

fiscally conservative policies throughout my service in Congress. My voting record in this regard has earned numerous awards from groups such as the National Taxpayers Union, the Grace Commission's Citizens Against Government Waste, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Watchdogs of the Treasury, Inc., Citizens For A Sound Economy and the Concord Coalition, which rated my work in the last Congress at 100 percent.

Despite my strong opposition to tax increases, however, I do not feel it is appropriate to amend the Constitution by adding a two-thirds supermajority requirement to it for Congress to pass tax increases. Over 200 years ago, our forefathers founded our nation in tax revolt. King George III's imposition of huge and unfair levies without the consent of the American colonists led to their rallying cry of "no taxation without representation." The British crown's impositions, including heavy taxation, were among the principal causes of the American Revolution.

Within a decade, in 1787, the leaders of that revolution were writing a new constitution to govern the relationship among the new national government, the states, and the people. Heavy upon their minds was the power of the central government to tax, as can be seen throughout the document. Yet having the opportunity to require supermajorities for the imposition of any tax, they did not write such a provision into the new constitution.

Supermajorities are found in our Constitution for a number of purposes, but each one relates to the separation of powers and the system of checks and balances among the branches of government. No supermajority provisions concern policies which federal governments might seek to follow in the future. Our nation's wise founders clearly and explicitly placed their faith and the entire structure of our government in simple majority rule. This is the essence of our democratic Republic under the Constitution.

To write a two-thirds requirement for tax increases into the House rules is one thing. I support it and voted for it during the last Congress. But to write the same provision into our Constitution to bind Americans for all time to come is quite a different matter. I cannot support it. I believe it should be a matter for the people of each time to determine on their own.

As always, I remain committed to cutting federal spending and to opposing tax increases. My view is that these policy decisions should be driven by the will of the people and the individuals they choose to elect in their time, not by the views of one generation enshrined as a constitutional mandate.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, taxes are too high. Federal taxes take over a fifth of America's entire economic output—more than ever before in history, and many Americans pay half of their income in combined Federal, State, and local taxes.

And some people will do anything to throw up roadblocks and detours in our trip to fiscal responsibility. They don't want to make the journey toward a balanced budget in the first place. They like joyriding instead, and sending the bill to taxpayers. They want to spend, spend, spend, without regard for how much it costs or how much debt we build.

When confronted with the debt, they always do the same thing: Raise taxes, and pat themselves on the back for "making the tough decisions!"

Mr. Speaker, the joyride is over. This time we move toward a balanced budget, and we can't bill taxpayers for the trip.

Big government got us where we are. So big government can foot the travel costs to get us back to fiscal sanity. Cutting spending is the way to reach a balanced budget.

But the joyriders won't stop looking for a free ride from taxpayers, and that's why we need the Barton tax limitation amendment. No more detours. No more tax increases.

Let's pay our own way to a balanced budget. Support the Barton amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 407, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on final passage are postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize special orders without prejudice to resumption of legislative business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### INVESTIGATION VIOLATIONS

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues I would like to address today in my time here as a special order: leaking underground storage tanks, on this, today being Earth Day; and also on food safety; but first, Mr. Speaker, I have something I would like to say. I think I, as all Americans, we should be outraged by the actions of the so-called investigations that are going on here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately these are not investigations but violations of everything that we hold as dear as American citizens. Every basic right, every fundamental belief on which this great country was founded upon is being trampled by a select few. But it is this few, those who think they are above the law, that give Congress and government a bad name.

But this is more than just giving Congress or government a real bad

name. This is about privacy, it is about the Constitution, it is about the laws of this Nation, it is about the oath of office, and it is about our word.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), has released private recorded conversations covered by the Privacy Act to the news media. The conversations released were those of Mr. Hubbell, and those conversations were amongst himself to his wife and his family, and they were subpoenaed by the committee from the Justice Department.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) was allowed access to these recordings because of his position as a Member of Congress and as chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) was warned by the Justice Department that Mr. Hubbell had a right to privacy, and that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and his committee should safeguard these tapes against improper disclosure. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), a Member of Congress, put himself above the law and has purposefully released these tapes.

Does not a Member's oath of office, the Constitution of the United States, in which we are sworn to uphold the Bill of Rights, the Privacy Act, human decency mean anything any more? Since when is it okay for a Member of Congress to trample the rights of individual citizens, no matter who that Member of Congress is? It is never okay for anyone, let alone a Member of Congress, to trample the individual rights of individuals.

Mr. Speaker, the rule of law applies to everyone on every occasion. This government cannot pick and choose when to follow the law. The laws of this Nation mean everyone must follow the law. Everyone includes, and especially it includes, Members of Congress, those of us who are sworn to uphold the law.

When Members or individuals who are elected officials sit by and allow a chairman or any Member of this Congress to openly ignore the law, then we are not worthy of holding elected office. That is why I can no longer sit by while the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) continues to place himself above and beyond the rule of law.

And then I must ask who is going to be the next target? Who is the next target of invasion of privacy, of violation of our constitutional rights? I often have to ask myself, in the last few days, why do the American people sit idly by and tolerate such an invasion of rights of privacy?

Mr. Speaker, in this case let us be very, very clear what is going on here. In this case the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is the first chairman in congressional history, in the 200-and-some years that we have had Congresses, to have the power to unilaterally, unilaterally issue subpoenas and release confidential information.