

must have maximum flexibility. Public welfare programs must be designed to allow states to respond to rapidly changing environments. The reason we are struggling with AFDC today is that the prescriptive statute has not kept pace with changes in public attitudes, economics, social conditions, etc.

Once again, we appreciate the opportunity to provide input. Thanks for all that you are doing on this important issue.

### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

### TERM LIMITS DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, assuming, for argument's sake, that term limits really will have the beneficial effect on the Congress that their proponents claim, why should we pass a term limits amendment that does not apply with full force to current members?

Do current members possess some special virtue which immunizes them from the hazards of extended incumbency? My good friend Rep. MCCOLLUM has said that "those of us who believe in term limits \*\*\* need to stay longer" to make sure that a term limits amendment is passed.

Do I sense a contradiction here? By the same reasoning, we should encourage the alcoholic to continue drinking, so that he will be able to keep his goal of quitting one day.

But the McCollum resolution doesn't just buy the alcoholic a drink; it gives him an open tab at the bar.

Were the McCollum resolution to be ratified by the states and become part of the constitution immediately following next year's elections, Mr. MCCOLLUM himself would still be eligible to serve in the Congress until 2008. By the time he retired, he would have been in Congress for 28 years.

Twenty-eight years.

Of course, the states can take up to seven years to ratify the term limits amendment. If the states do so, then Mr. MCCOLLUM—who has already served for 14 years—will have 19 more years to talk about our need for "citizen legislators" while he waits for his term limit to take effect. Under this scenario, when Mr. MCCOLLUM's term limits amendment finally forces him out of this body, he will have served for 33 years.

It's a tough situation for Rep. MCCOLLUM. As he himself has noted, "The worst thing that anybody could do who supports term limits as a sitting member of Congress is to step aside right now." (Press Conference on Term Limits, 5/4/92)

Every once in a while Members of this House are called upon to cast a truly difficult vote, one that affects their own lives directly. Such is the constitutional amendment mandating retroactive term limits, of which I am an original sponsor. Members who have already served six terms when the amendment passes will be ineligible to run again. This amendment will give Members who really believe in term limits a chance to vote for a term limits amendment with teeth.

But while we're waiting for term limits to pass, there's something else we can do to clean up Congress, to make elections something more than the "mockery" which our Speaker has said they often are, to reduce the overpowering advantages of incumbency in the American political system.

I am talking about campaign finance reform.

I've noticed that the Contract With America is completely silent on the issue of campaign finance reform.

Yet the rhetoric about term limits grows louder by the day. Whether you are on this floor, in your car listening to the radio, or at home watching your television, it's everywhere these days.

Yes, it's true, we have too many Members of Congress who have been working here so long that they now feel that they are entitled to be Members of Congress.

And we have too many lobbyists, too many "public relations" specialists in this town, and they certainly have a lot more influence over the legislation that is produced by this body than the average working man or woman does.

But this problem does not exist because people are serving in Congress too long; many of our greatest statesmen have had unusually long Congressional careers.

This problem exists because of the way elections are paid for.

To hear them talk, you would think my Republican friends are boldly leading the way into the era of Citizen Legislator, and that term limits are the definitive answer to the problem of the professionalization of politics.

But all the while, my Republican friends are completely ignoring the legislation that will do more than anything else to release the Congress from its bondage to the lobbyists and the special interests—campaign finance reform.

The McCollum term limits resolution is really nothing more than an incumbency protection resolution. This is why more than 30 Members who have already been in Congress for 12 years or more support it so enthusiastically.

Instead of following such an uncertain and indirect path to reform, wouldn't it be much simpler to pass real campaign finance reform, and take away the money and influence that allow people to stay in this body for year after year by drowning their opponents in a sea of money?

Wouldn't it be much simpler to stop talking about phony term limits resolutions and instead do something to se-

riously limit the influence of big money campaign donors on our political system?

But the Contract With America is silent on this issue.

It's time to stop posturing on this issue and do the right thing.

If you are for term limits—really for term limits—support the real thing, support retroactive term limits.

But even more importantly, let's reform the campaign finance laws and restore equity to the electoral process.

Whether you are in your first term or your twentieth, let's try to create a political system in which the citizens rule, and in which the dollar is no longer king.

### QUOTABLE QUOTES ON TERM LIMITS

"This is a tool that I think will do for Congress exactly what I did with a pitchfork for my dad's stable."—Dick Arme (first elected, 1984) (Seelye, N.Y. Times, 1/12/95)

"I have served here now in my 13th year. I am not ready to walk away from here until Teddy Kennedy and you guys want to voluntarily walk away. Those of us who believe in term limits and those of us who want to see things change around here need to stay longer, unfortunately, because the system is the way it is, in order to have the influence it takes when you get a few years in here."—Bill McCollum (Testimony before Subcmte. on Civil and Constitutional Rights, 11/18/93)

"If the Republicans can straighten out the House, I think Americans will find their enthusiasm for term limits waning quite a bit."—Dick Arme, after Nov. '94 elections (AP, 12/6/94).

"Term limits are essential for a healthy and open political system."—Dick Arme, one week later (AP, 12/6/94).

"I am for them [term limits] myself, but the retroactive feature is not a fair feature. It's not the way the Florida statute reads."

\* I think that's unconstitutional."—Bill McCollum, CNN's *Crossfire*, 11/29/94.

\*\*\*\*I think systematically the balance of power in favor of professional politicians as incumbents is so great that in fact it may—in many places it has made a mockery of the process of open elections."—Newt Gingrich (Press Conference on Term Limits, 1/11/95).

### SUPPORTERS OF NON-RETROACTIVE TERM LIMITS WHO WOULD BE FORCED TO STEP DOWN UNDER RETROACTIVE 12-YEAR LIMITS

Dornan (1976), Solomon (1978), Roth (1978), Packard (1982), Stump (1976), Crane (1969), Fields (1980), McCollum (1980), Hansen (1980), Bereuter (1978), Gekas (1982), Gunderson (1980), Leach (1976), Saxton (1982), Schaefer (1983), Shaw (1980), Wilson (1972), Goodling (1974), Gingrich (1978).

### SUPPORT TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I have just heard the gentleman from Illinois say it to everybody out there that, gee, MCCOLLUM must not really believe in term limits because he does not believe in the particular version that the gentleman prefers, with retroactivity in it. I hope every Member on that side of the aisle who wants to support their version will do the same thing I am going to do, and that is make a pledge

and then live up to it to vote for whatever version of term limits comes out of here next Wednesday when we finally get a chance after all of these years to vote on term limits and vote for whatever version is on the floor for final passage.

If it is the gentleman's version out here with retroactivity in it, BILL MCCOLLUM is going to vote for it. I urge them to do so. I happen not to prefer that, I prefer another version, but I think we need to put all of the term limits business in perspective, and that is why I am out to help do that a little bit this evening.

Next week this House of Representatives is going to have an opportunity to cast a historic vote. For the first time in the history of this country in either the House or the Senate, we are going to get to vote on a constitutional amendment to limit the terms of Members of the House and Senate. Just two Congresses ago, in the 102d, there were not more than about 33 Members of the House willing to publicly support term limits. In the last Congress, in the 103d, thanks to the sophomore class that came in of both parties last time, we got up to 107. Now we are trying to get to 290, the magic number it takes to pass a constitutional amendment to give us term limits throughout this Nation.

I do not know if we are going to achieve 290, but I think it is going to be a very big successful day for term limits getting to the floor and having the vote. And I believe we are going to go well over 200. We have a good chance and we are working very hard to get 290, but we need everybody who says they support term limits, and I hope they really do, to be there, to be there on the final vote, to cast their vote yes for whatever is out here.

There are going to be four options. Yes, my bill is the base bill, but it may not be the one that is finally there standing. I personally favor 12 years in the Senate, 12 years in the House. I think it makes a lot more sense than versions that have a shorter number of years in the House of Representatives to cap the length of time you can serve here. I personally believe that it would be a very serious problem in terms of the power of the House versus the power of the Senate if we had the House serving less time. I think you would have a stronger Senate vis-a-vis the House and a weaker House if that occurred, and I do not think that is smart for us to do 6 or 8 years for the House and 12 years for the Senate.

So I think 12 and 12 is the right balance.

I also think 6 years is too short, but that version is going to be out here. I think it is too short in the sense from my experience here, as complex as this government is, you need to be here about that length of time, 6 years before I want you to be a full committee chairman or in leadership of either of the parties, but that is a judgment call on my part.

Mr. ENGLISH is also going to offer 6 and 12. If it gets enough votes to be here on final passage, I am going to vote for that, I am going to encourage you to vote for it.

Then we are going to have an option out on the floor, Mr. HILLEARY's option that will say we pass a 12-year cap for the House and Senate and if the States want to decide under that 12-year cap whatever they want to decide in lesser years, then they ought to be allowed to do that and we will put it in the Constitution. I personally do not favor that. I happen to think that that is going to allow a lot of hodge-podge around the country for years to come with some States with 6 for the House and some 8 and gosh, maybe 4 and 10 and so forth.

□ 2000

I do not think that is good Government. I think uniformity throughout the Nation is preferable. My particular proposal is going to be silent with regard to what the Supreme Court is going to decide. It would not preempt the State. If the Supreme Court decides in the Arkansas case later on this spring that the State provisions that have been passed around the country for 6, or 8 or other years is a constitutional thing to do, then they will indeed prevail but the 12-year cap will be there, and the Hilleary idea will be ingrained into law by virtue of the Supreme Court decision, but I do not think it is a good idea, and I think, if the Supreme Court decides the present powers of the States do not exist in the Constitution to do this, then we should not give them the additional powers. We should go ahead and pass my version of the amendment, and then it would become at that point, if the court rules otherwise, it rules that States cannot do this, the uniform national 12-year standard. But if the Hilleary proposal prevails here and it is the wisdom of the majority to have it as the substitute amendment, I am going to vote for that on final passage, and I hope my colleagues do, too.

And, yes, the Democrat version with retroactivity is in there. I do not agree with that. I happen to think that all 22 States that have passed term limit proposals in the States are right. They did not pass retroactivity in any of those States, and in the one State it came up, in Washington State, they defeated it and had to come back later with one that was not retroactive. I do not think that is smart. We can debate it out here, but, if that version happens to prevail, I am going to vote for it, too, on final passage.

The bottom line is we have a chance finally to do what the American people, nearly 80 percent, have been saying all along, and that is for us to pass a term limits constitutional amendment, and nobody should try to hide or be allowed to hide under dodge of one preference or the other. The key is going to be to get to final passage and vote yes. I say to my colleagues, "If you don't

vote yes for term limits on final passage, don't come back to your voters next year and tell them you're for term limits."

#### H.R. 4 REWARDS THE RICH, CHEATS THE CHILDREN AND IS WEAK ON WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, in one hand I have letters from the students of Cesar Chavez Elementary School in San Francisco asking President Clinton and the Congress not to cut the school lunch program. In the other hand I have H.R. 4, the Republican so-called welfare reform bill. Mr. Speaker, I hope never the twain shall meet. I hope that the children of Cesar Chavez Elementary School, or any of the other children throughout this country, never have to feel the pain of this legislation. I hope it does not pass.

Mr. Speaker, why I hope it does not pass is because in this legislation is contained provisions that will cut the children's nutritional programs, and, yes, even the school lunch programs. Why? Because it does not provide enough money to cover all of those programs because it does not require the Governors of the States to spend 100 percent of the school lunch monies that are sent to the State, but only 80 percent because it eliminates the nutritional standards that are contained in the school lunch program presently, because it eliminates the eligibility that is contained presently in it so that poor children, who really need nutrition, will suffer from this legislation.

And why is that?

That is because our Republican colleagues want to save money for a tax break for the wealthiest Americans. Why start with children first? Women and children first were traditionally those first to the lifeboats. Here they are first to the gangplank, to walk the plank.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR]. As he comes up, I want him to join me in recognizing that this school lunch program cut will cut 503,000 children, will be dropped from the school lunch program under the Republican plan in the first year.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I say that H.R. 4, the Republican so-called welfare reform bill, rewards the rich, cheats the children and is weak on work, and in our State of California, and the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] and I will place this on the map together—67,900 children will be cut from the school lunch program in just the first year.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 4, and I am pleased to yield to my colleague from California.