



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 15, 1996

No. 47

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BARTON of Texas].

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
April 15, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOE BARTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 7, 1996:

H.R. 2196. An act to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 with respect to inventions made under cooperative research and development agreements, and for other purposes.

On March 12, 1996:

H.R. 927. An act to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3021. An act to guarantee the continuing full investment of Social Security and other Federal funds in obligations of the United States.

On March 15, 1996:

H.J. Res. 163. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

On March 20, 1996:

H.R. 2778. An act to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing services for

the peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Macedonia shall be entitled to tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone, and for other purposes.

On March 22, 1996:

H.J. Res. 165. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

On March 26, 1996:

H.R. 2036. An act to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to make certain adjustments in the land disposal program to provide needed flexibility, and for other purposes.

On March 29, 1996:

H.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3136. An act to provide for enactment for the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act of 1996, the Line Item Veto Act, and the Small Business Growth and Fairness Act of 1996, and to provide for a permanent increase in the public debt limit.

On April 1, 1996:

H.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to grant the consent of the Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the Bi-State Development Agency by the States of Missouri and Illinois.

H.R. 1266. An act to provide for the exchange of lands within Admiralty Island National Monument, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1787. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to repeal the saccharin notice requirement.

On April 4, 1996:

H.R. 2854. An act to modify the operation of certain agricultural programs.

On April 9, 1996:

H.J. Res. 168. Joint resolution waiving certain enrollment requirements with respect to two bills of the One Hundred Fourth Congress.

H.R. 2969. An act to eliminate the Board of Tea Experts by repealing the Tea Importation Act of 1897.

The message further announced that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

On March 28, 1996:

S. 1494. An act to provide an extension for fiscal year 1996 for certain programs administered by the Secretary of Housing and

Urban Development and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

On April 1, 1996:

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Vermont-New Hampshire Interstate Public Water Supply Compact.

On April 9, 1996:

S. 4. An act to give the President line-item veto authority with respect to appropriations, new direct spending, and limited tax benefits.

### MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leaders limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for 5 minutes.

### JAPAN FORCES REDEPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today President Clinton arrives in Asia on a trip designed to shore up the United States security relationship with Japan and Korea. Since the conviction of three marines on charges of raping a 12-year-old girl in Okinawa and the ensuing protests on the island, the future status of U.S. forces on Okinawa has been unclear.

Following the rape incident, other issues, such as the return of land used by U.S. forces on Okinawa, have boiled to the surface. Last week, landowners on Okinawa refused to renew land leases

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

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



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H3233

on which U.S. forces train. Pressure from Okinawan landowners has forced the Pentagon to reevaluate the future status of U.S. military bases on Okinawa.

A discussion of United States forces in Japan inevitably involves an evaluation of the United States presence in both Guam and the Asian Pacific region and the Pentagon's policy of forward deployment of 100,000 American forces in the region. I am pleased that the administration has stood firm on our security commitments and on maintaining the military forces necessary to support these commitments.

As recent incidents in the Taiwan Straits and North Korea's military provocations in the DMZ demonstrate, the United States must maintain the flexibility to respond quickly to threats in the region. In spite of technological advances which enable rapid deployment of forces from other U.S. bases to the Pacific, there is no substitute for a forward-deployed U.S. presence in the region. For 50 years, the U.S. presence in the Asia Pacific region has maintained the peace and made possible the economic prosperity of the region and the United States have enjoyed.

Yesterday, Secretary of Defense William Perry announced that the U.S. military will give back to Okinawa about 20 percent of the island property it uses for training. Secretary Perry qualified this action by saying that "we are in no way backing off from our view that the United States military presence in Japan, in Okinawa, is critical to security in the region." While some of these forces are being transferred to other bases in Japan, the Secretary said the United States is now considering moving some military forces from Japan to other places in the region, including Guam.

Secretary Perry's thinking on this issue proves what Guam has been saying all along: Guam should be considered in the context of its role in Asia and not compared to domestic bases. It appears that Guam is Secretary Perry's fallback position. The Defense Department should make clear its intentions for Guam. This is only fair to Guam, which has been subjected to mixed signals from DOD—on the one hand we are enduring military cuts mandated by BRAC 95 while on the other hand we are told our island is DOD's fallback.

The problematic status of foreign basing should make the Pentagon reevaluate its timetable and pace of base closures on Guam. Guam and its U.S. citizens provides stability, and unlike foreign bases, the military does not have to deal with arduous political issues and international agreements.

The reliance on workers at foreign ship repair facilities undercuts the Pentagon's support on Guam. As a matter of principle, American workers on Guam deserve the benefits of forward deployment. As a matter of policy, the Pentagon would be prudent to

guarantee an effective transition for the ship repair facility on Guam which was slated for closure by a recent BRAC decision. A prudent policy would be to keep the Military Sealift Command supply ships forward deployed on Guam while Guam transitions to a privatized SRF.

The successful transition to a privatized SRF-Guam depends on repair work from these supply ships. Keeping the supply ships on Guam for the foreseeable future is good policy for three reasons:

First, the supply ships will help Guam implement its privatization by providing SRF with a base load of work;

Second, this policy will provide support for American workers at an American shipyard;

And third, this policy will give the Navy a reliable ship repair facility that supports their forward presence in Asia unencumbered by changing international dynamics.

The Navy's national security concerns cannot be divorced from Guam's economic recovery. The Navy has long-term requirements on Guam, but it must also recognize the needs of its host. I am hopeful that the Pentagon will learn a lesson from its experience in Okinawa: unlike foreign bases, Guam is reliable.

#### A HISTORIC OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE ON A TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this evening at approximately 9 p.m., this House is going to have a historic opportunity to vote on the tax limitation constitutional amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The wording of the pertinent paragraph of that article is to my left. It states "Any bill, resolution, or other legislative measure changing the internal laws shall require for final adoption in either House the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present \* \* \*."

Back in 1787, when our Founding Fathers wrote the original Constitution and sent it to the States for ratification, there were 7 requirements in it to require some sort of supermajority. A two-thirds vote was required to ratify treaties, a two-thirds vote was required to expel Members from Congress, a two-thirds vote was required to impeach Federal judges and so on. The Founding Fathers did not require a supermajority vote to raise taxes, but they were aware that the ability to raise taxes should be restrained in some way. So they gave the authority to introduce tax bills to one body, the House of Representatives, because in 1787 the only Federal institution that had to be directly elected by the people was the House of Representatives.

That limitation worked fine for 125 years, and then in 1913, the 16th amend-

ment to the Constitution said an income tax was constitutional. I have a copy of the first 1040 form back in 1913 with me this morning. It shows that the tax was 1 percent on income up to \$20,000, net income. Only one-tenth of 1 percent of all American citizens had to file a 1040 back in 1913. Since that time, though, there has been an explosion in Federal taxes.

I have with me a photocopy of my 1040 that I sent to Austin, TX, last week, and the instruction booklet that goes along with it.

The marginal tax rate on American citizens today is not 1 percent, it is 40 percent. That is an increase in marginal taxation on the American people of 4,000 percent, 4,000 percent in less than 90 years.

Enough is enough. It is now time to add an amendment to the Constitution that says there should be a supermajority vote required to raise taxes. Why a supermajority tax limitation amendment? Quite simply, as I have already said, it is necessary. More importantly, it works. There are 10 States that currently have some sort of supermajority requirement in their State constitutions. They are Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and South Dakota.

□ 1245

In those 10 States, there are four things that are true in every State: Taxes are lower than in States that do not have supermajority; taxes go up slower than in States that do not have supermajority; consequently, jobs increase faster; and the economic growth in that State goes up faster. So we know that in the 10 States, including the largest State, the State of California, including the State where our President is from, Arkansas, tax limitation works.

Interestingly, no State that has adopted tax limitation has repealed the constitutional amendment or the law that put it in place.

Tax limitation would require in this House and in the Senate, if adopted, that there be a consensus to raise taxes. It would not make raising taxes impossible. We could still raise taxes, but it would take a two-thirds vote, which would mean you would not have the kind of tax bill that we had 2 years ago or 3 years ago that passed the House by two votes, all Republicans voting against it, and some Democrats voting against it, and passed the Senate on a tie breaker vote by Vice President GORE. It would require consensus, which is what supermajorities are all about.

The bottom line on why we need to pass this amendment is not about Washington, DC and it is not about macroeconomics analysis. It is about real people. For example, my district representative, Linda Gillespie, is a divorced mother of two. Her oldest son is married now. He and his wife both work. Linda's daughter is going to college and works part time. Linda works