. I pointed out to him that Medicare was going from \$196 to \$304 billion and if he thought that was a cut, that was a reflection of the education system in New Jersey.

I have a letter here from a Mr. Ron Jones in New Jersey, and he says he is offended by that. He agrees with me that the Congressman from New Jersey may have missed the point, but when you increase Medicare spending from \$196 to \$304 billion, that is not a cut.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think the observation to make to the good people of New Jersey is the gentleman from New Jersey, who fails to understand that, it is not so much that he is a product of New Jersey's system of education as much as he has adopted the old math, I will call it, the old math of the Washington bureaucracy, where a reduction in an anticipated increase is called a cut. Only in this city does that transpire.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that.

We are also increasing student loans from approximately \$27 to \$36 billion. Yet the President of the United States has called that a cut. I do not know what school system he went to, but, again, going from \$27 to \$36 billion is not a cut.

On Medicaid, we are doing the same thing, going from approximately \$90 to \$140 billion. Yet the same status quo Washington liberal bureaucracy is calling these things a cut. The fact is, we have got to get these programs under control.

I have an article here where the Atlanta Legal Aid Society tried to sue the State of Georgia because Medicaid did not pay for a sex change operation.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Would you please repeat that? I want to make sure that I understand what you just said and I think you owe it to the people nationwide who watch us tonight and to the Speaker in the chair, could you please repeat this letter?

Mr. KINGSTON. Remember the backdrop here. We are a country that is \$5 trillion in debt. We are a country that has a welfare program that is totally out of control. We have spent about \$4 trillion on it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Actually, all told, Government spending at all levels in the so-called war on poverty is now in excess of our national debt, \$5 trillion.

Mr. KINGSTON. Which is more money than we spent to win World War II. And at the time that most of these programs started under the big Government expansion programs of Lyndon Johnson, the poverty level was 14 percent. Today it is about 14 percent. So for all that we have done, we have only created great jobs for bureaucrats.

But here in the backdrop of all this debt, the Atlanta Legal Aid Society sued the State of Georgia to try to force it to use Medicaid funds, which is welfare insurance, to pay for a sex change operation. The case was called Rush versus Parham. Fortunately, it was dismissed. But that is the kind of ridiculous thinking that we have got out there.

Now, the gentleman from California will find this interesting. The legal services also sued the State of California because although one immigrant did not have, excuse me, very big distinction, these were illegal aliens.

Mr. HUNTER. We have lost several members of the bar in California. They were backed over by a van carrying illegal aliens. I am being facetious. Actually, they usually wait for the van to stop before they get out and offer their services.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is finished, I will continue.

The legal aid society sued the State of California for not giving illegal aliens a driver's license, even though they were in the country illegally.

Mr. HAYWORTH. It is just interesting, because in other States, I could be corrected by my friend from California, that is very interesting. Legal services wanted to step in for illegal immigrants. Illegal aliens here in this country without a passport, without due process to come into the country and remain, sued for the right of a driver's license. And yet in other States, I believe California has been courageous in this regard, because so many States

have processed motor voter where all one needs to register to vote is to apply for a driver's license.

Mr. KINGSTON. All one needs to get people to vote is drive down the street and say, hop in my van, let me take you to the polls because you are now registered to vote, because you are on welfare or you have a driver's license or you have other forms of public assistance.

Mr. HAYWORTH. It is stunning. Give us an update on the California situation.

Mr. KINGSTON. Just save us from your jokes.

Mr. HUNTER. I will not offer any one-liners, but I have to say that this situation does beg for some one-liners. You could actually get a twofer. If you are an illegal alien and you are driving to vote and you are pursued by the Border Patrol, you will not only be able to cast your ballot but also enjoy a healthy lawsuit against the Border Patrol or a sheriff's department with a good chance for recompense.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask you something else.

Mr. HUNTER. What the gentleman has described is true. As I understand, in talking to a member of the State assembly, the bill to deny illegal aliens, and this was Jan Goldsmith who represents Poway in San Diego County, the bill to deny illegal aliens the right to a duplicate driver's license, even though it is obvious that the driver's license was fraudulently issued, was passed out of committee. His bill to deny them this right was passed out of committee by, I believe, a single vote. I believe every member of the Democrat Party voted against that.

□ 2230

Now, I am not positive on the breakdown of the vote, but as I understand, it was a very, very narrow vote to pass the ban coming out of committee on this activity.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And is it not amazing that for most commercial transactions, when any American citizen wants to go into a major retailer or any store, a grocery store, and wants to pay for the items purchased with a check, that that shopper must produce two forms of identification, quite often, and with the manipulation and the usurpation of rights under motor voter, we are setting up a scenario in which noncitizens will not be required to show any proof of citizenship to have the right to vote in elections that determine the future of the United States of America.

How cynical, how corrupting. What an insult to those hard-working, honest immigrants who come here who apply for citizenship, who want to be American citizens more than anything else in the world, who want to contribute something to this country, who want to have a better future for themselves and their families, and whose very citizenship is being cheapened by these cynical actions designed to perpetuate a cynical welfare state and to

return to power those who seek power by any means necessary.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let us talk about this because I think it is very important, as we explore welfare reform for the third time, and hopefully, maybe because it is an election year, the President will vote for it this time, but as we get into the health care benefit and the portion of welfare and State grants and so forth, I think it is important to know we have worked on health care reform for American middle-class families. We have tried to make it more affordable and more accessible through the portability clauses and eliminate the preexisting-illness conditions of the policies so that middle-class Americans can take their health care with them and not be held hostage to the insurance company or have a job loss.

The other thing, which I know the two of you have supported, is medical savings accounts. Today I presented to the Speaker and to DENNY HASTERT and the health care conferees a letter signed by 162 Members, bipartisan Members, of this Chamber asking that conferees keep the medical savings accounts in the health care reform; medical savings accounts, basically a high-deductible plan that allows consumers to pay for their own first-dollar health care expenses like stitches, x rays, routine checkups, and so forth, but they get to save the money, they get to pocket what they have saved from the deductible, use it for long-term health care or use it for a college education account or, you know, use it for Christmas money or whatever they want. The money is tax free, though, if it is spent on medical expenses.

And that is what middle-class American needs, is health care—

Mr. HUNTER. But, if the gentleman will yield, the liberals in America do not want the American people to have the freedom to shop for themselves, because it is exactly what you are talking about is shopping. Instead of shopping for food, instead of shopping for clothes, you get to shop for your own medical care. And if you think you have got a good doctor who will take that x ray for \$25 or \$30 under the costs of another doctor, you have got an incentive to go out and shop for that better buy just like you shop for a better buy in all aspects of life.

Liberals do not like that. They do not like it because it cuts dependency, and they do not like it because people exercise freedom. If you teach people to exercise freedom enough, pretty soon they are going to want to have a lot more freedom, and that is a bad thing from a liberal perspective.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, the irony is two things, how this can serve, is that when American consumers go into an appliance store, they know how much a dishwasher costs, a new refrigerator, a stereo, an automobile, even a house, and yet if you get a broken arm, we do not have any idea. Is it \$200, is it \$900? How many bills am I going to get? You

know, what about setting a broken leg? I have no idea.

I mean American consumers need to know. An amniocentesis, if a woman gets an amniocentesis, she gets bills from every lab in America for 6 months. Should not the women in America be able to know when they go in how much it is going to cost them?

What a medical savings account will do will put her back in charge, and then she will know, hey, this is supposed to be a \$300 deal, this is not going to be a \$600 deal, Dr. Jones down the street only charges \$275.

Mr. HUNTER. You know, you are talking about that woman who, in so many cases today, is the head of household, and the idea that we are so cynical in Washington, DC, or liberals are so cynical that they do not want that woman who is head of the household to go out and shop for medical care, they do not think she is smart enough, they do not think she should be trusted with making that choice. So they are going to do it for her. And yet if she goes out and shops smart, and she is able to shop smart in every other area; there are many households now headed by women who are building and, in many cases where there is single women raising kids, they have many choices and many challenges to meet with respect to education, with respect to buying homes, with respect to buying automobiles, with respect to forging the lives and building the character of their kids, and the idea that liberals have that somehow that a woman is not capable of shopping for a less expensive x-ray or she is not capable of finding out how much a medical procedure costs, does not make sense.

In fact the only way that we are going to be able to make health care affordable in this country is to rely on the best thing that we have got. That is the good common sense of our citizens.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is exactly right.

Let me give you another example of how medical savings accounts can make a difference and more consumer information. I read an article—

Mr. HUNTER. Now, what does a medical savings account do? If I have a medical savings account, what will I have?

Mr. KINGSTON. It is basically a high-deductible plan where any money that you do not spend you can use for long-term health care or you can use for a college education.

Mr. HUNTER. How much could I save out of the year if I do not spend much money on—

Mr. KINGSTON. It is \$2,500, \$2,000, \$4,000 deductible. So anything that you do not spend goes into your pocket.

There is a woman in Tampa, FL, who had breast cancer. She could not get the information she needed through the traditional health care provider network. So what she did, she got on the Net. How many of you out there have breast cancer? And she formed a

network and was able to find a support group and a physician who had a new specialty and a new drug, and as a result she has been able to deal with her illness a lot better.

Now, there is a doctor in Fort Worth who recommends a system whereby we can use our own television to actually one day get on some of those blank channels after channel 40 that, you know, we have on every TV, and they are all blank, get in there and say, "Back injury. How much? What? Lower back? Upper back," and keep pushing your remote and concentrate on where your back problems is, and then it would tell you the nature of it, which physicians in your area serve it, how much it costs to prevent, to spend on it. And think about how, if you tie in medical savings accounts in with the information highway, how great it will be for the American consumers.

Mr. HUNTER. You know, if the gentleman will yield on that point, a great American conservative, Tom Clancy, the author of "Hunt for Red October" and so many other best-selling books, has done something along the line of what the gentleman is talking about. He had a young kid who had cancer, kid named Kyle, young boy, and Tom formed a great friendship with this youngster as he was experiencing the trauma of cancer, and Kyle ultimately passed away. Well, Tom Clancy formed the Kyle Foundation, and the Kyle Foundation is dedicated to linking up people who need cancer information: What kind of information can I get about this type of cancer or that type of cancer? What types of doctors are specialists in this particular type of cancer that my son may have? Where do I go to get these doctors? And networking not only the users, the moms and the dads with children with cancer, but also networking the doctors so that a doctor who is making a breakthrough in one type of cancer on the other side of the country can hook up with a doctor on the other side of the country and exchange information, and this exchange of information and this ability of free people to shop for the best ideas and the best innovations in medicine is kind of what the gentleman is talking about.

That is the idea of not being harassed by government one-size-fits-all, "Wait in this line, and we will get to you when we get to you."

Mr. KINGSTON. We had a neighbor of mine, unfortunately he passed away also, named Julian Bono, and he did the same sort of thing is Savannah, GA, networking with other people who had cancer, passing on information, passing on treatments about doctors, and they had a list of physicians all over the country. Actually, he found a cure or a potential cure in Greece and helped some of the people go over there, and it is all we are saying to the liberal Washington establishment is let the American people do what they are best at: be sharp, smart shoppers.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And it goes a bit further than that, if the gentleman would yield. It goes to this question:

Not just allowing the American people to do so because realistically the power resides with the American people. Our system of government, our constitutional republic, provides that the power that many of us believe comes from a higher authority is bestowed on the people. The people in turn bestow it on the government. So it is not the government's domain to, quote unquote, allow the people this opportunity. Instead it is their fundamental right to pursue treatments they believe can help them, and it is their fundamental right, and I dare say as we stand poised at the dawn of the next century, we should restore the basic element of trust that we who are honored to serve in government through the consent of the governed trust the people to make decisions.

And again as I have said many times, I believe what crystallizes the debate when we get past the playground talks, when we get past the scare tactics, when we get past the deliberate disinformation, what characterizes this debate on almost every question of import is this:

Do you trust the American people, or are you so cynical or disdainful of the American people that you place your trust in a centralized bureaucracy in Washington?

I trust the American people, and I believe the people trust themselves, and we work to empower the people.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield on that, about the big bureaucracy, it is interesting that as we are debating budgets, the Democrat budget versus the Republican budget, that the Clinton Democrat budget adds 3,000 more Federal employees to the payroll and adds 14 new bureaucracies and agencies, and you know that is not what the message was. The message from the American people, which was accurately mirrored by the President, was the era of big government was over.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I just want to make sure because the gentleman was sitting close to me, and I heard in this well in that very unmistakable twang of Arkansas speech that the era of big government was over, and yet again I would ask the gentleman from Georgia to offer those figures, provided by the gentleman who stood here and told us the era of big government is over; what is that again?

Mr. KINGSTON. I will be happy to give you these figures, and I tell you one other, but the Clinton budget will cost us 3,000 more Federal bureaucrats, it creates 14 new Federal programs, and it claims to have \$129 billion in tax relief, but it takes back \$90 billion in increased taxes which were passed under the President, and then, as you probably know, the savings are all on the back end.

Yes, the President's budget balances in the year 2002, but, as the gentleman

in the well has pointed out it is equivalent of Mr. HAYWORTH saying, and I can get away with kidding him a little better than Mr. HUNTER, but it is the equivalent of you saying that you are going on a diet and lose 30 pounds, but you are not going to in 1 year, but you are not going to lose any of it until November.

□ 2245

Yes, you will be 30 pounds under by December 31. I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], if he wants to join in that, it might be a good idea.

Mr. HAYWOOD. Really. It is the equivalent of trying to lose 50 pounds and spending all year, the first 50 weeks, losing 2 pounds, and saying you are going to lose the other 48 in the final 2 weeks of the diet. Mathematically, the operation of subtraction can work when you put pencil to paper. Realistically, honestly, it does not work. It does not work.

This is what is especially galling. For when one is selected to serve and take the oath of office in this Chamber, as a member of the legislative branch, and I daresay, as our Chief Executive at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, there is a sacred trust, and there is a burden, an opportunity of governance that rests upon our shoulders.

How cynical it is to devise mathematical formulae which would say, oh, if I am bestowed with the trust of the American people for a second 4-year term, 2 to 3 year after I leave we will achieve this; 2 to 3 years after I give up custodianship of this role, things will come into balance.

It is akin to the shortcut to house cleaning, but it is with far, far more dire results, because you can sweep a little bit under the rug. We can take those kinds of shortcuts, but what this threatens is the very structure and the very foundation of our free society. It is not the same as sweeping the dirt under the rug, but it is fundamentally being less than candid about the challenge that confronts the American people.

And to some, in a Machiavellian sense, it may be really smart politically, but what a tragedy it would be if we would sacrifice candor and truthfulness and forthrightness in our governance for the sake of political expediency, rather than a call to make changes for the better.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, I hope and I think that the American people are not going to be taken in by the inconsistency that this President has displayed. I remember we were all sitting here the night when he said, "The era of big government is over." But I recall a few minutes later in the same speech, he announced, I believe, three new programs. Only William Clinton could do that and get away with it. I notice not a single news station, at least the ones that I observed, picked that up.

Only this President, who said that he loathed the American military and de-

liberately avoided service during Vietnam, could use the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act that is designed for military men and women serving overseas to keep them from losing their property while they are serving their country. Only he could invoke that Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act to protect himself from a civil lawsuit in Arkansas.

But I think that there is such a thing as being a little too cute and underestimating the American people to the point where, ultimately, when the people make a judgment with respect to this President, we are going to see that they have a lot more wisdom than he attributes to them.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me get back on the balanced budget. There are three reasons we need to keep focus on the balanced budget. No. 1, the Federal Reserve says if you have a balanced budget, interest rates will fall. If they fall as much as 2 percent, it would make a significant savings in your monthly home mortgage and your automobile bill, if you own your car.

No. 2, it will create jobs. Because small businesses can borrow money at lower interest rates, they will expand more opportunities which will be out there for everybody.

No. 3, your taxes will go down, because you will not have that huge crunch from the Federal Government that is draining the pocketbooks of American workers right now. That is one reason why this Congress fought so hard for the \$500-per-child tax credit.

The gentleman earlier talked about single women at home. Raising children is the most frustrating, the most difficult, the most expensive thing that I think I have ever tried to do, or anybody else can do. And a \$500-per-child tax credit will help the American working men and woman afford their family. It will help the middle class like no other measure that we could pass in Congress.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, what is especially important, I think of the single moms in the Sixth District of Arizona, and imagine if they had for their 3 children \$1,500 to save, spend, and invest as they see fit for those children, to spend that money on those children, to save that money for those children, instead of surrendering that money to Washington. It is especially galling that we have had a President who campaigned, and people talk about political strategies, and, oh, members of that reelection team looking at the Ronald Reagan strategy of 1984. Non-sense.

This is the same strategy utilized by the President in 1992. It is, simply stated, this: Talk like Ronald Reagan, govern like Michael Dukakis. Always talk right, govern left. This same President who said that the middle class deserved tax relief gave itself the largest tax increase in American history. This same President who said end welfare as we know it, has vetoed, not once but twice, the very welfare reform he purports in a general sense to champion.

This same President who said as a candidate in 1992 that he would balance the budget in 5 years, even when given a grace period of an extra 2 years, if you will, still uses curious mathematics and said, as pointed out by the gentleman from California, even in the same breath with yet another Reaganesque utterance: The era of big government is over, but here are three more programs. Here is more and more spending in Washington, DC. Here is more and more power vested in Washington, and here is the preservation of the status quo, even amidst the language of change.

There is, as I said earlier this evening, Mr. Speaker, a credibility canyon to go along with the Clinton crunch.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let us do some taxes. I think a lot of single moms out there, a lot of heads of households, a lot of folks with kids would like to know what this tax cut was that the President kept them from getting. We have all done our taxes in April. Most folks realize and remember how much they paid for taxes. Let us prepare some income taxes here, and show them what the American people lost when President Clinton killed the tax cuts for the American family.

It is very simple. If you are out there and you have two kids, you multiply two kids times \$500 apiece, and that is \$1,000. You deduct that from what you paid on April 15, so if you paid \$1,000 on April 15 and you have two children, under the tax cuts that the Republicans passed but that President Clinton killed, two times \$500 is \$1,000. At the bottom line on your 1040 you would have deducted \$1,000 from the \$1,000 you owed and you would have paid no taxes.

That means you would have had \$1,000 in your pocket for maybe the last half of that mortgage payment you were having trouble making, maybe the education fund for your daughter who is 15, who will soon be going off to college, maybe \$1,000 to put that down payment down on the lot outside of Phoenix, AZ, or San Diego, CA, where you want to build a house someday. That is the tax cut for the rich.

If you have four kids, you multiply four times \$500 and that is \$2,000, so everybody should just remember right now, just take a minute and remember what you paid in taxes to the Federal Government on April 15. Look at your family, whether they are in the living room with you or in the kitchen or they are out playing Little League or whatever, count the number of kids that you have and multiply that times \$500, and deduct that mentally from what you paid. That is the amount of money that you would have saved. Once again, Mr. Speaker, President Clinton depicted that tax cut as a tax cut for the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with him in a way. I think everybody in America, in this land of opportunity, who has chil-

dren is wealthy. They are rich. They are rich; not rich economically, but they are rich in opportunity. But this President killed this tax cut, and he called it a tax cut for the rich, so I hope that every American who pays taxes will remember that last figure they put down on their 1040, that \$1,000 that they paid or that \$10,000 that they paid, and that \$500 per child that they could have deducted if President Clinton had not stepped in and killed that tax cut.

Mr. KINGSTON. What is interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that while the administration was busy not cutting taxes, they had no problem cutting drug awareness money. Last week I had the opportunity to speak at the Harris County DARE graduation, and just some statistics that are in my mind.

The average age now nationally that teenagers smoke marijuana is age 13. Thirty-eight percent of parents think that their kids do not smoke or get involved in drugs, and yet, in reality, the percentage is often higher than that, depending on where they are. Twelve- and 13-year-olds and 14- and 15-year olds have one of the highest increases in marijuana use in the Nation, higher than any other age bracket.

But one of the statistics that I think is very encouraging is that if you can keep your child off of drugs until he or she is 19 years old, then they have a 90 percent chance of staying drug-free for the rest of their lives.

I think what we really need to do is talk to our teenagers about drug abuse. I think it should be drug and alcohol abuse and any other substance, legal or illegal, that they can abuse, because we have to keep our children drug-free. We have to keep our schools drug-free and the workplace drug-free. If we can do that, we are going to have a generation that will successfully take the torch on, and we will all be able to retire one day and they will pay for our Social Security.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would say, in fairness, I am glad that our friend, General McCaffrey, has been given charge of the war on drugs, but that does not excuse the fact that this administration has basically been AWOL in that war for the first 2½ years, almost 3 years of its time in office. So again, it is a case of too little, too late; or a type of "me too-ism" that smacks of electioneering, that smacks of opportunism, rather than a genuine quest to make the changes the gentleman from Georgia mentioned are so necessary.

It is borne out in other figures in the President's budget. Oh, sure, there are modest increases, for example, for the Drug Enforcement Agency, for the number of employees; for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, for the Border Patrol.

But yet, but yet, the glaring problem is this: that more and more money is put away so that upwards of 115,000 people in Bill Clinton's budget would be employed in the Internal Revenue

Service; easily, what, three times the number of people, or close to that, employed with the INS or the Border Patrol. So the message in fact is this: We may not have time to fight the war on drugs, we may not have the ability to protect the sanctity of our borders, but, by golly, we have the time to come and audit you, Mr. and Mrs. America, and your tax returns, because we fundamentally do not trust you; and these other problems, well, sure they are problems, but you see a lot in the priorities expressed in that budget with reference to the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, let me tell him what has happened with the Clinton administration's policy on stopping cocaine that is coming across the international border. A border patrolman, and as you may know, I represent a great deal of the California Mexican border, kind of the southern slice of the State. I know the gentleman represents a great deal of Arizona just to the east of my district.

A border patrolman came to us one day and gave us an internal memorandum from Doris Meissner, who is the head of INS for the Clinton administration. It concerned the border fence, because we have been building a border fence made out of landing mats, steel planks like those that you used in Desert Storm to build runways, except we turn them vertical instead of horizontal, and when we weld them to posts, we are making a steel fence 10 feet high and now some 14 miles long, from the Pacific Ocean to the coastal hills.

□ 2300

When we built that fence, my staff went out and searched the inventories of every military base from Guam from Guantanamo and found 179,000 surplus steel planks to build this fence with. But when we built the fence, we increased cocaine interdiction by 1,000 percent because the drug runners, who were just driving their cars and trucks across the border, not at the regular crossings but just right across the sagebrush landscape, now could not get across because of the steel fence, so they had to go through very channelized areas and we were catching them.

Now, in a number of places we had fence that was made out of chain link, and these chain link fences, the drug pushers and the drug smugglers would just take their clippers, clip that chain link, roll it back and drive their van or heavy-duty truck through it with cocaine for America's children.

The Government of Mexico asked Doris Meissner to meet with them because they did not like the idea that we were replacing these chain link fences with steel fences that nobody could drive through, made out of steel landing mat. As a result, she circulated a memorandum. I am going to bring it out to the floor next time we have a special order because I have got a copy of it.

It tells every Border Patrol chief, "You are no longer allowed to replace this flimsy chain link fence with steel landing mat." I call that the drug smuggler provision. Because the Government of Mexico has complained about it, from now on you can only repair a chain link fence with chain link.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman would yield for a question, since when does an official of this Government change policy for the protection and the edification of the citizens of this country to please representatives of a foreign government? Where on Earth and why in this Nation has that taken root? What is the explanation or the rationale for this?

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is asking me to explain a President who has sent our Government to the United Nations, our marines to Bosnia, and our jobs to Mexico. The answer is that this President is an internationalist. He believes very strongly in listening to people on other sides of the border. Now, that can be good, but it is not good when it conflicts with the thoughts of people on his side of the border.

We have an absolute right to maintain a border with integrity, tell people when they come across, come through the front door. Do not come through our back door. Do not drive cocaine across the hillsides into the southern reaches of California and Arizona.

But this administration has been dragged kicking and screaming to the border, and they have been a little disingenuous with us, while they are doing press conferences. They fought us on the 6,000 Border Patrol increase that we put in the crime bill and on the 600 Border Patrol increase that we put in the appropriations bill in fiscal year 1994. They fought us on that.

Mr. KINGSTON. And, I want to point out, vetoed the provision in welfare reform that said no permanent welfare benefits for illegal aliens, and that then was vetoed by the President.

Mr. HUNTER. Precisely. When the President vetoed that welfare provision for illegal aliens, when he allowed that welfare provision to keep being paid out, that kept the magnet alive. That kept the magnet that told people that if they came to the United States, as several Social Security ladies showed me when they came in my office, they said:

Congressman, here are some illegal alien families making more money on welfare than we are making as GS-11's working for the Federal Government, and they have discovered the joys of daytime television, they are not working.

That is a magnet that this President has allowed to keep turned on at full power, that brings people into this country illegally, because he is paying them more in welfare payments than they can make working in their native country.

But the point that I am making is this President and Doris Meissner, his INS Commissioner, who is a nice person, have testified against and fought

against every Border Patrol increase that we have passed in this Congress, that Republicans have passed.

Yet when we bring those newly trained Border Patrolmen that the Republican Congress passed down to the Boarder Patrol headquarters at San Ysidro, who is there to do a press conference and greet them but the very same Clinton administration officials who fought their funding in the first place. You know something? They do not even crack a smile.

You know something else? If we took all those Clinton officials who do press conferences at the border in San Diego and we simply had them touch hands, just link arms, they would stretch across the entire border between San Diego and the gentleman's great State of Arizona. We would not need a Border Patrol because we have more public relations people there than we have illegal aliens.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Well, it bring to mind really the definition of politics, I suppose, here in the late 20th century, at least as practiced by our campaigner in chief. I would have to say it is politics at its most cynical, the mission being, accept credit for those things you have absolutely nothing to do with and divert the blame for those projects and those objects, I might add, that cause problems that you literally may have your fingerprints all over. That has come to define politics here in the late 20th century as practiced by our friend at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. HUNTER. Well, if the gentleman is talking about those documents that they found in the White House after months and months of not being available, I know where they were. They were right underneath the TV Guide all the time. That is where they were.

Mr. KINGSTON. Maybe underneath the Constitution. I know that is not read over there.

The question that some of you just mentioned, and I think it is about time we need to close, but the other day I was speaking to a chamber of commerce for the gentleman from Columbus, Mr. COLLINS, and he was kind enough to get a good bipartisan group of speakers. He had somebody from the administration talking, and he was talking about the wonderfulness of Government partnerships.

A small business, independent business person raised his hand and said:

I tell you what. I do not want the government to be my partner. In fact, the less I see, the less I have to do with the government, the better for me and for my business.

I think that said so much, because people do not want the Government in their lives setting up, as you just mentioned, these obstacles and then coming up and saying, "But I will get you through them."

"Well, why do you not just remove the obstacles and get out of my life, too, and that would be better."

But it is about time to wrap up, so let me yield to the gentleman from California first for a closing comment.

Mr. Hunter. Let me just say I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia, whose tenacity and eloquence has really kept these very educational sessions alive, and also my great friend from Arizona, who is so articulate and who is so concerned about this country.

I have got one thing I would like to ask you both. Speaking of single moms, we did a Boy Scout hike from sea to shining sea, from the Salton Sea to the Pacific Ocean, a couple months ago. We are going to take this walk. We had a lot of single moms, and there were Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts on this walk. 100 miles. We are going to take this walk literally from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic ocean, from the real sea to shining sea next year. I want the gentleman who has so much of Arizona, and the gentleman who has so much of Georgia to get their Scout troops to participate in this sea to shining sea walk.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I cannot pause or hesitate to say as an Eagle Scout, and I search out my card here in my pocket, as an Eagle Scout, I am happy to take that challenge. Goodness knows I need the walk for my own physical fitness. But having just participated in the Grand Canyon Council Scout-arama at Papago Peaks, I am happy to do that. I trust during our time in San Diego this summer we might have an opportunity to involve some of the youth groups in San Diego to see what is transpiring in your city and again to reinforce this notion that we trust the American people, and it is not so much a case of being hostile toward Government but instead embracing that Jeffersonian ideal of a limited but effective Government, not as a partner, not as a mechanism to be reinvented, but simply as the fabric of our constitutional Republic that enables us and empowers us to provide for the common defense and in the classical true sense, to promote the general welfare of everyone.

That is the challenge we confront as we face the next century, whether arm in arm with the Boy Scouts or other members of every generation in this country, to work together to trust one another, to understand it is our people who lead us and our Government which exists to help empower people, rather than partner with them or simply be reinvented to grow ever larger, to grow ever more intrusive, and to require ever more of the hard-earned money the people of the United States of America richly earn and richly deserve.

Mr. HUNTER. As a second class Scout, I salute my Eagle leader.

Mr. HAYWORTH. You far eclipse me my friend, in other endeavors.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], I am looking forward to your west coast boy scouts coming our way and we will show them what a real ocean and a real beach looks like. I just want you to remember that since I control the time, I can say that last.

Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do, what we have been talking about tonight is having a good welfare system, one that helps those who need a helping hand but puts able-bodied recipients to work; a criminal justice system that gets the thugs off the streets so that American families can walk down the streets without having to look over their shoulder and be scared; having a budget that is balanced so that interest rates go down, having the waste cut out of it. Above all, changing this Washington bureaucracy, rocking it, changing it permanently so that we can have a government that is limited and one that responds.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD:

**JOBS LOST**

The following is a very conservative State-by-State estimate of the number of jobs lost if the minimum wage is raised to \$5.15:

State	Number of jobs lost
Alabama	15,300
Alaska	300
Arizona	8,900
Arkansas	8,800
California	63,100
Colorado	8,000
Connecticut	4,000
Delaware	1,300
District of Columbia	600
Florida	35,500
Georgia	18,000
Hawaii	(1)
Idaho	3,200
Illinois	29,200
Indiana	16,400
Iowa	4,200
Kansas	7,300
Kentucky	12,100
Louisiana	15,400
Maine	2,800
Maryland	7,400
Massachusetts	4,000
Michigan	23,000
Minnesota	10,100
Mississippi	10,500
Missouri	16,200
Montana	2,800
Nebraska	5,100
Nevada	2,500
New Hampshire	2,200
New Jersey	900
New Mexico	4,600
New York	29,900
North Carolina	19,100
North Dakota	2,400
Ohio	28,000
Oklahoma	10,800
Oregon	2,100
Pennsylvania	27,400
Rhode Island	1,300
South Carolina	11,900
South Dakota	2,400
Tennessee	17,700
Texas	60,600
Utah	5,400
Vermont	400
Virginia	15,000
Washington	1,700
West Virginia	5,800
Wisconsin	11,800
Wyoming	1,700
National total	621,000

<sup>1</sup>\$5.25 is minimum wage.

Prepared by: The Employment Policies Institute.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BLILEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

**SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED**

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. LAFALCE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, for 60 minutes, today.
- Ms. KAPTUR, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

- Mr. LAFALCE.
- Mr. UNDERWOOD.
- Mr. MILLER of California.
- Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota in two instances.
- Mr. STARK in three instances.
- Mr. MENENDEZ.
- Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
- Mr. JACOBS.
- Mr. FILNER.
- Mr. HAMILTON.
- Mr. FOGLETTA.
- Mr. SKELTON.
- Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
- Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- Mr. KANJORSKI.
- Mr. BARCIA.
- Mrs. KENNELLY.
- Mr. DINGELL.
- Ms. HARMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

- Mr. STEARNS.
- Mr. GALLEGLY.
- Mr. SANFORD.
- Mr. CLINGER in four instances.
- Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- Mr. CANADY of Florida.
- Mr. SAXTON.
- Mr. PACKARD.
- Mr. FUNDERBURK.
- Mr. KING.
- Mr. GINGRICH.
- Mr. SHAYS.
- Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
- Mr. MARTINI in two instances.
- Mr. SOLOMON.
- Mr. RAMSTAD in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

- Mr. FRISA.
- Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

- Mr. MANZULLO.
- Ms. ESHOO.
- Mr. MCDERMOTT.
- Ms. FURSE.
- Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.
- Ms. MOLINARI.

**ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED**

Mr. Thomas, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1965. An act to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2066. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide greater flexibility to schools to meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and school breakfast programs.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, May 23, 1996, at 9 a.m.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3127. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Processed Fruits and Vegetables, Processed Products Thereof, and Certain Other Processed Food Products Regulations Governing Inspection and Certification (Docket No. FV-96-326) received May 22, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3128. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act—Air Force violation, case number 95-13, which totaled \$384,046, occurred in the 6th Air Base Wing, Air Combat Command [ACC], at MacDill Air Force Base, FL, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3129. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Final Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions From the Printing and Publishing Industry (FRL-5509-1) (RIN: 2060-AD95) received May 21, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3130. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Cold, Cough, Allergy, Bronchodilator, and Antiasthmatic Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use, Amendment of Monograph for OTC Bronchodilator Drug Products (RIN: 0910-AA01) received May 21, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3131. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory