

consciousness to meet the needs of our people.

As we honor the courageous legacy of our Nation's women of color and celebrate the diversity of their backgrounds, talents and contributions, I reflect upon one great woman that has placed her stamp on public service and who played an important role in my life, the Honorable Lena K. Lee, former Maryland House of Delegates member.

A coal miner's daughter, Delegate Lee earned her prominence in Maryland through her indomitable intellect, compassion and character. Ms. Lee was the third woman to receive a law degree from the University of Maryland Law School, a founder of the Maryland Legislative Black Caucus, and a member of the Maryland Women's Hall of Fame.

Teacher, principal, union leader, lawyer and legislator, Delegate Lee created a new vision of what African-American women could hope to achieve in Maryland and across this Nation. However, her impact would be much broader. She has touched the lives of many. Her leadership and noteworthy contributions in the fields of education, law and politics are well known in our State.

In the summer of 1982, I received a call from this woman known only to me by reputation. She praised my work in assisting young African-American law graduates in their efforts to pass the bar exam, as well as my community involvement. I had been working in my small law practice wondering how my career would proceed when this renaissance woman and legend in our community was calling to compliment me. As the one that influenced my decision to begin a political career in the Maryland House of Delegates, Lena K. Lee was my teacher in public life.

"Mentor" is defined as a wise and trusted guide. I can proudly say that Lena K. Lee is a mentor. I have served the citizens of the 44th District in Maryland as a member of the House of Delegates and then as Speaker Pro Tem of the Maryland General Assembly and now I stand on the floor of the United States Congress today as a Member of this body.

She exemplifies the very idea that no matter what your background or circumstances, one can achieve great success. However, upon arrival, she believes that one is a public servant, with a first and fundamental responsibility to those who are unknown, unseen, unappreciated and unapplauded. Her life is a model of the old adage that "to whom much is given, much is required."

She is a champion of justice and a dynamic legislator that was instrumental in getting Morgan State College changed to Morgan State University and saving the Orchard Street Church, a site of the underground rail-

road, from destruction. When we needed a black caucus and a women's caucus in the Maryland legislature, a new Provident Hospital or any other improvement in our community, it was her unselfish public service that was at the creation. Whether the cause was the health of Maryland prisoners or rebuilding of Orchard Street Church or Morgan State's university status, it was public service that was at the forefront of her agenda.

Martin Luther King Sr. said, "You cannot lead where you do not go and you cannot teach what you do not know." She may not have known her influence on other people's lives but Delegate Lee has led and taught a countless number of Baltimoreans how to stand and fight for justice. And so tonight I publicly thank her for all that she has done not only to touch my life but to touch the world.

BUDGET BLUEPRINT KEEPS FAITH WITH ALL GENERATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln said, "You may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all the time; but you can't fool all of the people all the time." That observation is still true today. As complicated as our Federal budget is, most Americans know that the budget is not truly balanced until we take all of those extra Social Security taxes and no longer use them to make the deficit look smaller. The Republican budget which we will announce tomorrow and debate on this floor stops the practice of cooking the books with Social Security money and it does a lot more. I would like to present some of the highlights:

First, our budget blueprint ensures that every penny of Social Security taxes will be spent only for Social Security. For years, the conventional wisdom in Washington was that Social Security money in excess of current benefit payments could be used to finance deficit spending. So, while the baby boomers inched closer to retirement, folks in Washington were spending dollars borrowed from Social Security on other programs. And, worse, they were still running up big deficits, even counting Social Security money.

This has to stop. Under the Republican budget plan, it would. The President has promised to reserve 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security. This means that for a time, Social Security money would be spent on things other than Social Security. For example, the President's 30 new programs. In contrast, the Republican budget seals away every bit of the Social Security surplus.

Second, our budget blueprint keeps faith with the spending caps set in the

Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997. When I came to Congress, forecasters were predicting \$200 billion deficits growing to \$600 billion by the year 2009. Now, strong economic growth and spending discipline mandated by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 are projected to create ever-increasing surpluses, at least under the old way of keeping the books. But this is no time to let up. We must protect those surpluses by restraining the growth of Washington spending. The administration has been talking lately about a new virtuous cycle of surpluses and declining interest rates. There is no quicker way to return to a vicious cycle of deficit spending and higher interest rates than to abandon the hard-won spending caps from 1997. The Republican budget maintains our commitment to fiscal restraint.

Third, our budget blueprint begins the process of actually paying down the debt we are passing on to our children. Everyone would agree that we have a moral obligation to take care of our children. Part of this obligation is relieving our kids of the nearly \$6 trillion Federal debt. This is what I call generational fairness. The Republican budget plan would maintain our commitment to generational fairness by continuing the start we made last year on paying down some of the debt.

How would this work? Under our plan, Social Security taxes would be collected and locked away until a reform plan was enacted that would actually preserve the Social Security system. Until a specific fix is worked out, those excess funds would be used to pay off bonds owned by the public. This means it would be easier to meet future obligations to Social Security. And, Alan Greenspan tells us, it means lower interest rates.

Fourth, our budget blueprint makes possible reductions in the tax burden on American families as additional revenues become available. Americans are overtaxed. The average American family pays more in taxes than they do for food, clothing, shelter and transportation combined. That is wrong. The Republican budget plan makes strengthening Social Security our first priority. Then, as more surplus dollars become available, we believe Americans should start getting some of their excess taxes back. They should be given back as an overpayment, because that is what they are. Our plan recognizes that extra taxes left in Washington will get spent on new government programs that most folks neither want nor need. When we allowed Washington to start taking taxes out of our paycheck, we never said to Washington, "You can keep the change."

In sum, our budget plan reflects the priorities of the American people. It safeguards 100 percent of the Social Security money, unlike the President's plan, and keeps faith with our Nation's

seniors. Then, by preserving fiscal discipline, paying down debt and offering tax relief, this budget ensures lower interest rates and a stronger economy well into the 21st century. This keeps faith with our children. It is a budget I am proud to support.

ISSUES OF CONCERN REGARDING IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO HOUSTONIANS ON OBSERVANCE OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a month in which we honor women for the contributions that they have made to the United States and to our communities and our neighborhoods.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly acknowledge some of my neighbors in Texas, in Houston in particular, who I hope to be able to expand on their many contributions in weeks and months to come by tributes that I will submit to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But just for tonight briefly since I will also talk about another issue in the time allotted, let me pay tribute and acknowledge:

Christa Adair, the first secretary of the NAACP, who created opportunities for people to vote in Houston, Texas.

Luella Harrison, an outstanding teacher, pioneer and spokesperson in our community.

Mrs. Erma Leroy, another activist who has contributed along with her husband, Moses Leroy, to the labor movement in Houston.

Madgelean Bush who founded the Martin Luther King Community Center that today provides facilities for babies with HIV/AIDS.

Nellie Fraga who has championed Hispanic and Mexican rights but also cultural connections and exchange.

Mrs. Laurenzo, the owner of Ninfa's Restaurant, a businesswoman premier who has guided us to indicate and teach women that they too can be involved in business.

I pay tribute to those women among many others who have done such great things for our community with a special tribute as well to Mae Jemison who has pioneered into space and now has an office in the Houston area.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to respond and indicate some issues of concern that I have as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary. I was disappointed that the amendment today of my good friend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) was not able to be debated. The gentleman from Texas offered an amendment to ensure that criminal aliens that were already incarcerated would not be released until

deportation. I wanted the gentleman from Texas to have the opportunity to discuss and debate a very important issue. The issue was raised because of the \$80 million that was included in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill that was to provide increased border enforcement and funds for 2,945 additional beds for the detention of criminal aliens from certain parts of Central and South America.

I am concerned that when money is given to an agency and it is given to the agency still with the sense that the agency is not functioning, that we need to debate the issue and get clarification. I think it is important that we should acknowledge, as was acknowledged, that any presupposed or any memo that suggested that the INS was prepared to release criminal aliens is obviously incorrect or has been withdrawn. I am disappointed that preliminary discussions about that were ultimately released to the public. But INS should own up to it and explain what that memorandum was about. They say it was about the fact that they did not have enough beds. In fact, in our own community, they have contracted out the need for facilities for incarcerating or keeping criminal aliens. What I would like to see is the Federal Bureau of Prisons move more expeditiously, although I know they are working toward doing this, in providing beds for criminal aliens so that they are not located particularly in neighborhoods and communities around the Nation.

I also believe it is important not just to give \$80 million for the increased border enforcement, but we need trained Border Patrol agents, experienced Border Patrol agents. And so it is important that INS responds how they are going to ensure that the border enforcement patrol is well trained so that everyone is protected, both the Border Patrol agents as well as those they encounter.

I think it is equally important that we address the question that so many have approached me with, and, that is, the INS personnel, in terms of improvements, both in terms of their conditions but also, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the workings of the office, the delay, the treatment of those who come into the INS office.

My commitment to all of those who are commenting about the INS is that we are going to fix it. It is an agency that has an enormous responsibility. Mr. Speaker, this is a country of immigration but it is a country of laws. My colleagues have my commitment as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims that we are going to address these concerns to the INS and make the United States known for a fair and balanced immigration policy while responding to the concerns of our constituents and our colleagues.

□ 2015

THE NEW DEMOCRATS WANT FISCAL DISCIPLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow on the House floor we will begin the budget process. We will debate in the full House for the budget resolution, and the budget resolution is the parameters under which we will pass the spending bills later on in the session. So this is the first attempt to get a look at what our budget is going to look like for the fiscal year 2000.

I rise today to talk about fiscal discipline and to urge fiscal discipline in that process, and I do so from the perspective of a Democrat, but a New Democrat, and I would like to explain that a little bit at the outset because I am a member of the New Democratic Caucus back here in Washington, D.C., but that is not something folks may necessarily be completely familiar with outside of Washington, D.C.

The basic premise behind the New Democrats is that the Democratic party needed to change to address some of the legitimate concerns that the American public had with our party. Essentially we in the New Democratic Caucus believe that the Democrats did have to make some changes in some of its policies in order to address the concerns the public had expressed with us and the reasons that we started losing elections, quite frankly. We had to understand some of the changes that were going on in society and some of the changes that were going on in government and address them in manners that had not been previously addressed, and one of the biggest ones is fiscal responsibility.

Now, as Democrats, we believe that government can, in fact, in certain areas be a positive force in peoples' lives. We can look to Medicare, Social Security, the interstate highway bill, the GI bill, laws that have protected our environment by cleaning up air and water; all of those areas have made a difference. So it is not that we do not believe, as some of our colleagues on the right, in the Republican party, sometimes believe, that government can never do anything right; it is just that we believe that they need to do it in a fiscally responsible manner, and there is a variety of reasons for that.

First of all, all of the needs that we have as a society: education, defense, cleaning up and protecting the environment, medical research, taking care of our veterans, providing health care and pension security for our seniors are not one-time needs. Our generation is not going to be the only generation that is