

Q. If you are re-elected, do you expect any tax cuts?

A. Yes, the ones I just mentioned—unless we get them done before Election Day. If we get them done this term, in the context of the balanced budget, I would not expect significant tax cuts in the next term because we must continue until we balance the budget. But we already have enough savings identified to balance the budget and have a middle class tax cut targeted to education and child-rearing.

Q. Your reply indicates you expect to be re-elected. Do you?

A. I'm hopeful about winning the election, but I'm not overconfident by any means. As we do this interview the polls look good, but it is forever until the election. I am working hard as president, and also to be ready for the campaign, but I'm not overconfident. I believe we'll be successful because of our emphasis on the future.

Q. Speaking of the campaign, how do you compare your style with Bob Dole's?

A. Bob Dole is not like me; we're very different. Also, he has never lost an election in Kansas and I lost two [in Arkansas.]

Q. In your estimation, what are his strengths and his weaknesses as a campaigner?

A. I think Sen. Dole is a good campaigner, a very tough and effective one, and I expect him to do rather well. I'm also impressed with his patriotism. He was severely wounded in World War Two and could have become indifferent and bitter but he became a fine senator and public servant. You know, I think it's healthy to say positive things about competitors. I don't mind Senator Dole saying anything he wants to about how he thinks I was wrong on the budget or the Brady Bill or about any issue on which he disagrees with me. I look forward to a vigorous debate. ●

IN MEMORY AND HONOR OF HART T. MANKIN

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the dedication, public service, and patriotism that personified the life of Judge Hart T. Mankin. Hart T. Mankin, an associate judge on the Federal Appellate Court of Veterans Appeals, passed away on May 28. I knew Hart well, having worked closely with him at the Pentagon during the turbulent years of the Vietnam war.

Hart served as the General Counsel to the Department of the Navy from 1971 to 1973. It was my privilege to first serve as Under Secretary of the Navy, and then Secretary of the Navy during this same time period. I remember Hart as a hard working, dedicated man, who gave his time, talent, and efforts to the service of his country.

Judge Mankin is survived by his wife Ruth, to whom he was married for 42 years, and three children—Margaret Mankin Barton, Theodore Mankin, and Susan Mankin Benzel. He was also a grandfather to four lovely granddaughters.

Hart's son, Ted, delivered the eulogy at his father's funeral service. I believe the words he used to honor his father's memory are very touching, and I ask that they be inserted in the RECORD.

REFLECTIONS OF H.T. MANKIN

The great jazz musician Count Basie once said, "To make great music, it is not the

notes you play, but the notes you don't play." I would like to think that my father made his music or lived his life the same way.

Dad's quiet strength and confidence affected everyone and everything he touched.

As a child growing up, whenever the we wondered how Dad could accomplish a certain feat, he would respond "Clean living." And you know what He was right.

While never claiming sainthood or looking for credit or attention. Dad's humility contributed to the strength other derived from him.

Dad could have been considered unemotional at times, but he was quite the contrary.

Always centered and anchored, Dad's emotions weren't symptomatic or reactionary, but honest and heartfelt.

At work, his calm transcended the litigious. At home, his calm transcended partisan politics.

His methodical thorough approach to life helped us all look before we leapt.

LISTEN

That was one of Dad's secret. Whether it was personal, work, or any other kind of problem, Dad listened. He might help you find your path, but would never push or force you into any decisions. But once your decision was final, he would support you to the end.

To Dad, the philosophical, the intellectual, the theological or spiritual were inextricably one. Any one movement to one side of the triangle affected the other two sides.

And Dad constantly pursued the truth, and at times defined it legally; and at other times left the truth open ended. The gray areas intrigued Dad, making him hungry for more interpretations.

Not that Dad didn't have his light side as well. Anyone who knew Dad, knew his dry sense of humor was clever yet playful. We all appreciate the time Dad spent doing his small part to save Delaware's Mountains.

Which brings us back to strength, this time strength of convictions. In our family, to get a word in edgewise is a feat in and of itself. But Dad, always choosing his words carefully, spoke softly and always above the fray.

Every word he spoke was very deliberate, well thought out, and almost always correct. One did not guess or take shots in the dark with Dad. Come prepared before you make your point. What some men say in 200 words, Dad could say in 20 words.

On the other hand, Dad did not wear blinders, and always listened to every point of view. Because of his rare gift to carefully consider every vantage point, he gradually was recognized outside of his immediate family and peers as someone who might really possess the truth. Some may consider this blasphemous, but to many of us right here, he was the truth.

To Dad, humanity was the coexistence of all through the truth. Humanity didn't just mean kindness or tranquility, it meant everyone striving for the truth and how it applied to their own particular life.

Dad taught from legal and religious texts, but what most learned from Dad came from the discipline in his demeanor.

We learned from my Dad, Hart Mankin, that truth and beauty can be found in Maritime law, Milton, or a Texas Straw Hat.

God will help Dad uncover the truth, and we will continue his journey. Dad we love you and miss you already. ●

U.S. CAPITOL HISTORICAL SOCIETY DINNER HONORING THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, on September 17 the U.S. Capitol Historical Society hosted a wonderful dinner honoring the Senate Armed Services Committee as the Committee celebrates our 180th anniversary. For those who may not be familiar with the history of the Senate committees, the Senate established the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs in 1816, and these two committees were replaced by the Armed Services Committee in 1946.

Under the leadership of former Congressman Clarence Brown, the Capitol Historical Society does an outstanding job of preserving the history of the Congress and promoting and encouraging the public's interest in this great institution. I want to express my appreciation to Congressman Brown and the staff of the Capitol Historical Society for the delightful evening honoring the committee.

Mr. President, the featured speaker at this dinner was Dr. James Schlesinger, a man who has made an enormous contribution to our national security.

I have known and worked with Jim Schlesinger since I came to the Senate in 1973. Over the years he has testified numerous times before the Armed Services Committee—both as a cabinet official and as a private citizen whose advice and counsel the committee has repeatedly sought on most of the difficult national security issues we have faced over the years. All of the members of the Armed Services Committee—both Democrats and Republicans—regard Jim Schlesinger as one of the pillars of this Nation's security.

In my remarks at the dinner, Mr. President, I recalled a Senate resolution which the Armed Services Committee and the full Senate adopted in 1975 and which I coauthored with our late colleague Senator Scoop Jackson. It was Senate Resolution 303, and it read:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States commends Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger for his excellence in office, his intellectual honesty and personal integrity, and for his courage and independence. The Senate believes that our country and the free world owe a great debt of gratitude to Secretary Schlesinger for his untiring efforts to improve the efficiency of our armed forces, the cohesiveness of our alliances, the wisdom of our strategic policies and doctrine, and for his determination to convey to the American people the truth as he saw it and the sense of the future he so deeply believed they must understand.

Mr. President, those comments about Jim Schlesinger are as true today as they were when the Senate passed this resolution in 1975. As I end my Senate career, I want to thank Jim Schlesinger for his tremendous contributions to U.S. national security and foreign policy and to me personally.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Schlesinger's remarks to the Capitol

Historical Society dinner honoring the 180th anniversary of the Armed Services Committee be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I also want to note for my colleagues that the Center for Legislative Archives of the National Archives will soon be publishing a history of the Armed Services Committee by historian Richard McCulley. All of us on the Armed Services Committee are very excited about this project and eagerly look forward to its completion.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JAMES R. SCHLESINGER, UNITED STATES CAPITOL HISTORICAL SOCIETY DINNER HONORING THE 180TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 17, 1996

I want to join Bud Brown in welcoming you to this evening's festivities run by the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, chartered by Congress with the uphill responsibilities of preserving American history.

Why are we here this evening? We are here this evening to celebrate the 180th anniversary of the founding of the predecessors of the Senate Armed Services Committee and to honor the committee for its exemplary service to the nation. Actually, the Senate Armed Services Committee is only 50 years old—created as a result of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which Bud Brown's father was instrumental in bringing about to create the Hoover Commission.

As all of you know, the Preamble to the Constitution—"We the People"—Article I of the Constitution assigns to the Congress the responsibility to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain the Navy. In turn, that responsibility is entrusted by both Houses to their Armed Services Committees.

As I said, this is the 50th Anniversary of this committee. Its predecessors trace back to 1816, back even to the Continental Congress itself which maintained such close daily supervision over General Washington. That close daily supervision is increasingly emulated by the current Congress.

Founded in 1947, the Congress preceded the Pentagon in achieving unification of the Armed Forces. Indeed the chairman of the Armed Services Committee is senior to the Secretary of Defense. In fact, the committee provides a channel for communications. It is sometimes difficult to communicate to one another. As you know, this difficulty in communication is reflected in the fact that different services do not use words in the same way. Take for example that simple English verb—secure. It has different meanings for each of the services. To the U.S. Navy, secure as in "secure a building" simply means to turn out the lights and lock the door. To the U.S. Army, secure means seize and hold. To the U.S. Marine Corps, it means attack and destroy. And, to the U.S. Air Force, secure means a three-year lease with option to buy.

Ladies and gentlemen, I shall pass over such sensitive issues from the past as the committee hearing on General Custer's actions at the Battle of Little Bighorn, the Civil War (sometimes referred to as the Late Unpleasantness), Billy Mitchell, or the firing of Douglas MacArthur. Those last hearings, I believe, took place in this Senate Caucus Room.

I turn to two subjects. The first—the characteristics of the Committee. And secondly, its substantive activity.

As you know, the existence of the Senate Armed Services Committee more or less coincides with the Cold War. As a consequence,

the Armed Services Committee has attracted the giants of the Senate. Richard Russell himself after whom this building is named, was actually the second to chair the Committee. John Stennis, who died last year, and who declared in his 1947 race, "I want to plow a straight furrow right down to the end of my row." And that he did. Both Russell and Stennis served as Chairmen of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee—a practice now prohibited because it looks as if it is an inside operation.

But there are other giants—Scoop Jackson, Barry Goldwater, Leverett Saltonstall, John Tower, not to mention our co-host of the evening—Strom Thurmond, the present chairman. You may not believe this, but Strom and I both received our degrees from the University of South Carolina on the very same day. Sam Nunn—the ranking Democrat—has been an illustrious chairman for so many years and my trusted friend for this past quarter century. I have not mentioned some of the 35 members of the Committee I have known over the years.

The second characteristic of the Committee is that it is heavily Southern, as you may have known from the Chairman. My calculation of the 50 years this Committee has been in existence—42 have had Southern chairmen. The South, as you know, is the only part of this country with a historic memory of being subjected to military occupation. In the South, it has been determined that fate would not come to this nation as a whole. Georgia, South Carolina—I liked to believe that the last and best service performed by the late great William Sherman was to create the tradition of Southern dedication to national security. I know many of you will appreciate that, but our friend from Ohio won't.

The third element in this Committee's history is its bipartisan tradition. Strom Thurmond exemplifies that tradition in an exceptional way. The first six years he was on this Committee, he was a Democrat. The last 30 years he has been a Republican. That bipartisan tradition may reflect the affinity that Southern Democrats had for the Grand Old Party.

Senator Nunn, during the recent ceremony at the Pentagon, thanking him for his service, in his invocation commented that, in his experience, nothing is accomplished in Congress unless it is on a bipartisan basis. During the period of Republican dominance during the early 1980s, he was the driving force in creating this more integrated Pentagon.

My first connection with this Committee was with Scoop Jackson. When I was still at the RAND Corporation, Scoop Jackson asked me for an assessment of systems analysis as it was practiced at the Pentagon under Secretary McNamara. Scoop tended to be harder on Democratic Administrations than on Republican Administrations.

The fourth characteristic of this Committee is that it's conservative. The Democrats score lower than other Democrats on the ADA scale of liberalism. Republicans score lower on that ADA scale than do other Republicans. And it's on that conservatism that I had to rely, in those years that we needed support, those happy days, Vietnam and the aftermath of Vietnam.

But this Committee is conservative in a different and special sense. It recognizes that there are no free rides. The Committee knows that international engagement is not free—that one needs careful preparation. This Committee has learned through this bitter experience. It needs a more than adequate structure. It needs modernization, training and above all readiness, so that the United States is not put through the embarrassment it was put through at the start of World War II.

Since the end of the Cold War, there has been a public tendency to treat American leadership in the world as just another entitlement. It is not. American leadership requires more than rhetoric; it requires continued effort and sacrifice.

The final characteristic of this Committee is that it is the protector of the military services. It is historically wary of Defense Secretaries who might neglect or abuse the institutional requirements of the services.

Let me turn for a few moments to the substantive activities of this Committee.

Foresight. We must go back to the 1930s, before the Senate Armed Services Committee existed in its present form. There was Carl Vinson—the Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. When the great uncle of Sam Nunn, who in the late 1930s managed to pass the Vinson-Trammell Act. The Act authorized ship construction monies despite the ample federal deficit. And as a result of the Act, the carriers that were created included the Yorktown, which was launched in 1937; the Enterprise in 1938; and the Hornet in 1941—all before Pearl Harbor. Those are the three carriers that won the battle of Midway. Without that legislation, we would have lost the battle of Midway. The Japanese could have cruised along the Pacific coast of the U.S. That would have made it difficult for the U.S. to win that war.

We mention this although today it is fashionable to object to deficit spending in all of its forms. If we would have had an annually balanced budget then, we might have lost World War II. An annually balanced budget may be a high priority, but it is not the first priority of this nation.

When our conventional strength was eroding, during the period when the President was negotiating the Salt II agreement, this Committee, on a historical and bi-partisan basis, asked the administration to increase defense expenditures for conventional forces and to rebuild our stockpiles of conventional ammunition, on the penalty of the loss of support on a bipartisan basis for SALT II. That is followed by the Reagan build-up and those actions paid substantial dividends during the Gulf War. The inventories were full, and we were ready. Fully mission capable rates for the U.S. Air Force for all aircraft during that war was 90 percent. By contrast in World War II, the mission capable rates were no higher than 50 percent for any length in period, and in the Carter years, for the B-52s. The rate was 40 percent for fighter aircraft.

The Senate Armed Services Committee has not always been triumphant. In the 1950s, they repeatedly tried to force the B-70 bomber on the Eisenhower Administration. The Committee failed in its effort, but of course not every President is an allied member in Europe, conqueror of Hitler, a 5-star general and chief of staff of the Army. The Committee has been more persuasive with other presidents. And I'm happy to say that the B-52s are doing alright.

Let me close with some additional observations. These are comments about the present and the future. At the end of the Cold War, there has been a massive shift of power within the U.S. as Congress is reasserting its prerogatives—and a resurgence of power toward the Congress. Constitutional limits that were ignored are being restored. From the time at Pearl Harbor until roughly the time of the Tet Offensive in 1967, the Congress regularly deferred to the President; that pure deference is now over. Congress must resist the temptation by any Congressional majority to embarrass the President. There is danger these days that everything becomes final for politics.

Second, the U.S. is a rather odd country to serve as a world leader. It is not as ruthless