

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. MIKE WARD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1995

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of February as Black History Month, a tradition dating back to 1926 when Carter C. Woodson set aside 1 week in February in order to honor the contributions and achievements of African-Americans, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the African-American men and women who have contributed so much to my hometown of Louisville, KY, our Nation, and to the world.

In Louisville, there have been many in the African-American community who have made invaluable contributions not just to their community, but to society as a whole. Judge Janice R. Martin, appointed to the bench by Governor Jones in March 1992, is the first African-American woman jurist to serve in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Judge Martin brings to the court a long history of involvement in many organizations, including: the Metro United Way; the Kentucky Women's Leadership; the Urban League; Dare to Care; and the Kentucky Task Force on Racial Fairness in the courts.

Dr. Joseph H. McMillan, a professor in the University of Louisville's Department of Early and Middle Childhood Education, has contributed greatly to educating all Kentuckians on matters of racial tolerance and understanding. In 1950, Dr. McMillan began his teaching career in Lake County, MI, and later became the first African-American principal in the Grand Rapids Public Schools system. Dr. McMillan has been active with the Annual National Black Family Conference in America. He has also served as chairman of the Louisville/Jefferson County Human Relations Commission, president of the Louisville Urban League, and as chairman of the Kentucky Rainbow Coalition. Dr. McMillan currently serves as a commissioner to the Kentucky State Human Rights Commission under Governor Jones.

Eleanor Forman, one of Louisville's first African-American real estate agents, focused her efforts on integrating the Louisville real estate market. At the time Ms. Forman entered the real estate profession, the white-dominated real estate market, for Ms. Forman, was a hostile environment in which to work. Prior to Ms. Forman's work, areas of the city were marked as being reserved for white real estate agents or African-American real estate agents only. Ms. Forman was also recognized as the 1994 Women of Achievement by the Business and Professional Women's group.

Other individuals who, through civic participation and education, have strived to ease tensions and empower others to follow their example include: Lyman T. Johnson, the first African-American ever to graduate from the University of Kentucky, whose case for admittance was argued by former Supreme Court

Justice Thurgood Marshall; Ann Elmore, who, in 1994, became the first African-American woman elected to the Jefferson County Board of Education; and Evelyn L. Waldrop, whose work with the NAACP, the Urban League, the Public Works Association, and the National Council of Negro Women has set the standard for community involvement.

History shows us that as our Nation was struggling for freedom and democracy, African-Americans played invaluable roles and contributed greatly to our efforts. These contributions have been largely overlooked and such recognition is long over due.

When our Nation was in the midst of a Revolutionary War, African-Americans, such as Crispus Attucks, who died in the Boston Massacre, heeded the call to arms and did so without reservation—these men and women served as infantryman, laborers, cooks, and also as part of the Minutemen brigade. African-Americans, such as Sgt. William H. Carney, who was the first African-American to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor for his efforts in the Civil War. Again, in World War I, World War II, in Korea, and in Vietnam, African-Americans served their country with honor and dedication. The memories of these men and women who have served so dutifully must never be forgotten.

Throughout our history as a nation, African-Americans answered our Nation's call to arms; however, in the area of civil rights, it took our Nation a longer period of time to answer their calls for justice and equality. Throughout the civil rights era of the 1950's and 1960's, our Government created roadblocks in the path of equality for African-Americans. These roadblocks were in the overt form of "whites only" signs in bus stations, restaurants, theaters, and hotels; in the overt form of denying African-Americans the right to vote; in the overt form of segregated schools; in the overt form of African-Americans being forced to ride in the back of the bus.

Through such legislation as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited any public establishment from discriminating on the basis of race, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we, as a nation, have reached a greater level of equality among all people; however, we do have far to go in this effort.

Today, we do not see the overt forms of racism and discrimination that we saw in the 1950's and 1960's, rather, we see a more covert form of discrimination in the form of glass ceilings in hiring practices and a vast disparity between African-Americans and whites in the areas of income, education, and crime statistics. We also see this covert discrimination in the efforts of many to defeat a minimum wage increase. The current minimum wage of \$4.25 per hour provides the full-time worker an annual salary of \$8,500, which is less than one-half the current poverty line for a family of four. With inflation, the minimum wage has decreased almost fifty cents since 1991 and is currently three-quarters of what it was in 1979.

How can we encourage people to get off welfare when we do not provide a decent

wage for them to live? How can we say that we reward work over welfare when we do not provide the means by which an individual can achieve this goal.

Today, it is an honor to pay tribute to these African-Americans, who serve as testament to the fact that as a nation we have come far. However, I believe that is also appropriate to remind ourselves how much further we must go in order to achieve total equality among all in our richly diverse society. I hope that we all can make this journey together.

THE PRESIDENT'S 1996 BUDGET

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 15, 1995 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE PRESIDENT'S 1996 BUDGET

President Clinton recently sent to Congress his \$1.61 trillion budget for 1996. The President says his budget will allow simultaneously leaner government and sufficient funds for popular and expensive social programs. He claims it cuts middle-class taxes, keeps the deficit down, and does not cut education, Social Security, or Medicare. The budget has come under fire on Capitol Hill.

SUMMARY

The President's budget calls for \$1.612 trillion in spending and \$1.415 trillion in revenues. That leaves a \$197 billion deficit, up slightly from the \$192 billion he projects for 1995. The biggest spending goes for Social Security (\$315 billion), Medicare and Medicaid (\$270 billion), defense (\$262 billion), and interest on the national debt (\$257 billion). The budget proposes few new initiatives. The most important is the middle-class tax cut, which is actually three cuts: a children's tax credit, a college tuition deduction, and a liberalization of individual retirement accounts. On the spending side, the President seeks to eliminate 131 programs and reduce funding for another 86. He calls for the restructuring of five agencies: Housing and Urban Development, Transportation, Energy, General Services Administration, and Office of Personnel Management. He also proposes merging 271 separate programs into 27, including the consolidation of 69 job training programs. The number of federal employees will continue to decline under the President's budget. The total reduction will reach 173,300 in 1996, nearly two-thirds of the 272,900 required by 1999 under existing law.

He requests increases in discretionary spending for crime reduction, national service, Goals 2000, education, Headstart, and WIC. His budget only includes limited changes in entitlement programs and makes no changes in Social Security and only modest changes in Medicare. He calls for a slight reduction in defense spending in 1996 but increases starting in 1998. He keeps foreign aid at current levels (1% of budget) to help maintain U.S. commitments overseas.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

CHALLENGE TO CONGRESS

Members from both sides of the aisle have taken aim at President Clinton's budget for not being aggressive enough in reducing federal spending and reducing the deficit. The argument of the President that the deficit is now under control because it has shrunk by \$100 billion over the past two years has not been well received. The President did not identify deep spending cuts for the new leadership in Congress, and in a sense his budget challenges them: "It's your turn, show me where you're going to cut the budget."

The big question now is what the budget of the new congressional leadership will look like. We may not know for another few months. The leadership's strategy seems to be to keep everything very quiet and secret and then spring a surprise on the country and the interest groups that might be affected. It remains to be seen whether Congress will be serious about eliminating the deficit.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

The good progress that has been made on deficit reduction in the first two years of the Clinton administration seems to be replaced by a strategy of deficit control. The President and Congress were right to attack the budget deficit in the last two years, and the reasons for doing so are still compelling today. The key issue here is the country's future standard of living. The deficit preempts investment that would otherwise go into expanding the economy. That is one major reason for the stagnation of wages and incomes for many Americans since the mid-1970s.

I believe that any serious effort to cut the deficit will inevitably have to deal with health care costs. The political judgement behind the President's budget is that the electorate offers little thanks to those who make a serious run at deficit reduction. Many Members of Congress continue to play on the overwhelming belief among the public that the budget can be balanced just by cutting out waste, fraud, and abuse, and that all it takes is cutting foreign aid, taking young mothers off welfare, and ending congressional perks. At some point we will have to be honest and specific with the American people. Difficult choices are needed, and anyone who takes a hard look at the budget knows it. One of the most important things that has to happen in this country is improving public understanding about the budget.

Too many Members of Congress favor a balanced budget but are unwilling to offer any specifics. Indeed many go in the opposite direction. They want larger tax cuts and more spending on defense and other popular programs. They list only the spending they will not cut, like Social Security. They also try to assure the governors and mayors that they will be held harmless in the process. I do not want to repeat the experience of the 1980s when the country was told it was possible to cut taxes and balance the budget by cutting domestic spending. The spending cuts were never found and the national debt, as well as our interest payments, quadrupled.

TAX CUTS

Basically I believe that for the sake of our children we should cut the deficit first and then cut taxes, not the other way around. At the same time, I am prepared to support tax cuts that are deficit neutral—cuts that are offset with spending reductions so there is no impact on the deficit. I would target tax cuts to savings and investment because that is what the country really needs to grow and to increase standards of living.

I am inclined to think the tax cuts are being oversold to the American people. Middle-class Americans are in economic pain, but I doubt the tax cuts being proposed are

a genuine cure for their afflictions. And unless offset by equivalent reductions in government spending, the measure might end up costing middle-class taxpayers more money in the form of higher interest rates on their mortgages, credit cards, and loans.

CONCLUSION

A President's budget is simply the opening ante in an annual game between Congress and the President. President Clinton's budget comes to a hostile Congress. It is not a dead-on-arrival budget, but a document for bargaining. Congress understands that. Significant changes are expected in the weeks and months ahead.

THE SPRATLY ISLAND GRAB

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was alarmed but not surprised to read in Saturday's Washington Post that Communist China used its growing military strength to take over a large area of disputed territory in the Spratly Islands.

Many of our friends in that region, including our important Filipino allies, have been warning us of the dangers of understating the People's Republic of China [PRC] military buildup as a moderate modernization program. As anyone knows who seriously studies the issue, the PRC's military budget, recent acquisitions, technology transfers—legal and otherwise—and their expanded espionage program in the United States is a cause for the highest concern.

The Spratly Island grab occurred just 2 days after the Wall Street Journal reported that the PRC raised tensions in the region by buying four Russian submarines. The PRC already has over 100 submarines. Taiwan has only two and yet our State Department will not allow our democratic friends on Taiwan to purchase any submarines from the United States.

Time and time again the Communist leaders have refused to work with the ASEAN nations to defuse the Spratly tensions. All attempts to get Beijing to address specific issues such as: A regional arms registry, maritime surveillance, various military transparency proposals, and contentions regional security and territorial disputes have been ignored. The result is that Beijing's rulers incrementally grab what it wants and without a peep from the State Department.

Some 40 years ago, when the Communists sought to create a buffer between themselves and democratic India, it expanded its territory by swallowing up Tibet, a country the size of Western Europe. In 1989, when the Communists felt threatened by a possible democracy emerging on its border with Burma, it sent \$1.4 billion in military assistance to the State Law and Order Restoration Council [SLORC] in Rangoon. Due to SLORC's rule, opium production has doubled and perhaps quadrupled in Burma and New York's streets are awash in cheap, almost pure heroin.

Taiwan, Tibet, the Philippines, India, New York—people all over the world, including the United States, have good reasons to be concerned about the PRC's aggressive acts. Regrettably, the State Department does not have any strategy for dealing with it other than to

enhance its trading capacity in the hopes that its economic growth will bring about positive political changes. In the meantime, the PRC uses its booming economy fueled by its exports to the United States to make bold and substantive strategic gains.

The basic lesson that some policy makers in the State Department have yet to learn is that if you give in to a bully he will keep coming back for more.

CRIMINAL ALIEN DEPORTATION
IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 10, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 668) to control crime by further streamlining deportation of criminal aliens.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 668, the Criminal Alien Deportation Act. This legislation represents title VIII of the Taking Back Our Streets Act, one of the 10 points of the Republican Contract With America, and continues our efforts here in the House to address our Nation's crime problem.

The legislation we consider today makes several amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act and other immigration laws to address the problem of aliens who commit serious crimes while they are in the United States, and gives federal law enforcement officials additional tools with which to combat organized immigration crime.

The most significant provisions of H.R. 668 are intended to accomplish one or both of two broad goals. First, the bill strengthens the Government's ability to efficiently deport aliens who are convicted of serious crimes. Second, the legislation adds immigration crimes to those crimes that the Federal Government may investigate under the Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organization [RICO] law, and adds certain other crimes to the definition of "aggravated felonies," thereby expanding the number of criminal aliens who can be deported. The bill makes it clear that expedited deportation procedures that currently apply to nonresident aliens also apply to aliens who have been conditionally granted permanent residence.

Finally, in an effort to identify criminal aliens who may flee jurisdiction to avoid deportation, the bill directs the Criminal Alien Identification System, formerly the Criminal Alien Tracking Center created by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, to assist Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in identifying and locating criminal aliens who may be deported.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of proposition 187 in California in 1994, was indicative of the frustration of the American people with the number of illegal aliens in this country. Ironically, under the California law, a 7- or 8-year-old child can be deported, yet the Federal Government still has difficulty deporting some criminal aliens. Under current law we may not deport aliens who have been convicted of