

better be careful here, general. To have a widow, through the Army Times, have to beg people, Mother of his four children, not to portray him in a bad light. She said, "He was not careless. He was caring. He was a loving and devoted husband, father and military leader. My husband made the ultimate sacrifice. He gave his life to save others."

She talks about the cards and letters she had received from his friends who I told you called him McGyver. Since when does a widow have to beg, do not think ill of my husband who had told his men the day before, the week before and that morning, we are here to save these children in Bosnia from blowing themselves to bits by these mines?

Mr. KINGSTON. This was a woman whose husband went because of the Commander in Chief sending them into harm's way.

Mr. DORNAN. His was one of the first vehicles to cross the Sava River. Get this peculiar thing, of being the first man, he was in A company, A troop of the first company of the first squadron of the first battalion of the first brigade of the First Armored division. He was one of the first to cross the bridge.

The media could highlight with a little brightened circle and say, here is Donald Dugan, one of the first men into Bosnia. He gives his life, and he has probably saved other lives because now everybody is backing off the explosives. There will be kids losing legs and arms and their lives with these land mines that all sides planted there.

To have the widow beg, through the Army Times, Please do not think ill of my husband, he was not careless, he was caring, is symbolic. That is why I say, all of our people in Bosnia on the ground are a form of hostage, relieving European men and women from being there, outside of the NATO mandate that they should take care of this on the ground.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman from Arizona has joined us. I yield to Mr. HAYWORTH.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia. As always, I am heartened and, yes, frankly troubled by the statements of our good friend from California. For once again, our friend from California points up a disturbing pattern of denial on the part of this administration.

□ 2345

As we said on the evening when we debated the whole notion of sending our troops there, this is not for fighting men and women to pull the zebra stripes of the referee in an athletic contest over their camouflage. Our fighting men and women are exactly that. They are not referees, nor are they social workers.

And far more disturbing, my colleagues, in addition to the disinformation, the denial, the disavowal of this man's sacrifice, now word comes that the President of the United States would like to extend this

mission in Bosnia past the deadline of 1 year, perhaps to silence critics that said this could have been a political move, or perhaps fitting into a pattern of inconsistency that has beset the foreign policy of this administration, a foreign policy typified by the irrationality—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas). The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] has expired.

PARLIMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, is it in order for this gentleman to make a unanimous-consent request that we continue to speak until 12 midnight?

Mr. DORNAN. Ask for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has the right under the rules to request a unanimous-consent request that he address the House for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KINGSTON. Is it not true we are about to end the 5-minute session?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there are no other 5-minute requests under the Speaker's previous announced policy, the minority will be recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. And is it not true, if the minority is not here, then we can request unanimous consent to use the balance of the time if the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] does not give a 5-minute request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not know that the statement the gentleman from Georgia made is correct at this time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I, rather than requesting—

Mr. KINGSTON. No, no.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Ladies and gentlemen, we are consulting on this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

DISTURBING TRENDS OF THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro-tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the Speaker pro tempore for taking us through that process which is required because, after all, this House operates by rules, and we attempt to bring some rationality to this process that some would call highly irrational.

But as I was saying a moment ago, what I find completely irrational are

the flip-flops of this administration as stewards of our foreign policy for once again, remarkable to me upon my election to this institution was hearing the suggestion, far from modest and far from realistic, that this Nation provide the technology for nuclear reactors to be construed in the outlawed Nation of North Korea. I asked the Secretary of Defense at a brunch we held, and I thanked the Secretary for coming by, and essentially he told me:

Congressman-elect, you need a better briefing on the subject.

It was my good fortune to run into the Honorable Jean Kirkpatrick, our former ambassador to the United Nations, who was far more candid in her assessment when she said:

Congressman-elect, you do not need a fuller briefing. You correctly identified the problem.

And it is this disturbing trend of this administration that would put Americans in harm's way, that would deal with the most irrational policy around the world that should give all Americans grave concern, for this administration is typified not by what it can accomplish but how it can explain away its problems this time, what verbal contortions and rhetorical gymnastics can be brought to bear to explain away an unfortunate snafu this time? Woe to us if we fail to develop a rational, consistent foreign policy that has paramount interests of the United States of America as its clearly defined goal.

No good people can disagree, but I maintain this administration, perhaps with the best of intentions, has made the worst of decisions.

I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, now on this subject of what is reality I have one that I want to share with you. It is a little bit off the military path, but is true.

Last night I attended a Georgia Farm Bureau dinner in Washington, and the speaker was Clinton appointee Richard Rominger. Now he was speaking on accomplishments of the Clinton administration. Well, as did everyone else in the audience, I thought it was going to be a real short evening with that being the topic, but as it turns out he was claiming everything with the conviction of the rooster taking credit for the rising sun, and so it was rather lengthy.

But one of the things that he said was the Clinton administration is claiming that the national debt has fallen \$15,000 per family of four.

Now our colleague, MAC COLLINS, a Ways and Means member and number cruncher, says how is that possible? The national debt has risen for the last 3 years the Clinton folks have had the White House; how could it be falling? And without blinking a shameless Clinton appointee said:

Oh, it is easy. The annual deficit had been going up at a certain rate, and since it is no longer going up at that rate, then the savings that we calculate, the \$15,000 per family, is in the anticipation.

And I said, OK, wait a minute, let me follow this, let me put it in laymen's terms. I weight 170 pounds. Now I have never weighed 190 pounds. But if I add up all the days that I passed up ice cream sundaes and other fattening desserts, I probably would weigh 190 pounds. But according to Clintonomics I have lost 20 pounds, and so I am going to pat myself on the back. And, Mr. HAYWORTH, I know that you are dieting. I just want you to feel better about yourself.

Mr. HAYWORTH. You know, I really do appreciate this new insightful diet plan offered by the administration, and let me pause here to actually give the President some credit because in terms of his diet and exercise regimen in the real world he has done a pretty good job passing up the fast food on several occasions, and I have to give him credit there.

Mr. DORNAN. Not Milwaukee.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Would that he only would help us put this Nation on a fiscal diet to help straighten out the priorities with tax reform for the middle class which he promised and then backed away from; with welfare reform, as the claim was to end welfare as we know it, but vetoing that meaningful welfare reform which we sent him and a myriad of other projects that he campaigned on and then backed away from. I can appreciate his exercise regimen, but I do wish that his exercises in his role as chief executive would have more followthrough and be more in tone with reality. But that new diet plan offered by an assistant secretary—

Mr. KINGSTON. A Clinton appointee, yes—

Mr. HAYWORTH. I guess this is something that will be printed up in the not too distant future and be available in Pueblo, CO, from the consumer folks there: The painless Clinton diet. Not "I feel your pain," but "I can miscalculate your calories." Imagine what you would have weighed.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the best Director of the Office of Management and Budget in my 18 years here, 20-year span, was Jim Miller, and Jim Miller in President Reagan's last 3 years brought the budget deficit down to \$150 billion, down about where we are trying to get it now. Those were the 3 best years of all the Reagan 8 years and the Bush 4 years, which means, using his logic, if Reagan had had a third term and then a fourth term, every family in America would have saved \$50,000, \$60,000, \$70,000, \$100,000 because of Jim Miller. He was not able to carry that message in his quest to win the primary in Virginia, but this is like one of the most stunning speeches I ever heard in this house:

The then Speaker, Jim Wright, stood at what was then the majority lectern

and said "Ronald Reagan has made a raid on the U.S. Treasury." I got him out in the Speakers Lobby, and I said, "Jim, that is tax dollars not yet collected." This was the Reagan tax cuts of 1982. I said, "It is money not yet collected. You mean money that has not even been taken out of the pockets on the withholding part of the check stub, that has not even be collected yet, is owed by the U.S. Treasury?" And he says, "Yes, that is exactly what I mean."

And I thought this is the difference between the two parties in modern America. They count tax dollars as theirs that have not even been earned yet.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield for a second, it is not a difference between the two parties, it is a difference between Washington, been in town too long, status quo liberals and the rest of the United States of America.

Mr. DORNAN. And most of the Governors.

Mr. KINGSTON. Because not one household in America would think of economics—

Mr. DORNAN. Can I give you another example that one of the Interior Committee people asked me if I got to the floor before they did?

Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior, in testifying recently before the Interior Committee, and everyone is choking on themselves trying to hold back the word "lying." It is a tough word. We are not supposed to use it on this floor to one another, and we do not. Words can be taken down. But they are frustrated. They are trying to say to him, "You are not telling the truth."

So they got him afterward, this is your former Governor in Arizona, and they said to him, "Mr. Secretary, you were lying out there." They did use the word then off camera. And you know what his response was? And this ranking Republican majority member on Interior said please tell us on the floor. He said to them, smile ear to ear, you can picture him saying it: "Well, you guys know how the game is played."

Unbelievable.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Let me talk quite candidly about my fellow Arizonian who has a decidedly different interpretation of reality. In a western caucus meeting I brought forth a speech that Governor Babbitt made on two occasions, now as Secretary Babbitt, once at Tufts University, on the other occasion in Colorado Springs, where he essentially said that those of us who have honest disagreements on how best to balance the priorities of the economy and the environment were, quote, guilty of the greatest sneak attack on America since Pearl Harbor, end quote. When I asked him politely, "Now, Governor, do you really believe that?" he

gave us the same aw shucks grin and said, "Oh, come on now, J.D., you know how the game is played."

Mr. Speaker, let me make this point, let me make this point to all the American Nation, Mr. Speaker. This is not a game.

Mr. DORNAN. Exactly.

Mr. HAYWORTH. It is a competition in a free society of conflicting philosophies, and when the day comes when one side continues to deliberately distort the truth, then, as in the eloquent words of Robert J. Samuelson last summer in the Washington Post, quoting now:

The purpose is not to debate, it is to destroy.

That has no place in the free society. If we cannot honestly debate factual material along philosophical lines and have honest disagreements, then I fear for the very foundations of our republic.

When someone will go around the country saying here it is, here is the secret list of parks the Republicans are closing, when there are no secret lists and there are no plans to close the crown jewels of this country, it is inexcusable, and there should be an accounting to the—

Mr. DORNAN. Let me add a bipartisan note to some friendships around here. We all have friendships on both sides of the aisle. A Democrat from Texas who I deeply respect, I am sorry to see him leaving, a Democrat from Michigan who I dearly respect, one of the pro-life leaders on their side, both discussed today with me that pretty soon Clinton is going to have to visit all his friends from jail.

He was talking about indicted, not unindicted, coconspirator Bruce Lindsey, No. 2 man down at the White House staff down there, and this means that they could indict him, but they want to take care of the two bankers that are already indicted, Kenneth Starr special prosecutor, and by naming Bruce Lindsey an unindicted coconspirator they can go after what would otherwise be ruled hearsay evidence and get these two people, and they are going to win indictments against Herbie Branscom and the other banker.

But there is a young handsome guy, about 35 years old, beautiful wife, two or three kids, who my wife looked at him on the cover of Washington Times a few months ago, Ainslie, Jim, or John Ainslie, and she said.

Look at this young man, a young banker, rural banks, small town, Parish, Arkansas. She said his life is destroyed because he got too near Bill Clinton.

I am going back to my original prediction in 1993 and 1994 when I sat in for Rush Limbaugh:

An honorable man named AL GORE I believe is going to be the Democrat nominee and a new Vice President.