

As Members know, this goes right to the gag rule which right now is very shaky. President Clinton lifted the gag rule when he came into office, but this Congress has never lifted it through legislation, so what this is saying is that no government, be they Federal, State, or local, can dictate to doctors or to any medical professional what women can hear nor tell women that they cannot hear it.

We introduced this bill on this very historic 23d anniversary of Roe versus Wade, which the Supreme Court upheld and has continued to uphold. We also know that in the Republican contract for a while the gag rule repeal was being overridden. They were putting the gag rule back on. I am very pleased that the Republican contract decided that was not where they were supposed to be, and that came away, but it makes us all feel a little uncertain.

We think the time has come for Members to rally around in a bipartisan manner, stand up very firmly, and say that if women are going to have responsibility for their lives, we have to treat them like responsible adults. I am very pleased that many members of the medical profession obviously agree with us: no more gag rules for women and no more gag rules for doctors.

We have the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists agreeing with us, we have the American Medical Association agreeing with us, and I could go on and on with people saying women should be treated equally at all levels in their doctor-patient relationship.

This is important to move forward on, and I think it is also an interesting time to pose it, because we saw yesterday the death of Rose Kennedy. Here is a woman who, when she was born, could not vote, and just a few days before she died, saw her granddaughter sworn into office. What a change that woman saw in her life.

I think we have seen women becoming more and more empowered under this Government, but I think the gag rule goes right at that empowerment of women and says we are not mature enough to hear what is out there, or hear what different choices are. If we are going to hold women accountable, we have to treat them as adults.

Mr. Speaker, I hope many Members of this body will join with the gentleman from Connecticut and I and the other bipartisan cosponsors and get on with this, because it is time once and for all that we legislatively join with the President in saying that the gag rule should not be there, the Federal Government should not deny the right to hear information on health to any American citizen, nor should the Federal Government or any U.S. section of government dictate to the medical profession what they can say to different people within our society.

That is wrong, and that is un-American. That certainly is turning back the clock, not moving the clock forward, as many people have cheered in

seeing it moving forward, whether it was Rose Kennedy or many of the rest of the women.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for moving forward on this important legislation. It is just absolutely essential that a woman know of her rights, and never be denied because of a government law from knowing of her rights.

I just want to thank the gentlewoman for introducing this bill. We will be working on a bipartisan basis to have the will of the Chamber be recognized.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut, and I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his courage in standing up on this issue. There are strong supporters on both sides of the aisle. This should not be a partisan issue.

This is an American issue. It is about free speech, it is about responsibility, and it is about the right to know different health options that are out there. Therefore, I thank the gentleman for carrying the banner on this. We will aggressively do it on this side, and let us have a race to see who can get the most cosponsors.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today Representative CHRIS SHAYS and I are introducing legislation with bipartisan support for the Women's Right To Know Act, a bill that unequivocally asserts American women's right to receive information about the full range of their reproductive health options.

The Women's Right To Know Act amends the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and simply says that government, Federal or State, cannot restrict a doctor's right to give or a woman's right to receive information about her reproduction health options, including family planning, prenatal care, adoption, and abortion services.

We introduce this bill on the 23d anniversary of Roe versus Wade, the case in which the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the right to choose abortion is protected by the Federal Constitution.

It's also a time when the gag rule stands on shaky ground. The original Republican contract included a gag rule on information welfare recipients could receive about abortion. We then heard that was a mistake. It wasn't supposed to be in there.

I don't want to leave anything to chance. It's time for this Congress to stand firm and say no more gag rules for women and no more gag rules for doctors.

That's what this bill says. We say it's a doctor's right to give information about reproductive health and a woman's right to receive that information. Very simple.

I would like also to remind my colleagues that the American Medical Association and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists strongly condemn Government interference with the freedom of communication between physicians and patients. That is what this legislation outlaws: Government interference with the doctor-patient relationship.

In 1991, the Supreme Court in Rust versus Sullivan maintained that the Government can censor health information in Federally funded family planning clinics. That has made it more imperative than ever for Congress to enact the Women's Right To Know Act. Passage of this act would make it clear that censoring information about women's reproductive health options violates a women's right to know accurate information about her health.

IN SUPPORT OF THE UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act. I rise today to argue that the time has come for us to reign in the unfunded mandates and the misguided notion under which they operate. By voting for this bill, we can show the American people that we mean business by reducing the dictatorial power that Congress has exercised over the States through unfunded mandates.

I think we should take a moment to consider the idea of the unfunded mandate. In essence, with an unfunded mandate, the Federal Government goes to State and local governments and says you must do this, and you must pay for it yourself. How incredibly arrogant. How did this Government grow so arrogant as to pass such dictates onto the States? We can not wisely set the priorities for spending the limited funds a county has to operate with. We should not try to micromanage 159 Georgia counties.

If we are going to dictate to the States, we must also have the guts to raise the taxes that pay for the dictates or mandates—not pass that responsibility onto State and county officials. If the Federal Government cannot afford these programs, the programs should be passed onto the States as strong suggestions—not unfunded mandates.

But we all know that there is more to the arguments against this bill than fear of cutting certain Federal programs. Underneath all that they say is a simple refrain—a tired, failed, liberal refrain—that says to the people we are the Federal Government, we know what is best for you, we are the Federal Government, we must take care of you. Why? Because you can't take care of yourself.

What made us so smart? Do we really believe we want clean air and clean water more than the folks at home? How did we become so endowed with the knowledge of what is right and what is wrong for America? We are simply 435 men and women who won elections on November 8. We have the power to pass laws that force State action, but we should use that power in moderation. Remember the words of

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 some-

thing 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 furnace 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.