

## 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