

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.

The families of Bethlehem, PA, throughout the area are lucky to have a school superintendent that will fight the system in order to ensure that their children can learn the language of opportunity in America. It is time Congress takes up this fight by ending almost three decades of failed bilingual education programs and bring our educational focus back on teaching English again.

Whether it is Newsweek, whether it is a daily paper, no matter who has investigated this issue over the last 30 years, has said that changes have to be made. I am delighted now that we have a commitment that we are going to be addressing this issue in the near future here in Congress.

Let us help the brave men and dedicated men and women, like Thomas Doluisio, by passing H.R. 739, the Declaration of Official Language Act.

I thank the Speaker and the Members for yielding me this time.

#### PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, I have discussed with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON], who I believe is scheduled to have the hour special order following this one, and I think the country will be well served by a real give-and-take kind of debate on this very important issue of amending the Constitution to require a two-thirds vote by both the House and the Senate.

So I expect we are going to be yielding back and forth a lot for some questions and answers on both my time and the time of the gentleman from Texas later on. I hope it will be a useful, enlightening and serious discussion about this proposal which is way past due, because we have not had a serious, enlightened and careful discussion of this before it gets to the floor later today. In fact, the procedures that the majority has followed in scheduling this matter for the floor on April 15 really makes a mockery of the regular order that ought to be followed in bringing something of this substance and moment to the House for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke about that a little bit earlier. I am not going to belabor it again now. I do want to remind my colleagues that I, because of the abuse of process that the majority has followed in bringing this up without any vote in committee, any markup in committee, any time for Members to really examine it, I really think all possible procedural rights ought to be exercised, at least at this point in the process. But let me just talk for a moment, then I want to invite the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], to engage on this with me, as well, talk for a moment about what, for me anyway, is one of the most central matters

raised by this proposal. That is our reliance or not on the fundamental principle of majority rule in this Republic of ours.

I do want to commend the sponsors of this proposal for one thing. They recognized that if we are going to require supermajority votes to deal with any particular kind of legislation, in this case taxes, then you have got to put it in the Constitution. I think, in effect, they concede that the attempt made by the House a year ago January to do this by a mere change in House rules is constitutionally improper.

But I oppose this amendment, as I say, primarily because it violates what James Madison, the principal architect of the Constitution, and of its defense during the debate on ratification, what he called the fundamental principle of free government, and that is the principle of majority rule.

The Constitution makes very few exceptions to that principle, and none of them has to do with the core ongoing responsibility of governance, which includes, among other things, of course, how we raise the revenues necessary to fund the responsibilities that the Federal Government has. I believe we should be very, very wary of extending any of the existing supermajority exceptions to other areas, especially if it would complicate the essential responsibilities and competency of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to be particularly aware of the fact that it is a logical corollary of any time we require a supermajority to do anything that we are giving effective control on that issue to the minority. You cannot have it any other way. Under this proposed amendment, that majority could be comprised of as few as 34 Members of the U.S. Senate, representing less than 10 percent of the American people. They would have effective power to control the Government's revenue and tax policy.

Now, that is bad enough as a matter of basic democratic theory and philosophy, but I think, putting that to one side, if we really look at what is likely to happen were this proposal to get into the Constitution, we will be amazed at the absurdly impractical consequences that will flow from it, some intended, perhaps, I suspect many of them unintended.

Let me just take a look at some of those that seem to me to be most significant. First of all, if this were in the Constitution, it would for all practical purposes lock into law whatever the then-current tax structure of the country might be at the time of the amendment's ratification, because I would suggest to you that it will be extremely difficult to meet the two-third vote requirement necessary to make any significant overhaul of the tax system. There may be some tinkering around the edges that could command two-thirds.

So if you like the tax system the way it is now, or if you have supreme con-

fidence that some future Congress is going to get it just right before this amendment might be ratified by the States, then sure, embrace this. I simply do not have that level of confidence, certainly in the way the tax laws now are, or in the supreme wisdom of some future Congress that may adopt some reform or overhaul of the Tax Code to have gotten it just right later. But we should be aware that we are really buying into whatever the then-state of affairs happens to be at the time of ratification.

I think another consequence of this proposal would be to greatly complicate our efforts to balance the budget, which ought to be the central goal that we unite behind right now, particularly complicate the efforts to balance the budget as it relates to changes that will reduce the growth in entitlement programs. We all know that is where the money really is, if we are ever going to get this deficit problem under control.

Another reason that I think we ought to think long and hard and then reject this proposal is that as with the current rule of the House requiring, except when it is waived, which is always, requiring a three-fifths vote whenever there is a tax increase, this constitutional proposal is vague and will almost certainly generate confusion and litigation and, I believe, basically put the validity of most future tax legislation on hold for whatever period of time it takes for the courts to go through and parse out the language of this proposed amendment, deciding what is meant by some "reasonable" act of a future Congress to define what is meant by "de minimis" and any number of other vagaries that are inherent in this proposal.

□ 1445

I have got a number of other points that I may get around to as the debate continues this afternoon, but my colleague from Virginia, Mr. MORAN, has really put in a great deal of time and effort in examining this proposal. I know he has a lot of things on his mind about this, and I would be pleased to yield at this time.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend from Colorado for yielding to me and for his valiant efforts to resist the political temptation to vote for a constitutional amendment which is really little more than political grandstanding.

Now there are any number of reasons that Members could choose to vote this down. They could vote it down because we already have a rule that requires a three-fifths vote to increase taxes and every time that it has applied to legislation the Committee on Rules has waived that rule.

They could vote it down because it is bad public policy. It says essentially that whatever is in the Tax Code now stays because it is going to be almost impossible to change it. It is going to be impossible to close the corporate