

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HUTCHINSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SUPPORT THE TAX LIMITATION AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, in Bill Clinton's first term, he and the liberals who then controlled the Congress passed and signed into law the largest tax increase in American history. Since that time, we have still had no relief. It is April 15 today, and many people feel this pain.

The President, Bill Clinton, vetoed the middle class tax cut passed by the new Congress, and as a result, even though last year the gross domestic product, the measure of our economy, grew by only 2 percent, individual income taxes collected by the Federal Government grew 8.5 percent. Taxes are growing and growing inexorably, year in and year out. Today, the average American has to spend 3 hours out of an 8-hour day working just to pay taxes.

Ask yourself this question: How much do you spend in total on your home mortgage, on your rent, on your electricity, on your telephone? How much do you spend on your suits and your dresses and your other clothes? How much do you spend on restaurants and groceries?

Over the whole year, add all of those things up, and if you are like the average American, whether you are rich or not, even if you are just a working American, you pay more in taxes than you pay on all of these things, food, clothing and shelter, combined; 35 percent more in taxes.

It has not always been this way. Our taxes have been growing at an amazing rate just within our lifetimes. Many people here are veterans of World War II. If you are not a veteran of World War II, almost certainly your father is. When Pearl Harbor was attacked, only one out of every nine Americans even had to file an income tax return. That is the America our parents knew.

I am 43 years old. When I was a kid growing up in the Midwest, the average American family like mine paid income tax at a rate of 3 percent. Today, April 15, 1996, most of our constituents can only pine for such days as their own rate of tax has grown more than 1,000 percent.

While the tax burden on ordinary Americans has been growing and growing over the last 40 years of liberal control of the Congress, so, too, has runaway deficit spending. All these higher taxes have not balanced the budget. That is for sure. They have only promised that we will have more spending.

They have provided an excuse to spend still more.

In fact, according to the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, throughout the postwar period every dollar in higher taxes has provided an excuse for \$1.59 in higher spending. In other words, the higher the taxes, the higher the spending.

To rein in higher spending, this House has given two-thirds approval to a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. But if we are going to amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget and the supermajority vote to break that budget, then we must also take care that this, the balanced budget amendment, does not provide a new excuse, a constitutional justification, to raise taxes.

Colleagues, our taxes are too high. Spending is too high. Those who contend otherwise or who say that merely greater institutional will is necessary stand athwart 40 years of liberal Congressional history.

For once in 40 years, liberals do not control this body. For once, we have the chance to add a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. And for once we have a chance to add a tax limitation amendment to the Constitution at the same time.

For once, let us do the right thing. Let us do the right thing for our country, for our children, and for our grandchildren, and vote "aye" on the tax limitation amendment later this evening.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON TAX INCREASES NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, today on this floor we will debate the issue of tax limitation. Many editorial pages across the country have criticized this concept. They say it is tampering with the Constitution. They suggest that it is dealing improperly with the sacred concept of majority rule. Indeed, they say and suggest it is a dangerous proposition.

I suggest to the contrary. Indeed, I think history proves to the contrary.

There are 10 States in this country which now have tax limitation amendments. My State, Arizona, is one of those States.

In Arizona, we added to our Constitution in 1992 a supermajority requirement very much like the one we will debate on this floor. It allows revenue neutral tax reform, but it says that when the Government seeks to raise taxes, to increase the Government tax bite out of the pockets of average citizens yet one more time, there ought to be not the narrowest of agreement on that idea, but a broad consensus. We ought not to foist down the throats of American taxpayers yet one more increase in taxes without first having developed a broad base of support for the

belief that that increase in taxes is necessary.

Now, why? Where are we today? What has the history been? Well, the history is that Government is a growth industry, that throughout my lifetime this Government has grown and grown inexorably, taking an ever larger bite time and again out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Six times since 1980 alone we have raised taxes in this country. In that time period, we have enacted some 4,000 tax changes. But those six specific tax increases have been passed by this Congress. And on what basis?

Well, the most striking of them was the most recent, the 1993 tax increase, the single largest tax increase in this Nation's history. By what margin did it pass? By the barest of possible margins. Had simply one vote in this body switched, it would not have passed. We would have not exacted that largest tax increase in U.S. history from the taxpayers of this Nation, by the switch of one vote in the U.S. House of Representatives.

But the contrast is even starker when we look at our body across the way, the U.S. Senate. There this measure was in a dead heat, a 50-50 tie. Not even a simple majority of U.S. Senators agreed on that massive tax increase. So the Vice President stepped in and he broke the tie, and we enacted that massive tax increase.

Now, for those who say we ought not to do this, we ought not to go from a simple majority to raise taxes, 50 percent plus one, to two-thirds, because somehow it offends notions of majority rule or of constitutional sanctity, let me point out that at 10 different places in our current U.S. Constitution, a supermajority is required. But let me also point out that 3 of those 10 were not in the original requirement. Three times since the birth of this Nation, three times since the adoption of our Constitution, we have added provisions requiring a supermajority for approval.

Why? Because there can indeed be a tyranny by the majority of the minority. Indeed, if you reflect on the premise, if you think about the reason for the Constitution itself, it is to guarantee certain rights, but, most importantly, to guarantee to the minority rights that they not be run roughshod over by the majority.

Let me cite just one example of such an instance in the tax arena. In 1990 this Congress passed the so-called luxury tax on expensive boats and automobiles and airplanes. The idea was we will punish the rich; we will make them pay a larger share of the tax burden of this country.

Indeed, it passed by the barest of majorities without a supermajority. But what did it do? Did it punish the rich? It did not. It punished the poor. It punished working Americans. Go anywhere in this Nation where we were leading the world in the manufacture of yachts, and you will discover skilled workers, skilled carpenters, skilled fiberglass layers, skilled people in the

marine industry, who lost their jobs, whose jobs were wiped out because of the tyranny of the majority, which said we ought to enact a tax on those items.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this amendment. It is not radical, but, rather, it goes a significant way towards restoring the balance that the Founding Fathers envisioned in our U.S. Constitution.

DETERMINING TAXES A RESPONSIBILITY FOR POLITICIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, welcome to Pander Theater. First of all, I want to say to people that the next hour is going to be a very thoughtful presentation that I hope every American citizen listens to. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] are two of the most thoughtful Members here. Please, I hope you listen to it.

Look, I am leaving at the end of this term, so I can speak a lot more freely. What you are going to hear today is going to be absolutely incredible.

Let me just give you the rule of politics that everybody ought to understand. Whether you vote for more B-2 bombers or more Head Start, whether you vote for more agricultural subsidies or more environmental cleanup, whether you vote for more prisons or more student loans, whether you vote for more highways or more education funds, more, more, more, and all of those you know who you make happy. You know the groups you make happy when you tell them you did this, and that is how you get reelected.

Whenever you vote for more taxes, you make everybody mad; everybody mad. So if you like what Juan and Evita Peron did to Argentina, you are going to love what happens if we get this through today. We are taking the Argentine model, which is give something to everyone, let us vote for all of you to have presents, and it will take a two-thirds vote to ever get enough people to vote for to pay for it.

What this is about is get your credit card back out, the Congress is ready to go back into Reaganomics II. If we do not learn from history, we are condemned to repeat it.

You remember the Reagan program of 1980. They said we are going to increase defense, cut taxes, and balance the budget. We did two out of three. We increased defense, we cut taxes, and the budget went right through the ceiling. The deficit went right up.

Now, we on this side of the aisle have taken some very hard hits. Without one vote from that side of the aisle we belied up to the bar and started paying some of this off. We have cut the deficit in half. I wish it were down to zero. I would do more. We have cut it in half.

How did we do that? We had to have a little increase in the gasoline tax. I am sure all of you felt that. None of us liked that, a few cents in the gasoline tax.

But we got the deficit paid down by half, because we realized we had a huge party in the eighties. Everybody had a great time. And we left our children to be the poorer-scoopers behind the horses after the parade down the street.

□ 1430

That was not fair. So today, because it is tax day, we are going to have like a Hallmark card legislation day. This is tax day, so we are all going to vote on a very tough issue. Yes, sir, we are going to come down here and say it takes a two-thirds vote to raise taxes. Of course, it only takes 50 plus 1 to do spending.

So the game I have seen around here since I have been a Member of Congress is people vote for all the spending programs and then they vote against the taxes, and you are guaranteed to have asbestos underwear that will get you through every election from here on because you made everybody happy and you voted for the spending that each of these groups wanted. They are the only ones that track it, so you made all of the individual groups happy, and then you made all of the citizens happy because you vote against all the spending. The only people who are not happy are the people who are going to inherit the debt. Yes, blessed are the young for they shall inherit the national debt.

We are saying that because we are so prone to run down here and vote for taxes any time we get a chance, this body just cannot wait to vote for more taxes, that what we have to do today on tax day is lift the ceiling to two-thirds to be able to do it. Ladies and gentlemen, if you believe that this body wants to have a tax will every week, that we cannot wait to vote for it every week, that we are so politically stupid we honestly think that you cannot find out when we vote for tax increases and we are going to love voting for more and more and that we have to put this constitutional restraint upon ourselves, I do not know where you have been. That is absolutely not true. Not one of these votes is popular.

To add those few little cents to the gasoline tax to start bringing this debt down, it took arm twisting on this side like mad. We did not have one extra vote of what we needed, and it took the Vice President of the United States to get it through the other body. Now, that is how tough it is. But if you want a culture where we spend, spend, spend and then we put it on a credit card, if we want to go back to seeing the debt go back up before we got it all the way down, you are in great shape. That is why I pointed out when this body cannot even get 51 percent to agree to a budget for this year, they have a lot of

nerve bringing this up, and I really hope we get some sense in this debate.

I thank the two gentlemen who will be leading this.

THOMAS DOLUISIO AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being allowed to take this 5-minute opportunity that we have at this time during the day.

I want to tell you about a brave and dedicated school administrator, Thomas Doluisio, who is a State school superintendent in Bethlehem, PA. In his district, he has shown some real leadership in Bethlehem, and he has enjoyed a dramatic improvement in academic success and progress. It is very important, I think, that we not only talk about the negative things that happen in our country and many times in the school system, and also the positive.

Here is an example of a person who has taken tremendous individual initiative and brought up the test scores. What did Doluisio do? He led the fight against the bilingual education bureaucracy and made it possible for his district's Spanish-speaking students to be immersed in English speaking classrooms. Here is what happened. He noticed that the typical student in his district spent 7 years in bilingual education classes before being moved or the student was moved to a regular class being taught in English. Children in kindergarten spent entire days without hearing a word of English and yet administrators were somehow perplexed when these students later scored very poorly in English tests.

Doluisio knew that the system was broken and he knew how to fix it. Barely a year after the school district switched to immersion from bilingual education, improvements have already started to show. Margarita Rivas, a Bethlehem parent, is praising the school superintendent because she said, now our children can speak English and they are able to compete in America so they too can rise and advance on the ladder of opportunity in America.

Mr. Doluisio did what any good administrator does. He recognized a problem and he started to fix it. But he also had the courage to take on an entrenched bureaucracy, and he won. For that, he was officially condemned in the 1994 convention for the National Association for Bilingual Education. He did, however, win the respect and admiration of Bethlehem parents, whose children are now better able to be prepared and to compete for jobs and pursue their share of the American dream. You know, I suspect that Thomas Doluisio will take that approbation and that approval and that endorsement over any endorsement from the National Association for Bilingual Education any day of the week.