

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## D.C. FLAT FEDERAL TAX

### HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 17, 1997*

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recommend the following editorial to my colleagues, entitled "Fixing a Flat," which appeared in the May 19, 1997, Wall Street Journal. I commend the Congresswoman for fighting against the District of Columbia's destructively high tax policies and for a pro-growth, pro-investment flat tax:

#### FIXING A FLAT

Summer's almost here, which means soon tourists will be pouring into Washington, D.C., to see the sights in their beloved capital city, a municipality so broke, so inept, so seemingly beyond hope that the financial control board that oversees its affairs is weighing a plan to appoint a city manager and largely supplant Mayor Marion Barry. There has to be a better way to save the capital, and believe it or not, some of the attending politicians may have hit on an answer: a flat 15% federal income tax and elimination of all capital gains taxes in the District of Columbia.

It's closer to reality than you might imagine. Last week, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott won rousing cheers from a crowd of D.C. residents when he and four other Senators embraced a flat tax sponsored by Eleanor Holmes Norton, the District's Democratic Delegate.

The Norton plan would levy a flat 15% federal tax on all bona fide District residents. The first \$25,000 of income would be exempt for single filers and the first \$30,000 for married couples. Her plan would zero out capital gains taxes on investments in the District made by residents. Senator Lott would go further: no residency requirement for investors and he'd add a \$5,000 tax credit for first-time home buyers to encourage a return of the middle-class. Since 1950, the District's population has plummeted to less than 520,000 from 800,000.

Ms. Norton says that the combined support of Senator Lott and Speaker Newt Gingrich has convinced her that "there is going to be some configuration of tax cuts for District residents" this year. She has other powerful allies, including Democratic Senator Joe Lieberman and GOP Senators Connie Mack and Sam Brownback.

No one pretends that a new tax regime will solve all the District's problems, but Delegate Norton says a dramatic confidence-building measure is needed to stop the exodus. She says her tax plan has "united black, whites and Hispanics" and in every part of the city "the enthusiasm and the chorus is the same: Do it and we'll stay."

The opposition to a flat tax for D.C. comes in two forms. Some claim it wouldn't spur economic growth and that rising property values will create a zero-sum housing crisis. "There are not enough homes for the poor now," says liberal activist Mark Thompson. "Where are they going to live when all these people start coming back in the city?" As far as we can see, every city with the exception of rent-controlled New York City manages to

build housing for a variety of incomes. A tax-liberated D.C. would likely see an explosive growth in construction.

Others object that a D.C. flat tax is unfair to nearby suburbs and other states; D.C. residents get a tax break while other Americans endure combined marginal tax rates of more than 40%. A fair point, we suppose, but hardly cause to condemn the District to economic and social collapse. And if it succeeded, the idea would spread rapidly elsewhere.

That, of course, is precisely why it's believed President Clinton will persist in his opposition to Delegate Norton's flat tax. The opposition of old-line Democratic constituency groups to any idea they didn't dream up 25 years ago is utterly pro-forma by now. Delegate Norton thinks the first step is to get her bill onto the President's desk. Senator Lott seems to agree. Keep pushing.

## A TRIBUTE TO RISA MUNITZ-GRUBERGER

### HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 17, 1997*

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Risa Munitz-Gruberger for her dedication to teaching Judaism throughout the Conejo Valley community. I recognize Risa on behalf of the Chabad of the Conejo as the recipient of the Lifetime Achievement Award.

This award is given to thank Risa for imparting her educational training on the Jewish Community. Risa has had great success achieving her goals—spreading a sense of values, morals, and ethics throughout our community and assisting the needy when they are troubled physically or spiritually. It is for this success that we are honoring her today.

Risa's contributions to Judaic education include countless hours of volunteering and lecturing, but most importantly, the design and distribution of her own innovative educational materials. These materials encourage young and old to embrace their Jewish identity.

Risa's recognition here today is long overdue. Shortly after moving to the area, Risa read about Chabad and knew she wanted to become a part of it. She immediately began planning a communitywide parent education series in conjunction with the Jewish Community Center and the Conejo Jewish Academy which explored Jewish ideas and theology. Risa has since sponsored several other programs and continues to support Judaism in our community.

In the spirit of building the bridge—a bridge to the past, future, and all people, I join our community in honoring Risa Munitz-Gruberger for her hard work and recognition of the Lifetime Achievement Award.

## HONORING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREATER LANSING BUSINESS MONTHLY

### HON. DEBBIE STABENOW

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 17, 1997*

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago J. Christopher Holman founded the Greater Lansing Business Monthly in hopes of publicizing and promoting local business within the community of Lansing. This week the Greater Lansing Business Monthly will celebrate its 10th anniversary.

I wish to acknowledge the efforts of Chris Holman and his staff to promote the strengths of the Lansing business community. With readership of over 30,000, the Greater Lansing Business Monthly is distributed to all non-resident addresses in Lansing, Mason, Holt, Grand Ledge, East Lansing, Haslett, and Okemos. The monthly features local stocks, profiles products made in the Lansing area, and provides updates on the overall Michigan economy.

The Greater Lansing Business Monthly serves as a base of local economic information to the community and its commitment to local small businesses is unmatched. It is much more than a periodical trumpeting Greater Lansing as a marvelous place to do business. It is also an integral part of the business community with the formation of CEO networks, directors luncheons, and the entrepreneurial awards.

On behalf of all the citizens of Michigan's eighth district, I extend congratulations and best wishes to Chris Holman and his staff.

## THE FAILURE OF RACIAL PREFERENCES

### HON. CHRISTOPHER COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 17, 1997*

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, President Clinton delivered a speech in San Diego criticizing the people of California for enacting the California Civil Rights Initiative [CCRI]. The wisdom of CCRI in outlawing special preferences based solely on race, said Mr. Clinton, should be suppressed in favor of continued race-based classifications by our Government. The following essay, published in the New York Times the same weekend, describes why Californians—and Americans—are indeed wise to abhor Government-mandated racial preferences.

[From the New York Times, June 15, 1997]

FACE THE FAILURE OF RACIAL PREFERENCES

(By Newt Gingrich and Ward Connerly; Newt Gingrich is Speaker of the House of Representatives. Ward Connerly is chairman of the American Civil Rights Institute and a University of California regent)

In August 1963, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. gave heartfelt voice to his dream of

• 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.

a world where children are judged by the content of their character rather than the color of their skin. A few months later, in May 1964, President Lyndon Johnson told the graduating class of the University of Michigan, "The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents."

Unfortunately, three decades and \$5.4 trillion of Federal Government spending later, Dr. King's dream still remains unfulfilled and nearly all of America knows that the Great Society has become an expensive failed tribute to the collective liberal imagination. Over the years, Federal welfare programs for the poor were enacted that created and sustained an illusion of activity but that, in reality, did more harm than good.

Even worse, a complicated set of Government rules and regulations were developed in almost every area of life, the intent of which was to eliminate discrimination. Yet the cruel fact has been that Government has brought about nearly as much discrimination as it has eliminated—just in a different form—and has masked the very real problems that still exist.

President Clinton's speech on race yesterday in San Diego was actually a missed opportunity to address these issues; there was little indication that his advisory board on race includes anyone who will critically examine the impact of racial preferences on society. But more important, we wish he could have laid out a plan for real education reform that would produce genuine equality of opportunity for all.

Let us take a look at the record. Welfare spending is more than eight times what it was in 1965, adjusted for inflation, and it's time to ask, What do our children have to show for it? Well, for starters, over four million more of them are now living in poverty—43 percent of all black children and 41 percent of all Hispanic children. Violent crime has skyrocketed, especially in the inner cities.

But for evidence of the Great Society's greatest failure, look no further than the current state of public education and President Clinton's politically expedient but totally indefensible support for racially based "Band-Aid" measures. Rather than face up to the catastrophic failure of inner-city educational systems and deal honestly with their essential problems, the President, like others holding on to this failed system, refuses to reform a system that fails morally as well as practically.

Like so many whose political fortunes depend on unions and bureaucracy, Mr. Clinton, sadly, refuses to acknowledge that the ill-conceived education policies of the 1960's deserted the children who needed help the most.

The education bureaucracy won't concede that, despite spending trillions of dollars on education over the past 30 years, American children are further behind today. It doesn't want to admit that the S.A.T. scores of African-American children, which average 100 points less than the scores of white children, are the direct result of the current policies. The National Education Association doesn't want to bear the blame for the fact that 40 percent of all 9-year-olds can't meet basic literacy standards or that 66 percent of African-American fourth graders fail national geography standards. These are not racial inadequacies, they are education inadequacies.

Nor will the education bureaucracy admit that low-income high school students are giving up on school in ever increasing numbers. The fact is that disadvantaged children are not receiving the "knowledge to enrich their minds and to enlarge their talents," as President Johnson promised. Instead, many education and minority leaders cling to a

system of racial preferences using the diplomas of an arbitrary few to paper over what has become a national human catastrophe. For the sake of all our children, these people must face the cold, hard truth: Every time we use racial preference to effect change, it is proof that we have failed a child somewhere.

President Clinton refuses to face the core of the problem: Money without reform will not educate our children. Look at the spending in inner-city schools today. The District of Columbia spends more money to educate its children than any state in the country—more than \$9,000 per student per year—and yet its children rank at or near the bottom of national test scores. Something is very wrong with the schools of our nation's capital; both the teachers and their students are being shortchanged by a stagnant, uncaring educational bureaucracy.

Government-imposed quotas are no substitute for education reform. Racial preferences may offer an illusory way out for a few students, but sadly, the vast majority of children in the inner cities are being deprived by their schools of the opportunity to go to college. We've all seen recently the dramatic drop in minority admissions to the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Texas School of Law, institutions that did away with race-based preferences. This shamefully underscores how much race and race alone has been used instead of merit in our halls of higher education.

Supporters of preferences see those numbers as vindication for their claims of racism in America; they are simply wrong. The real villain in this 30-year morality play isn't bigotry or the University of California Board of Regents or the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The original affirmative action policies were indeed well-intentioned efforts to redress centuries of racial discrimination. Yet they have been perverted over the years. The racial preferences used in their name have been used as masks to avoid real reform. They have become an excuse to perpetuate an inner-city system to cheat those children most in need out of a real future.

Failing to save these children should cause shame to all Americans. No one has chosen to help our underprivileged develop their talents. No one has insisted they have schools in which they can succeed. As a country, we all share that shame, but the creation of a small minority professional class through racial preferences to ease elitist guilt is an unacceptable and unconscionable alternative. And applying racial preferences to business practices is no better.

Yet the education bureaucracy warns that "radical" reform could harm children. It is difficult to imagine that any of the education proposals being offered today could do any more damage than the failed policies of the last 30 years.

There are promising solutions: In the 104th Congress, for the first time ever, a legitimate school voucher initiative for the children of the District of Columbia was passed in the House; there were enough votes to pass it in the Senate.

Unfortunately, unions, resistant to change, prevented it from coming to a vote. Representative Dick Army of Texas, the majority leader, has introduced a similar measure this year. Is giving poor parents the same opportunity as wealthy ones to send their children to the school of their choice a risky venture?

Is giving poor parents the opportunity to send their children to a safe school truly dangerous or just threatening to those dependent on the status quo? Is it harmful to the future of our children to demand that

they be able to read before they are passed on, or do real standards bring too many of the failures of the current bureaucratic system to light? Does lowering the standards of graduate school admissions for certain individuals really address inequality of opportunity or simply give one group a place at the table while trampling on the basic rights of another? Do we bring the people of this country closer together when we reject one of America's most basic principles—the notion that people should be judged individually on merit, not collectively by the color of their skin—or do we breed new resentment and doubt?

Education is the key to a productive, healthy citizenship. But our system of racial preferences is the wrong door. The failed Great Society policies have devastated and divided two generations. We have seen how Government-imposed racial preferences actually stand in the way of true educational reform. The President must abandon the misguided belief that our society should ever use discrimination to end discrimination.

## TRIBUTE TO JOHN TALLMAN

### HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 17, 1997*

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work and dedication of John Tallman who is retiring from the Bourbonnais Fire Protection District board of trustees after 48 years of service. Mr. Tallman has been Bourbonnais' Fire Protection District's only president since 1948 until his official retirement on September 19, 1997.

John Tallman has been instrumental in helping the fire district to grow and modernize. In 1948, a four-wheeled cart containing an ax and a hose was pulled by car to the fire scene. The first fire engine arrived in 1950. Today, The Bourbonnais Fire Protection District consists of three pumpers, two tankers, two ambulances, one grass fire truck, one rescue truck, one disaster trailer, one boat, two automobiles, extrication equipment, high angle rescue equipment, and gummy suits, all housed in a new fire station.

In addition to his work with the fire protection district, John Tallman farmed over 500 acres of land. He and his wife, Eileen, have raised four children on their farm. John has also served as a school board chairman and has served on the county board.

John Tallman's commitment and impact on his community is not only deserving of congressional recognition, but should serve as a model for others to follow.

At a time when our Nation's leaders are asking the people of this country to make serving their community a core value of citizenship, honoring John Tallman is both timely and appropriate.

I urge this body to identify and recognize others in their communities whose actions have so greatly benefited and enlightened America's communities.