the 10th amendment to the Constitution—''the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.'' Those words should not be treated lightly. The goal of the 10th amendment was to limit the powers of the Federal Government. Could we have moved any farther away from the intent of the 10th amendment than with unfunded mandates? We should be searching for ways to return control to the States and local governments. But when we must use our power to write laws that will force State action, we most certainly should pay for it.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act is the first important step toward reevaluating what Congress should do. It will put us in a position to reconsider the value of some of the dictates that have been passed onto State and local governments already. Maybe it is a good idea for Sheriff Berry of Oconee County, GA, to have to devote one of his few officers to stake out convenience stores in an effort to stop youngsters from buying cigarettes. Maybe Columbia County, GA, should have to meet such rigorous standards in their landfill that it makes the cost per acre go up by 1,000 percent. Maybe these unfunded mandates are good for the people, but can they afford all of our good ideas? But when the sheriff has to cut back patrols in certain areas of his county to meet a Federal mandate, or local property taxes go up to pay for landfill improvements because of a Federal mandate, do we not have a responsibility for our actions?

The bottom line is that one word—responsibility. Mr. Speaker, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act will make Congress take responsibility for its actions. If we see fit to force the States to act, then we must bear the responsibility of paying for that action. This act forces Congress to make the hard choices that have been too easily avoided. This act will provide much needed relief to State and local governments. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, and return responsibility to Congress.

INTRODUCING A FAIR BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, by the end of this week we will have under consideration a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. That is fine. West Virginia has a balanced budget requirement, as do most of the States in the Union. I myself have introduced a proposal for a balanced budget amendment.

Mr. Speaker, however, before the House undertakes that, and particularly before it begins debate on something so serious, it should definitely spell out, though, exactly how it intends to make the cuts to balance the budget, because that is the concern many of us have, and indeed, many West Virginians have contacted me about. Yes, the idea of a balanced budget within 7 years is an excellent proposal. It sounds good, looks good on a bumper sticker, but how do you actually propose to balance the budget? What is it that gets cut? Do you cut Social Security? ''Oh, no,'' recoil many in horror, ''Oh, no.'' Well, if you are not going to cut that, do you cut Medicare? What health care do you cut? What education programs? Is it Head Start? Is it WIC? Is it the defense budget? What is it that gets cut by the roughly $700 billion that is estimated to balance the budget by the year 2002?

West Virginians alike tell me ''We don't buy a pig in a poke.'' By the same token, if we go and we are looking to buy a house, we ask details about the mortgage: What are the interest payments going to be over the next 7, 10, 20 years? Does anyone walk on a car lot and say ''Just give me any car off the lot; don't show me the invoice, don't show me the payment terms''?

Does anyone go and authorize major work to be done to their house by a contractor without having it spelled out in advance before you start what it is you hope to do? You set the goal: ''I want the house painted, or I want the furnance put in,'' but don't you also ask how you are going to get there and how much it is going to cost?

So before signing off on a balanced budget amendment, I would hope that all of us in the public and the Congress alike would say ''how are you going to get there?'' We have asked the Republican leaders bringing this to the floor for their budget, for their 7-year proposal of how you balance the budget. Don't just put it in the Constitution, write out how you get it, what it is that gets cut, what programs get rearranged. So far we are waiting to see that.

I myself have introduced a balanced budget amendment, Mr. Speaker. Mine is a little different than some of the others, but it has much the same goal, to require a balanced budget by the year 2002. It does several things. First of all, it takes Social Security off budget. It cannot be considered. It is gone. Everyone says they want to protect Social Security. Fine. Adopt my amendment and you will protect Social Security. It has self-generating funds that are paid by every employee in this country. It runs a surplus. Social Security does not need to be in the budget process.

The second thing my amendment does is it encourages investment. My concern about many of the balanced budget requirements is that they will encourage, they will reward cuts in vital programs, like highway construction, water and sewer construction, airports, infrastructure, that make us stronger economically, not weaker.

Therefore, what my amendment does is to permit capital budgeting and permits you to treat the cost of physical infrastructure like roads and bridges differently than you do other expenditures.

Is that something new or novel? No, Mr. Speaker, every State has some form of capital budgeting along these lines. Every homeowner knows that you pay for your house on a mortgage and that the debt service is what is figured in your budget, not the actual cost of the house. Everybody knows that when they buy a car they buy it on a payment plan and they spread that cost out over the life of the car. That is all that my amendment does.

What my balanced budget amendment to the Constitution would do, which I hope will be made in order to be considered this week, is it will take Social Security off budget and it will encourage investment by permitting capital budgeting.

What we are asking, Mr. Speaker, is that as the House moves toward a balanced budget discussion this week, that if it is going to bring up the balanced budget amendment, that first of all we be honest with the American people and we tell the people where we are going to make the cuts and how deep those cuts are going to be.

Second, we say that we take Social Security off budget, because it does not have any business being involved in the overall budgeting of the Federal Government, since it has already been paid for and there is a surplus.

Third, Mr. Speaker, that the balanced budget amendment encourage investment, not discourage it; that we put in the balanced budget amendment those things that will make the economy grow, not shrink. That is what a fair balanced budget amendment needs if it is to be considered this week.

□ 1250

SUPPORT CONTRACT WITH AMERICA'S BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, over the course of the last week, the American people have seen a great deal of discussion in the Chamber about book deals. They have seen partisan posturing and parliamentary tricks designed to slow down if not halt completely the course that we have set out to make the Contract With America the people's agenda.

Mr. Speaker, this is the only book that we should be talking about, the ''Contract With America.'' I was noticing on page 23 of this book that it talks about the balanced budget amendment and the line-item veto.

''Isn't it time we hold Congress accountable?'' it says.

It goes on to say, ''Just as every American sits at the dinner table, and as they do, they balance their own books, they balance the budget of a family, a business, it's time that the American people hold Congress accountable to balancing the books.''

This week we will be taking up the balanced budget amendment, a piece of legislation that is long overdue.

We have already started giving the voters of America what they said they wanted in the Contract and now it is time to focus on the job at hand and get on with the people's business.

As a freshman Member of the 104th Congress, I was sent here by the people to make real change, to make this happen for the first time in 40 years.

Let us not continue backsliding toward politics as usual, but let us give the American people what they sent us here to do, and, that is, to pass a balanced budget amendment.

CALL FOR AN INDEPENDENT COUNSEL IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we Democrats are anxious to get on with the business before this House. I was pleased on Friday that the Speaker appointed his Members of the Ethics Committee and Minority Leader Gephardt appointed Members from the other side of the aisle as well. To avoid a conflict to interest, they each chose Members from the preexisting ethics panel. This was a wise move because the only complaint before the Ethics Committee right now is a complaint involving Speaker GINGRICH. Clearly the Speaker would have had a conflict of interest appointing new Members who would sit in judgment on his own case. Unfortunately, even with Friday's announcement, the Speaker still has a conflict of interest problem. The subject of the ethics complaint and the essence deals with the relationship of GOPAC, which is a political action committee controlled by Mr. GINGRICH, to Mr. GINGRICH'S other enterprises.

GOPAC is an organization which has raised over the last 9 years anywhere between $10 and $20 million in contributions. Its contributors included people who have direct interest in what we do in the People's House here. Direct interest. They have contributed to over 100 Republican candidates and campaigns. Yet we do not know who contributed the money or how the money was spent, because GOPAC still refuses to disclose the names of its past donors, and, I might add, its past expenses as well.

The ethics complaint involves questions about the relationship of this multimillion-dollar political slush fund to Mr. GINGRICH'S alleged nonpartisan college course. Clearly any person who has had dealings with GOPAC has a serious conflict of interest in this case. Yet in this morning's Wall Street Journal, we learned that 2 of the 5 Members appointed to the Ethics Committee by Mr. GINGRICH on Friday have had past dealings with GOPAC.

Mr. Speaker, this will not do. The only way we are going to get on with the business of this House and to get past this ethical cloud swirling around the Speaker's head, from his book deal to GOPAC, to his supposedly nonpartisan college course, is to have a professional, nonpartisan, independent outside counsel appointed to this case.

I would urge in the strongest way possible that that is the course that this body and that the Ethics Committee take.

QUOTES FROM THE PAST SUPPORT BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we are getting to the point in the balanced budget debate where the volume is being turned up, the heat is being turned up, we are starting to hear a lot of gnashing of teeth and beating of chests and wailing and wringing of hands, and I thought that it might be a good idea at this point to remind ourselves of the words of George Santayana who said that those who refuse to study history are condemned to repeat it, especially as we hear, and I talked last week a little bit, about the new species on the floor this year in Congress called the Metoobut.

The Metoobuts are known by their talking about a particularly positive and popular Republican principle, for example, in this case the balanced budget amendment, which the people of this country have said overwhelmingly that they want this Congress to enact, and they will say, ''We absolutely have to have a balanced budget amendment, I support it completely, it's the best thing in the world, it's the greatest thing since sliced bread, but,'' and then launch into 55 reasons why we ought to have it maybe in the next millennium but not in this one.

I thought it might be instructive if we could just look a little bit at what other people in other times have said about the ability to spend the national treasury.

Going backward quite a way, I thought maybe we could start with the Roman statesman Cicero when he spoke in the Roman Forum in 63 B.C. Listen closely, because this has particularly special relevance to today, Mr. Speaker:

> The budget should be balanced, the Treasury should be refilled, public debt should be reduced, the arrogance of officialdom should be tempered and controlled, and the assistance to foreign lands should be curtailed lest Rome become bankrupt.

Then we move closer to our own era, and we find a gentleman named Alexander Fraser Tyler who wrote about the decline and fall of the Athenian Republic. He was a Scotsman, a scholar, a historian and a professor, and he wrote this book in 1805. He said that a democracy ''can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves money from the Public Treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidates promising the most benefits from the Public Treasury with a result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy always followed by dictatorship. The average age of the world's greatest civilizations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed through the following sequence.'' This is all according to Mr. Tyler:

> From bondage to spiritual faith;
> From spiritual faith to great courage;
> From courage to liberty;
> From liberty to abundance;
> From abundance to selfishness;
> From selfishness to complacency;
> From complacency to apathy;
> From apathy to dependency;
> From dependency back into bondage.

Mr. Tyler's assessment is not very positive and I think I will take issue with his notion that every democracy will collapse over loose fiscal policy followed by a dictatorship. That is one of the reasons that we are not going to allow that to happen here at this time in the history, in the life cycle of our own Republic.

Let us go back to what one of our own Founding Fathers said, one of the greatest Founding Fathers, Thomas Jefferson, in 1789. He had one reservation about the Constitution, this document that he personally had had so much to do with authoring. He said, and this is 1789 he wrote this, ''If there is one omission I fear in the document called the Constitution, it is that we did not restrict the power of the government to borrow money.''

That is what our balanced budget amendment is all about. It is about requiring a supermajority, a three-fifths vote of the House, in order to borrow more money. The operative working section of this constitutional amendment is the requirement that 60 percent, that is the restriction right there, 60 percent of the House of Representatives and the Senate must vote in order to pass a raising of the debt service, or the debt limit, the ceiling on the debt. That is the restriction that Thomas Jefferson was talking about, right there.

Finally, I would like to quote from the founder of our party, Abraham Lincoln. He wrote, ''As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest and next to no one left to borrow from, so it must be with a government.''