H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 101. SUBMISSION OF BALANCED BUDGET BY THE PRESIDENT.

Section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

''(g)(1) Except as provided by paragraph (2), any budget submitted to Congress pursuant to subsection (a) for the ensuing fiscal year shall not be in deficit.

''(2) For any fiscal year with respect to which the President determines that it is infeasible to submit a budget in compliance with paragraph (1), the President shall submit on the same day two budgets, one of which shall be in compliance with paragraph (1), together with written reasons in support of that determination.''.

TITLE II—AMENDMENT TO CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

SEC. 201. REPORTING OF BALANCED BUDGET BY COMMITTEES ON THE BUDGET OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.

Section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) REPORTING OF BALANCED BUDGETS.—

''(1) Except as provided by paragraph (2), the concurrent resolution on the budget for a fiscal year referred to in subsection (a) as reported by the Committee on the Budget of each House shall not be in deficit.

''(2) For any fiscal year with respect to which the Committee on the Budget of either House determines that it is infeasible to report a concurrent resolution on the budget in compliance with paragraph (1) and includes written reasons in support of that determination in its report accompanying a concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall report two concurrent resolutions on the budget, one of which shall be in compliance with paragraph (1).

''(3) Each concurrent resolution on the budget reported by the Committee on the Budget of either House shall contain reconciliation directives described in section 310 necessary to effectuate the provisions and requirements of such resolution.''.

SEC. 202. PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Section 305(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''(8)(A) If the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives reports any rule or order providing for the consideration of any concurrent resolution on the budget for a fiscal year, then it shall also, within the same rule or order, provide for—

''(i) the consideration of the text of any concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year reported by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 301(j); and

''(ii) the consideration of the text of each concurrent resolution on the budget as introduced by the Majority Leader pursuant to subparagraph (B);

and such rule or order shall assure that a separate vote occurs on each such budget.

''(B) The Majority Leader of the House of Representatives shall introduce a concurrent resolution on the budget reflecting, without substantive revision, each budget submitted by the President pursuant to section 1105(g) of title 31, United States Code, as soon as practical after its submission.''.

SEC. 203. PROCEDURE IN THE SENATE.

Section 305(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''(7) Notwithstanding any other rule, it shall always be in order in the Senate to consider an amendment to a concurrent resolution on the budget for a fiscal year comprising the text of any budget submitted by the President for that fiscal year as described in section 1105(g)(1) of title 31, United States Code, and, whenever applicable, an amendment comprising the text of any other budget submitted by the President for that fiscal year as described in section 1105(g)(2) of title 31, United States Code.''.

TITLE III—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 301. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by it shall become effective for fiscal year 1997 budget submitted by the President as required by section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

CHANGING THE DIRECTION OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor to have been elected to this great institution with an opportunity to make real changes this year, because I believe, like so many other colleagues on both sides of the aisle, that the American hour is upon us, that now is the time for us to decide once and for all which direction we are going to take this Government, whether we are going to follow the same failed policies that have hurt this country over the past 30 years where we turned to Government to answer every single problem we have in our towns and in our counties and in our States, or whether we, instead, turn back to those simple, basic premises that our Founding Fathers laid as the foundation of this great Republic.

James Madison wrote over 200 years ago as he was framing the Constitution, ''We have staked the very existence of the American civilization not upon the power of government but upon the capacity of each of us to govern ourselves, to control ourselves and sustain ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.''

And Thomas Jefferson wrote, ''Government that governs least governs best.''

And what does our 10th amendment say? It says all powers not specifically given to the Federal government are reserved by the States and the citizens.

Well, what has happened? Where have we gone in the past 40 years? We keep turning back to government.

I could not help but hear one of the previous speakers talking about all the horrible things that would happen if we actually dared to try to balance our budget, like children would starve, grandparents would be kicked out in the streets, locusts would descend upon Washington.

Let me tell you something, this is not the type of government that Thomas Jefferson and James Madison and George Washington and Benjamin Franklin and our Founding Fathers intended for this country. It was about individualism. It was about the power of communities and families working together, not looking to Washington to try to figure out every single problem, but to band together as a community and as a family and as a State.

But that was the whole idea of States' rights. That is what the Federalist Papers were all about, about the power of States to conduct a type of welfare reform or conduct a type of health care reform that they wanted to conduct instead of having one highly centralized government unit.

Is that not what we were trying to get away from when we had a Revolution over 200 years ago, to get away from King George III, to allow families, individuals and communities to once again decide their own destiny, instead of having the Federal Government that tells us what doctor we want to choose, how we want to protect our family, and now, with these other reforms, how we want to take care of education? It just does not make sense.

And you know what? A year ago I was sitting on the couch, and as a citizen, I got fed up, Mr. Speaker, and said enough is enough, I want to take part in this process; I do not care whether I win or lose, I want my voice to be heard, and I thought it was a unique story. I did not have a lot of money. I did not have a lot of traditional support. I just had ideas.

And I thought they were my ideas and my ideas alone until I came here and found out that 85 others had similar type ideas.

And what had happened was everybody started talking, whether it was on C–SPAN or on talk radio or on E-mail or through faxes; citizens in this country became empowered, and because of it, we were able to speak as one voice without lobbyists in our camp, without the traditional party power brokers on the local level in our camps. We were able to do it on ideas and ideas alone, and because of that, we have an unparalleled opportunity in the 104th Congress to make real changes and make real reforms.

It starts by balancing the Federal budget. It starts by doing what middle class families have had to do for 40 years, and for what State legislators have had to do for 40 years, but what this Federal Government has failed to do since 1969.

It is a very simple premise, and yet if you hear supply-side economics professors talk on one hand, it can make your head swim. If you hear Keynesian economics professors talk on the other side of the matter, you say, well, how do those numbers add up. What we are trying to do is have a very simple economic theory, and it goes like this: You only spend as much money as you take in. What is so radical about that

concept? Why is it that when we want to act the way middle class Americans act we are called the enemies of children, the enemies of education, the enemies of farmers, the enemies of grandparents, and the enemies of all things that are right, noble, and just?

□ 1600

I have got a 91-year-old grandmother who gets $350 per month. I do not want to kick her out into the streets. I am not going to vote to kick her out into the streets.

I have a 7-year-old boy in first grade, and I do not want to hurt his chances in higher education. But does that mean we need a Federal bureaucracy telling school teachers in Pensacola, FL, or in Maine or in Washington State how to teach our children? No, it does not. That is what this revolution was all about.

Make no mistake of it, the 1994 election was a revolution of sorts. Do not let them revise history in a few months, do not let them start convincing you that all of a sudden these mean Republicans have come into town, or these conservative reformers have come into town and all of a sudden want to do all these things that they did not promise.

It is about a real revolution. Yet in a few weeks, inside the beltway, all that we have heard is what we cannot do and what we will not do and why we continue to do it.

I am here with other members of the freshman class to tell you that it can be done and it will be done, but only with citizens' help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Kansas to address the House.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, when I read the Federalist Papers, which Speaker GINGRICH has recommended to each of us, I am challenged because the Federalist Papers remind each of us who have received the honor of representing the people that we have also received the responsibility of representing them.

I am reminded how revolutionary the concept of a constitutional Republic was to the people of that time. They were engaged in a great experiment, an experiment in democracy.

In a sense, we are undertaking a new experiment in democracy. This new experiment is not so much about new ideals, but about tried and tested truths. For too long Washington has dictated to the people that they should do how they should do it. This Washington-knows-best attitude has grown exponentially during the last 40 years. Tragically during the same period of time, deficits have grown and Government now clearly is out of control.

However, leave it to the American to understand when it is time to act. The Constitution was the wise course of action for our Founding Fathers, and we are thankful for their wisdom.

Today Americans realize it is time, again, to act, that our Government has gone mad and has to be stopped. It is time to stop, look and listen; stop passing programs we cannot afford, look at the States and their examples of balanced budgets and ingenious new programs, and, finally, to listen to the people.

The answers to our problems are not found here in the beltway but in the hearts and the minds of the people who sent us here.

Mr. Speaker, Madison tells us in Federalist 39 that, ''In order to ascertain the real character of the Government, it may be considered in relation to the foundation on which it is to be established.''

What is that foundation? Mr. Speaker, it is the people.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman would yield, I must rise and take exception to an article I read in one of this Nation's leading weekly magazines where some of the mentality that has handcuffed us for the last 40 years continues to be propagated throughout the land. Now, one of the leading news magazines in this country, we talk about the dangers of what it phrased as hyper-democracy. The notion that somehow letters to the editor and appearing on talk radio and sending us faxes and sending us E-mail, somehow it is just too mind boggling; somehow it will muddy the water and somehow it will take America down the wrong road.

Mr. Speaker, how on Earth can it be that a government which derives its powers from the consent of the governed can ever be led astray by the input of the governed? Mr. Speaker, to the people of America, we thank you for the mandate of November 8 and we ask the people of America to stay in tune, stay in touch, and stay on top of this revolution.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, there is no more clear message from the people of the Fourth District of Kansas than that it is time to give government back to the people. They want to be closer to the decisions that are made, they do not want to be spectators in democracy, they want to be players on the field of ideas.

The freshman class and the new Republican majority are asking the people of Kansas and all Americans to come join the team. If we are going to be truly revolutionary, we need their help.

Ronald Reagan reminded us that the power comes from God to the people and from the people to government.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to change the country and get government off people's backs, all Americans must become an active part of this new experiment. They need to write letters to local papers, they need to get in touch with talk radio shows, they need to recruit, educate, and tell their friends and neighbors to all get involved.

What we have been given is a sobering responsibility to once and for all change the way this Government does its business.

The people must make sure that the power they gave us is used for their good and not for our good.

Let us not forget the revolutionary nature of those visionary thinkers who established this wonderful experiment in democracy. We must remember that the people who sent us here are the foundation because all too often the people have not been the foundation but the target, the target in the crosshairs of big, oppressive Government. The reforms that we passed the first day were the good first step in the right direction. Now, joining together with the people, we will work together to end unfunded mandates, work to have a strong tax limitation component and a balanced budget amendment.

I will support limiting the ability to raise taxes and will fight to make it a reality. This is not a time to scale back our goals. Rarely have the people of the Fourth District of Kansas and this country spoken with greater clarity.

Kansans want their Government to be responsive to them, and they want each of us to rise above parochial interests and return the government back to the people.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman from Kansas. I could not help but be reminded, after hearing the gentleman from Arizona, about the press' criticism of this revolution of sorts that took place this year. I could not help but be reminded of an article that I just saw this past week in the Washington Post Weekend section, when they were trying to explain the revolution that took place from coast to coast and explain this hyper-democracy. To describe the American people, this columnist wrote, ''We are nostalgic, we are susceptible, we are poorly informed, we are alienated, we are fearful, we are confused.''

Well, excuse me, Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, the American people had more access to information on this campaign than they have ever had in the history of the Republic. Between the rise of talk radio and CNN and C-SPAN and other media outlets, this was a truly open political process. To write, as this columnist did, that this revolution happened because we are poorly informed, we are alienated, we are confused, is absolutely inexplicable.

It reminds me of what happened in the early 1980's when this Government, once before, tried to cut back the size and scope of the Federal Government. Before the first cuts were made, there was an article in Newsweek that had a picture of a poor, pathetic, hungry, dirty young girl. What was the headline? ''Reagan's poor.''

He had been President for a year, and already he was being saddled with this as being his fault because he was proposing cuts.

And what did we see over Christmas on the front pages of weekly magazines? Was it stories about how we can balance the budget, how we can put an

end to 40 years of madness, of tax and spend, tax and spend, tax and spend policy? No. It was a cartoon with a caption: ''The Gingrich that stole Christmas.''

Really original, really cute, but it had absolutely nothing to do with how we were going to handle the tasks in front of us. We have been hearing for the past few weeks Members on the other side of the aisle come before the Speaker and talk about everything but specific cuts and on the need to balance the budget.

□ 1610

We have heard complaints about the fact that we did not spell out every single penny we were going to cut from the budget for the next 40 years. We have heard references to GOPAC. We have heard references to the Historian and an article she wrote 10–15 years ago. We have heard references to NEWT's mom. We have heard references to everything but what is germane and central to this very important discussion, and I yield now, to go into this further about specific cuts, to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to address this body, and it is a pleasure to be able to be a new Member of this body. It reminds me of all the newness, that perhaps there also is something else new, that perhaps the new federalists, to take a phrase from the gentleman from Florida that was used before, that we are the new federalists coming into Washington with an idea of less government, with an idea that government is governing too much on the people, with the ideas that Thomas Jefferson put forward, that many of us, as quoted frequently and often before.

One of my favorite Jefferson quotes is him saying that the moments for great innovation in society are few and far between. I think we are at one of those great moments where society has spoken with such great clarity that they want much less government, that they want a reformed Congress, that they want a return to the basic values that built the country, values of work, values of family, a recognition of a higher moral authority. It seems to me that that is what the people said on November 8. They wanted to reduce the Federal Government, reform the Congress, return to basic values.

I think we were sent here to this new Congress not to make the Federal Government work and do more with less. We were sent here to make less government. Republicans did not seize the majority because the other party did a poor job of trying to run the country from Washington. We won because they tried to run the country from Washington, and you know this country is just too big, too diverse, and its people love freedom too much for that to work. In a free society government is the people's servant, not its master. You know today the U.S. Government employs more people than we do in the manufacturing sector all told. We have more people working for the Government than we do making tractors, and tires, and computers. That is just insane. The fact is there are more Government departments and agencies which I believe could be completely abolished without American citizens even knowing. In fact, the public would be better served if most of the decisions government makes were instead left up to individuals, and families, and communities. Government today collects more taxes, spends more moneys, and issues more regulations than ever before. We have never had so many laws, or agencies, or regulations. Even through the Reagan and Bush administrations not a single Cabinet-level agency was abolished. In fact, one was added.

The growth of government has been slowed, but it has not been stopped. It now must be reversed. We must question the entire existence of many of the bureaucracies. Merely trimming a branch from the tree will not be sufficient. I think we are going to need to work to pull out the whole tree, roots and branches, if necessary. With this approach we can certainly find enough savings to balance the Federal budget and return money to the taxpayers, which is what we should do, which is what the goal of the new federalists should be.

But the most important point in this new paradigm is that these cuts are not just about paying. They are about freedom. They are about opportunity for a new society. They are about a new relationship between the Federal Government and its people, and that is the vision that we need to deliver to the American people, that new vision, that new relationship, that less government dependence is more personal freedom and that freedom to express, to grow, is what has made America in the past. That is what will make America grow even greater into the future.

Mr. Speaker, remember always the Government actually produces nothing. Government cannot give until it takes away. We must never forget this central premise. We need to get the Federal Government off the back of the people and out of their pockets, and that should be a goal of the new federalists.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas not only for his comments, especially about freedom, because during my campaign there was actually an opponent of mine that gave one of the finest speeches I think I have heard, and it was about freedom. He said what we need to do in Washington is make cuts in spending and regulations, not because we want to hurt people, but because it is about freedom, and then he reminded us what Americans have done over the years to fight for freedom, that it was freedom that we were fighting about at Iwo Jima, and it was freedom in Khe Sanh, and it was freedom over these 200 years, and it is that freedom now that we have to fight for, like the gentleman said, talking about those trees.

Mr. BROWNBACK. If the gentleman would yield back, my point with this is that so much of the time when we talk about cutting the Government we absolutely must do this, too. It is insane to run $200 billion annual deficits and put that on the backs of my children and grandchildren to come. That is wrong. That is morally wrong to do that. At this point in time in our history it is wrong.

But instead of focusing all the time, as we do so much of it on saying, ''OK, this cut is going to hit here, this one is going to hit there, it's going to hit here,'' what about all the liberation that takes place with that? What about all the freedom of the people? I think this has been an insidious relationship between the Government and its people over time, that it has grown and strengthened those bonds and surrounding us to the point that the Government has become our master and not our servant, and it is time to cut those shackles off. It is time in many cases to pull the whole tree up instead of saying we are going to cut the little branch off. Here it may be time, and it is time, I believe, to cut the hole and pull the whole tree up to give that freedom back. and let us talk about the freedom and the opportunity that that will yield to America and to this society and the growth that that is going to create, the entrepreneurial spirit that that will create for us instead of the, well, what is it going to do here and this for you? What about this particular program? What about that? That is the narrow. The bigger picture is much prettier.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman would yield back, I cannot help but think about one particular agency in general, and I know, without getting into the specifics, I have wondered what has been happening with the Department of Education, a bureaucracy that has not been around for 200 years, but since its inception and since it achieved Cabinet-level position, look what has happened in our schools. Look what has happened to our young people. As our Speaker has been saying for so long, we live in a country where 12-year-olds are having babies, where 15-year-olds are shooting each other, where 17-year-olds are dying of AIDS, and where 18-year-olds graduate from high schools with diplomas they cannot even read. What has this Federal bureaucracy that was supposed to help our children done for us for all the money that has been poured into it over the years?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I think it is a legitimate question, one that we have not asked, one that needs to be asked, and I hope that we, as Members of this new 104th Congress, will be asking that very question of that agency and many others. What is it indeed that has occurred here, and should we continue it, or should it be stopped?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman from Kansas, and I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, on January 4 we witnessed an historical change here on the floor of the House of Representatives when Republicans took control after 40 years. On that day the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader, passed the gavel and eloquently called for a new era of debate to begin.

□ 1620

Well, the freshman class was eager to engage in that debate. We passed nine bills the first day. I was proud to introduce the first one. And that included the Shays Act, which makes government live under the same laws as all the rest of Americans.

We are keeping our promises to the American people. And this week the debate will continue. We will vote on unfunded mandates, and I believe they will pass, and they are necessary.

The States need to be assured that the Federal Government does not balance its budget on the backs of the States, and that is what the unfunded mandate legislation is all about.

Next week we will vote on the balanced budget amendment with tax limitations. Over 80 percent of the American people support a balanced budget amendment. Inside the beltway, this is a great cause of concern. Back home in Michigan, we call it common sense.

In addition, many of us have sought to protect the American people from further tax increases by supporting the tax limitation amendment. The provision will ensure that Congress will not and cannot balance the budget on the backs of its citizens.

Such a provision would force lawmakers to balance the budget the same as millions of American families do every day. Hard working Americans do not have the benefit of spending more than they take in, and neither should their Federal Government.

We are looking pass the first 100 days, and certainly the distinguished gentleman from Kansas talked about the Department of Education. The Department of Energy would be another consideration, privatizing HUD and maybe the Department of Commerce. We need to rethink government at every single level. We will not lose our focus, because we work for you, the American people.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I would like to recognize and yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida. You know, very soon we have the opportunity to stand and deliver to the American people. Recently we talked about the Contract With America, that we would bring to vote the 10 items within the Contract With America. And one of those items within that contract was the balanced budget amendment, something I campaigned for for a very long time.

But, Mr. Speaker, not just any kind of balanced budget amendment, a balanced budget amendment that has taxpayer protection as its centerpiece. The taxpayer protection I am talking about is the three-fifths super majority.

But what does that really mean? It means that it is going to take 290 votes to pass any future tax increase, 290. That is very important, you see, because currently it only takes 218 votes to pass a tax increase, a simple majority.

Now, some in this body would say don't handcuff the Federal Government by tying our hands so that they can't raise taxes when they run out of revenue and just make it very easy for them to go ahead and pass another tax increase. But, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly why we need the three-fifths super majority for future tax increases, so it is going to make it tough to raise taxes in the future, so that when they do run out of revenue they can't just turn to raising taxes on the backs of the American working man and woman. They are going to have to look at the other side. They are going to have to cut spending and look at other ideas to make the books balance.

One of the things that I have talked about for along time is that this Congress should operate like a business. They should balance the books like every business balances the books. They should run their budget like a hard working man and woman working together to balance the books of their own family.

You know, on November 8 the American people sent us a message. They said enough is enough. It is no longer big government. We are going to send in the conservatives. And we are here. But the protection that I am worried about is after we are gone. Some of us are going to move on to the private sector. Some of us are going to move on to other offices. Some of us are going to do other things. And what about the protection for the American taxpayer when the 104th freshman class is no longer here to speak for the American taxpayer? And that is why we need a three-fifths super majority.

You know, I have heard for a long time that liberals in this House have said that you just can't handcuff us. You cannot handcuff us. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we need to do. We need not only to handcuff the people of this institution, but we need to throw away the key, so that no longer can they do it with a simple majority. Three-fifths is the magic number, 290 is the vote. Whether you are a business executive or a homemaker, we need your help more than ever. We need to energize the troops. We need to have you call on your Representatives, because we want to make it tough, because we wanted the books balanced, and we want a good, tough, strong balanced budget amendment.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska if he is persuaded by the arguments that he has been hearing about the reasons why we need to go ahead and cave in and not support this three-fifths majority for a tax increase in the balanced budget amendment.

It seems to me I have heard time and time again, you cannot support that, because it will never pass. It will never fly on the other side. The Senate will not pass that bill with a three-fifths majority requirement.

I say let them vote on it when it comes in front of them. I think any conservative, any fiscal conservative, whether he or she be a Democrat or a Republican, would be hard pressed to vote against a taxpayer protection plan like this three-fifths majority includes in it.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. If the gentleman will yield, that is exactly what this is all about. I am not worried about what the other body is going to do. We have 230 votes on here. We have to find another 60 to make it 290.

Once we do that, the ball is in their court. But we have stood and delivered to the American taxpayer. That is what we were sent here to do: Stand up for the little guy, stand up for the hard-working man and woman who are out there fighting under the taxation and regulation of this Federal bureaucracy, who do not know what makes this country run.

This country was founded on free enterprise, on the principles of capitalism, and we need to return that power back to the people, and that is what they said to this Congressman from Omaha, NE, on November 8.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska one final question: Were you elected in Nebraska by your constituents because of your ability to read the minds of the Members of the Senate on how they would vote on particular bills?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. If the gentleman from Florida would yield, I was elected from Omaha, NE, because I was going to come back here to Washington, DC, fight for the little guy, relieve some taxation from this body, so the American man and woman would have an opportunity to put money away on the weekend, to put money away at the end of the month, to put money away at the end of their years for their future retirement, to pay the bills, to send their kids to college, and that is exactly what this body is going to do. And I am proud to say I am a member of the conservative 104th class. And we are going to change the way this body does business, because we mean what we say, and we are looking forward to making it happen.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

Now I would like to yield to the gentleman from Maine.

(Mr. LONGLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONGLEY. It is interesting that 2 days ago, and I am almost embarrassed to bring this up, but the supreme court of the State of Maine heard arguments on a question of whether the Girl Scouts in the State would be required to pay State sales tax on their Girl Scout cookie sales. And in the course of the argument, the State tax assessor argued that learning responsibility of paying taxes was part of what it meant to be a Girl Scout, or, in effect that we have succumbed to the level in this country or at least in this State and in this country, where we are literally chasing 10-year-old girls around to collect sales tax.

The same problem is existing on the Federal level. It think it is bad enough and I heard this over and over again in my campaign, that we have reached the point where government was stooping to any length to get its hands on any extra nickel that it could from the taxpayers.

It is bad enough that government is taking the bite that it is taking, particularly out of wages. But it has reached the point where it is not only taking money out of our checks and taking money out of our lives, but trying to tell us what to do with the rest of it.

I am very interested to see a very important document, and I carried this in my campaign, a copy of the Constitution and Declaration of Independence. Over 200 years ago Thomas Jefferson said in very simple words, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But most important, to secure these rights, government are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Government was not meant to be our master. It was not even meant to be our partner. It was meant to be our servant. And with all the talk today about reinventing government, I think that the language perhaps has been misdirected. We need to get back to the basics. We do not need to reinvent anything.

□ 1630

The best wisdom that has ever been written about Government and the democratic system and the free enterprise system is contained right in words of this document. I think we need to get back to it.

I might add that I am also honored today to be part of a group of freshmen that is literally launching the first days of a new American Revolution. A couple of years ago there was talk about a gang of 7. I am very proud to be part of a gang of 73. Hopefully we can turn this country around, get the limits that we need on the growth of the Federal Government by forcing a balanced budget by the year 2002, and by insisting on a three-fifths majority rule as it relates to any future tax increases to make it more difficult for government to try to purchase its way or mandate its way out of the system through the taxes on the working people of this country.

Let us make it clear, in my campaign I campaigned on the fact that if I bought a pack of cigarettes, I pay three taxes. If I bought a can of beer, I would pay four taxes. But if I went out in this country and created a job, gave a working person work, I would pay or manage nine different taxes. Literally three times as many taxes as on the pack of cigarettes or twice as many taxes as on a can of beer.

When I look at those taxes, and let us talk about the minimum wage. There has been some talk about, a call for an increase. Yes, I would love to increase the take-home wages of working people. But when we look at what the Government has done at a minimum wage of $4.25 an hour, those nine taxes, five paid or managed by the employer, four paid by the employee, at the minimum wage they exceed 20 cents and, in many cases, approach 25 cents or more per dollar of wages. That is clearly exorbitant.

When you look at the totality of wages that we collect, the taxes that we collect in this country, the bulk of them are taken out of the wage base, out of the wages and pockets of working people. It is time that we got away from the politics of greed and envy and realized that we are all in this together. We have to deal with this together, and we have to deal with it by dealing with a government that is spending more than it takes in and does not show any signs of relinquishing.

I want to end on this note: I am very proud that today our Speaker, the majority leader, and the majority whip have addressed a letter to the President of the United States, pointing out that on, this past Sunday, and I will quote from the letter, that the Labor Secretary said ''the President is against simply balancing the budget.'' When there was another question about balancing the budget, the Labor Secretary said, ''your question assumes that the goal is to balance the budget.''

In the letter we point out to the President that this contradicts his 1992 vow to put forth a plan to balance the budget. And we are going on, and I am happy to endorse what our Speaker and leadership have said, we call on the President to be consistent with the likely approval of a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget by the year 2002. We call on him to submit a budget that would reach that objective and that would be consistent with his 1992 campaign pledge and that he disavow the comments made by his own labor secretary.

Finally, I want to address my comments to the American people. It is clear to me as a freshman Member of this body that the bias in Washington is in favor of increasing taxes. It is in favor of increasing control in Washington. We need to turn this government around. We need to reempower individuals and citizens. We need to reempower the private sector. We need to reempower local and State government. We need to put a collar on a Federal Government that is out of control. And it is only going to happen if the public demands it. It will not happen if you leave Washington to its own devices.

Again, I want to end on this one vote: Barely 2 weeks ago I stood on this floor with my 6-year-old daughter Sarah and my 10-year-old son Matt, and it was extremely troubling to me to realize, as I am sitting here about to take my oath of office as a U.S. Representative from Maine's First District that my 2 children, a 6-year-old and a 10-year-old, that we are literally spending money today in this country that my children are going to be forced to repay. And that is not only a burden on our own economy, it is a tremendous burden on the future and the opportunities that I hope that we can leave to my two children, my son and my daughter. I know that many parents feel the same way I do.

Sir, I appreciate the opportunity to address this body. I am happy to be part of the opening day, the first salvos in an effort to get this Federal Government to adopt a balanced budget amendment and to put a restriction on its ability to increase taxes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Like you, I carried around a copy of the Constitution during my campaign, and I still do it today, simply because this is a second American Revolution that we are embarking upon. People have talked about the Contract With America for the past several months, and it is an extremely important document, but not only because of what it does today but what it is going to empower this body to do over the next 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 years. And that is, to continue taking us forward into a direction that will actually help us abide by the original Contract With America, which was that very Constitution that you and I and millions of other freedom-loving Americans carry around every day.

I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. LONGLEY. I just want to pick up on what you said, because this is the fundamental Contract With America. I think that we do not need, we do not have anything that we need to reinvent. We have a system of government that is the finest in the world, that has stood the test of 200 years of American history. We need to get back to the basics. It was a government based not only on a Constitution but the 10 Bill of Rights, including the 10th amendment, which is something that, again, this Government was based on local and State government, delegating responsibility to the lowest level, consistent with the need to achieve results.

Again, we have build up a Federal bureaucracy, a government in Washington that is consuming resources left and right, is drowning the country with not only red ink, but it is totally seizing the tax capacity of this country to the derogation of individuals in local and State government.

I just want to end on, add one other note. It only occurs to me, as you raised your question.

I am fortunate, in the early 1970's, my father, now deceased, served as Governor of Maine. He was an independent. And he was also one of the initial cochairs of the national effort to balance the budget.

The initial committee consisted of Gov. Dolph Briscoe, a Democrat from the State of Texas, a Republican, former Treasury Secretary William Simon of New York, and my father, independent Gov. James Longley of Maine. That was 18 years ago, 18 years, and we still have not dealt with the problem.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to address this House.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

(Mr. SHADEGG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by commending the gentleman from Florida for bringing this issue forward. Indeed, on November 8, the American people sent the first shot, I believe, of a new revolution, a revolution not to change America but to restore America, a revolution which will remind us and our children and our grandparents that America was built around the premises outlined in the Constitution, which the gentleman from Florida raised at the outset of this hour.

Those premises were that people relied upon themselves, could govern themselves best, that a central governmental authority like we had escaped in England was not the best way for men and women to govern themselves. But, rather, that we should have that government which governs least and that men and women of this country for the first time would be free to determine their own future, to succeed or to fail on their own ingenuity, their own energy, their own effort and their own drive and that there would be no guarantee from government other than that of equal opportunity.

We have drifted so far from that that it is difficult to even recognize the Government that we once began. The principles which were at the heart of that Government have become ignored regrettably here in this Capital City, and it is time that we returned to them.

You began this debate by reminding us of the words of the 10th amendment. I think it is worthy to reharken to those words on many occasions. That amendment of the Constitution says that only those powers delegated specifically to the Federal Government are for use and exercise by the Federal Government and that all other powers are reserved to the States and to the people respectively.

□ 1640

I submit it is time to begin to review not just some pieces of legislation that pass through this distinguished body, but every piece of legislation which passes through this distinguished body, on that standard. In fact, is it within the power of the Federal Government to legislate in the area, or is it, rather, reserved to the States or to the people?

When I ran for this office, I did so on a premise that it simply was not true that the people who occupy this hall and the one across the way, and the army of bureaucrats that they control, know better how to run the lives and the businesses of the citizens of the State of Arizona than those people in my district and in the State of Arizona, and, indeed, across America. I simply reject the premise that Washington, DC, is the font of all wisdom, and that we can manage every business and run every life better from the floor of this House than those individuals can do for themselves.

The simple truth is, that stands the premise of this country on its head. I trust the people of Arizona, the people of Florida, and the people of America to determine their own fate. Yes, we need laws. We need to deal with those issues which cannot be dealt with by the States or by individuals, but we have gone so far beyond that that it is hardly recognizable.

Let me talk, briefly, about an issue that has been touched upon here, and that is the issue of the balanced budget amendment, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely essential and an essential element of the Contract with America that we pass a balanced budget amendment.

That is critical because we have discovered what Paul Harvey has warned us, and that is that self-government without self-discipline doesn't work. Regrettably, what has happened is that we have come to that point in America where at least all too often we have determined that we can vote ourselves benefits out of this body without ever having to pay for them.

Like you, I listened to the gentleman before this hour started talk about the dire consequences which would result if we simply enacted a provision requiring a balanced budget: that children would go without education in his particular school district, that schools would not have the resources they need; that the cities and towns in his particular district would not have the funds necessary.

That simply cannot be true, Mr. Speaker, because if that is true, then he is asking the people of some other part of America to subsidize the schools and the cities and the towns and the counties in his district.

The truth is there is no free lunch in America. If in fact there is a subsidy going to the schools or the towns and cities and counties in his district, that means that they would not have sufficient resources to run those schools, those cities, or those towns without getting money from Washington, DC. Then, in fact, he is asking America to subsidize his community. That is dead wrong.

The Federal Government cannot provide resources to one district that it does not first take from another. So the balanced budget itself is absolutely critical, and it is no more complicated than the principle you laid out at the outset, which deserves repeating, and that is that the American people can have and should only have the amount of government that they are willing to pay for.

However, there is a critical decision which will be made on the floor of this House within the next 10 days. That is will we pass a simple balanced budget amendment or will we pass an amendment with teeth.

I have been talking with the members of our class, and they are uniform in their belief that a simple balanced budget amendment is not sufficient; that indeed, it does not exact the degree of discipline which is needed in today's world, and that what we need, rather, is a super majority requirement to raise taxes.

Why is that? It is true because Government has discovered that we have anesthetized the taxpayer. We can take money out of their pocket through withholding and they never know it is there. So every time someone in this body dreams up a new idea for a new Government program or to solve somebody's problem, all we have to do is raise taxes just a little bit to pay for that good idea.

The burden has become excessive. It simply is not true that Government taxes too little. It is true that Government spends too much.

Let me relate a personal experience that I have. I have never served in a legislative body before having the privilege of joining this one, but I did have the privilege of serving as a part of a group of people who advised the Arizona legislature.

I sat in on countless meetings where citizens with good intentions came to a member of the Arizona legislature and said, ''Here is a serious problem. We need you to solve it.'' They played upon the emotions and the sympathies of those elected representatives, and of course their instinct was, ''yes, we should solve the problem.''

However, there was something missing in that dynamic. What was missing in that dynamic is that no one was there to represent the taxpayers who were to be asked to pay for that purportedly essential or necessary service.

It is time for structural reform as a part of this revolution. It is time that

we placed limits on the ability of Government to casually dip into the pockets of an already overtaxed citizenry. The way to do that is with a super majority requirement.

That is, if the citizens and taxpayers of America cannot be participants in that conversation where we are being asked to extend one more Government benefit, then make the structure of Government so that it is harder to raise taxes. Put them there by virtue of a structural change which would say ''We cannot raise taxes upon a simple majority. We must do it upon a super majority.''

On this floor within the next 10 days we will have an opportunity to vote for a requirement that says ''No future tax increase can be enacted without a 60 percent majority.'' I urge the people of America to get on their fax machines and their phones and to use their letters and any other communication device they have, buttonhole their Member of this Congress in the next 10 days, and tell them that they are not undertaxed but they are overtaxed; that we need a real reform, and that what we do not want is a balanced budget amendment which will lead to a balancing of the budget by an increase in taxes, but that what we need essentially in America is a balanced budget amendment which will lead to a balanced budget balanced on the basis of spending reductions.

This is a critical vote. It will occur within the next 10 days. I urge the American people, you are participants in this revolution.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Again, from hearing him talk, I was once again reminded about the dire consequences that this Member who spoke earlier and others have been speaking about, talking about what would happen if we passed a balanced budget amendment, what would happen if we actually lived by the words of the Constitution.

I have to ask you, in your reading of the balanced budget amendment as it is, does it seem to be ideologically driven by conservatism or by liberals, or is it value-neutral and policy-neutral as far as just what the goal is, and that is, to spend as much money—only as much money as you take in?

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, the language of the draft which I hope will appear before us states a simple principle, and that is, first, we must balance the Federal budget and, second, future tax increases will require a super majority. It is built around the premise that I think Paul Harvey best elocutes, and that is simply that self-government without self-discipline won't work.

The sad truth is that what we are doing now is we are voting ourselves benefits, but passing the bill on to our children, our grandchildren, and our great grandchildren. However, more than that, because we are creating that debt, we are also creating an interest burden, which means we have fewer and fewer dollars to pay for today's services because we are paying the interest on the debt we are creating, because we simply refuse the discipline to say no to extra spending.

The super majority or three-fifths requirement would institutionalize that discipline which is so critically needed, so we do not continue the policies of tax and spend and tax and spend and tax and spend, to the point where we are today creating an underground economy where people no longer are willing to pay the onerous tax burden we are imposing on them because they simply understand they are not getting their dollar's worth.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and would now like to yield to the other member of the Arizona delegation.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Florida. I would like to note what a personal thrill and high honor it is to stand alongside my friend and colleague from Arizona. We live in neighboring districts, and our people share similar thoughts and values.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things we have to remember was echoed in a previous remark by my good friend, the gentleman from Maine. It is that we are really not actively involved here in reinventing Government as much as we are involved in remembering what made this Government great, and what made it the last, best hope of mankind.

Though we may use the rhetoric of revolution, and indeed, after 40 years of maintaining an old order, it may seem revolutionary, Mr. Speaker, what we advocate is really not radical. Instead, it is reasonable.

In the remarks we have heard from the other side throughout the 104th Congress, there seems to be an important ingredient missing. It is this realization. The money talked about and the funds appropriated and the horror stories of alleged losses and decreases in funding that Members on the other side of the aisle would point to fails to understand this basic point. It is not the Federal Government's money. It is money that rightfully belongs in the wallets and the purses of the citizens of the United States.

□ 1650

They know best how to spend their hard-earned money. They know best how to care for their families. One size does not fit all.

Mr. Speaker, the answer is not found in government, but in ourselves.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

I must echo what he says, that the answers don't lie in Washington, and more importantly they don't lie on one side of the aisle.

This is a battle that is going to be taken up on both sides of the aisle.

I know on December 7, 1941, when Franklin Roosevelt stood before the House and Senate, as they declared war on Japan, it was a bipartisan effort. On that day, nobody cared whether you were a conservative or a liberal, or whether you were a Republican or a Democrat. They only cared that you were Americans. I can say this, that today, and as we approach this vote, it does not matter whether we are conservatives or liberals or Democrats or Republicans. The only thing that matters is that we begin treating our checkbook the way middle-class Americans treat their checkbook, and that we only pay what we have.

It is a very simple request that the American people have given us. I see the gentlewoman from Ohio, and I know that she, too, is concerned about this on the other side of the aisle. We have to remember that one party does not have all the answers. But we have got to start somewhere. I believe this three-fifths supermajority to raise taxes is a great way to start, because this year, more than any other year before us, we can make a difference.

The 104th Congress can bring about true reforms if both sides of the aisle will work together and if conservatives all across America will step forward and say, ''Enough is enough.''

I would like to end my remarks by quoting someone who said this in 1966, and the quote is inspirational and talks about American individualism, and what can happen when Americans get off their couches and dare to make a difference.

The quote goes like this:

> It is a revolutionary world we live in. It is young people who must take the lead. We've had thrust upon us a greater burden of responsibility than any other generation that has ever lived.
>
> ''There is,'' said an Italian philosopher, ''nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things.''
>
> There is the belief there is nothing one man or one woman can do against the enormous array of the world's ills, against misery and ignorance, injustice and violence. Yet many of the world's great movements, of thought and action, have flowed from the work of a single man or woman.
>
> It is from numberless diverse acts of courage and belief that human history is shaped. Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance.

That is what has happened in 1994 and 1995. Centers of energy from the people across this country have stood up and individuals have dared to get off the couch and make a difference.

I would like to commend the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy for making that statement in 1966, and I think it is a fitting statement that we as Republicans and Democrats can take forward