

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

for me, but on the weekends she did have a part-time job at a blue jeans store in Ennis, TX, until it went out of business, trying to make enough money to make ends meet for her family.

Tax limitation is important to Linda Gillespie and Billy Gillespie and Julie Gillespie, because they want to make their own way, and they are finding it more and more difficult to do so because of the tax burden today and the probability, if we do not pass the supermajority requirement for tax increases, of an increase in their tax burden in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that later this evening, when we have this vote, that all Members of the House will vote for the tax limitation supermajority amendment to the Constitution.

VETO ON LATE TERM ABORTIONS CORRECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to talk a bit about my least favorite subject, but, nevertheless, to say this is a day I really want to thank President Clinton and thank him very sincerely. Because while we as Americans all say that we are all different, but we are all equal, it is always hard to apply that. The President did apply that standard.

President Clinton listened carefully to women who had their pregnancies go off track late in the pregnancy, go terribly wrong, all sorts of awful things happening to them, and President Clinton, hearing them, had the courage to then veto the so-called partial birth abortion bill.

Now, the political thing to do was let it become law without signing it, do all sorts of things. But that would really be saying women are second class citizens. And why?

I think any woman would be horrified to know that this Congress wants to make a law that says that if your doctor considers what he thinks or she thinks is best for your health, they could become a criminal. We do not do that for any other area. We have never done this before.

There are probably people who could get very upset about organ transplants, about all sorts of things. But once we start entering the consultation room, where a doctor is told to take his best medical knowledge and push it aside because if he applies it he then is going to be subject to imprisonment, to fines, and to a felony, we really are entering a brave new world.

There has been so much distortion about this bill. The obstetric and gynecology groups, the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, have stood up and firmly said "This bill should not pass." The American Nurses Asso-

ciation has said the same thing. Yet we have got everybody all focused fetally. We have all these drawings that people have criticized and said doctors did not do those drawings, special interest groups did.

We go through all these grizzly things. Everybody knows that under Roe versus Wade, in the final trimester, abortions can be denied anywhere in this country except for the life and health of the mother. So what we will do if we try to override that veto is say we are changing that. Now the health of the mother does not count anymore. If she has one pregnancy and it goes wrong and the doctor says "This is the only procedure that will save your reproductive organs," too bad, she had her shot, she rolled the dice, she lost. She does not get another chance at parenthood, nor does her family, her husband, get another chance at parenthood.

I think if we could just get some calm and reason coming into this body, everyone would agree with the President that this is not where this body belongs, practicing medicine, entering the medical consultation room, saying that doctors cannot think about their patient, the woman, they cannot apply their medical training, they cannot think about what is best, because if they do we will punish them.

It does not say that they can impose their will; the woman, the family, her religious beliefs, anything allows them to say no. Never is this mandated. But to hear the rhetoric that this is going to allow abortion on demand is absolute baloney. This has nothing to do with abortion on demand. This has to do with what can you do, what tools are available, when everything goes wrong.

If we do this, we are going to be criminalizing a tool, a tool. I guess people feel they can play politics with this, because so very few people have ever needed this tool. Fortunately, by the time most pregnancies get to the third trimester, they are OK and they are going to reach the end. But how tragic it is that we are engaging in this very politically charged debate, and how fortunate as an American woman I feel today that I have a President that is protecting my right to my full medical care by my doctor looking at my health without being criminalized. I thank the President.

A PROPOSED SUPERMAJORITY

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, today on the floor of this House, we will debate and I sincerely hope pass a constitutional amendment to the U.S. Constitution, a provision which will provide a necessary level of discipline to this body.

Ten States in the United States currently have a supermajority require-

ment for future tax increases. Why? They have this provision because it has turned out to be necessary in order to restrain the ever-growing demands of Government for additional spending.

What has been the effect and what has been the experience of those States? It is quite simple and it is quite straightforward. In the 10 States which have a supermajority requirement to raise taxes yet one more time, things, which we would expect would have indeed happened, spending has gone up less rapidly in those States with such a provision; taxing has gone up less rapidly than in States without such a provision; but, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, in those States which have done what this Congress has a chance today to do, and that is to require a supermajority for future tax increases, economic growth has increased at a faster pace than in those States without this restraint.

Mr. Speaker, what is the issue? The issue is a simple one. If we make it harder, somewhat harder as this constitutional amendment would do, to exact additional tax dollars from the people of this Nation, then this Congress and the Federal Government will spend the money which it has more judiciously.

Now, is that necessary? Indeed, it is. The record of this U.S. Congress in controlling spending and the record of preceding U.S. Congresses is abysmal. In 1950, the year after I was born, the average American family with children paid \$1 out of \$50 to the Federal Government in income taxes. They earned \$1,500, they sent \$2 to the Federal Government in income tax.

By 1993, that had become \$1 out of \$4, and today it is dangerously close to \$1 out of \$3. Earn \$100, do not send \$2 to the Federal Government in taxes, but rather send \$33 to the Federal Government in taxes.

We will hear from the other side grave reservations, that we are tampering with the U.S. Constitution, that this violates the premise of majority rule. For those people who make those arguments, let me point out that the U.S. Constitution today requires a supermajority in 10 days.

In places where the Founding Fathers thought that restraint was necessary, and they should also be reminded when they harken to this premise of majority rule, that the fundamental purpose of a Constitution is to restrain the access of legislative majority.

Indeed, a legislative majority enabled this Congress in 1993 to enact the largest tax increase in U.S. history. Even in the U.S. Senate with a majority of the Members of the Senate, that tax increase was dead tied, 50-50, for and against, until Vice President AL GORE broke the tie and increased taxes.

For those who believe we ought to be concerned about minority rights, I would point out the experience in which, in the 1990 Omnibus Tax Reconciliation Act, we destroyed a major