

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

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

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

VETO ON LATE TERM ABORTIONS CORRECT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A PROPOSED SUPERMAJORITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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