

big bosses telling them what to do. A lot of their legislation is drafted by the special interests right here in Washington, DC. They do not even draft it. Lobbyists do it, because the lobbyists want the money.

Where is that money going to go, folks? You know where that money is going to go that is coming out of the mouths of children in my district in Missouri, that is going to be taken away from the elderly with heating assistance in my district in Missouri? I have got thousands of people that would be injured by this.

Where is the money going to go? It is not going to go to reduce the deficit. No, they rejected that. Overwhelmingly, they rejected it. Of all the thousands of people taken away from that need it in my district, I have got about 1,500 very wealthy people in my district that are going to get the benefit from the tax bill that they are going to take up.

And they are going to pass it next week, folks. They are going to give people at \$200,000 in income, if they are married and they have four children, they are going to give them \$2,000 for their children. \$2,000 for their children.

Who are they taking away from? They are taking away from kids in my district whose parents are making 10 and 12 and \$14,000. They say that those kids do not need it. They say that the person who makes \$200,000, their children need it. Ladies and gentlemen, that to me is gross hypocrisy.

They say again, no cuts in these programs. Well, if there are no cuts, folks, again I say to you, where does the \$66 billion that is going to go to the wealthy, where does it come from? It does not come from trees. It does not come from the sky. It is coming out of those poor people of median income, hard-working people in my district. That is where it is coming from.

PROBLEMS IN THE WELFARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, last week and again this morning, I happened to witness discussions about a system that we call the welfare system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I grew up in a neighborhood and I had friends and where we were was a working class neighborhood, but many of my friends and their families were on welfare. I also happened to have served for 10 years as a county supervisor in the county of San Diego which has a welfare system larger than 32 States of this Union.

Let me tell you as somebody who grew up in the neighborhood and had to run the system, anybody who can face off with the American public and honestly say what we have called the welfare system for the last 30 or 40 years is

somehow a great contribution to our country obviously ignores the atrocities that have been done under this so-called welfare system.

The system that we call welfare is nothing short of subsidized misery. In fact, if you or I would treat our children in the manner that welfare treats children, it would not only be immoral, it would be illegal.

Mr. Speaker, I will give you one example. If I gave my teenage daughter a check and told her to go live by herself in her own apartment, I would not only be abandoning my child, I would be actually committing child abuse by definition in the State of California and most States in this Union. I, as a parent, am not allowed to take a minor child and send him or her off to live by themselves. But, Mr. Speaker, that is what our welfare system has done for over 40 years.

It is time that we rethink our well-intentioned but misguided concept here, that we have actually taken children and sent them off on their own under the guise that we have committed some great privilege and helped this individual.

We have actually punished people who have tried to work their way out of welfare for decades in this country. If you were on welfare and you got a part-time job, what did Uncle Sam say to you? They said, "For every dollar you earn in part-time, we will take a dollar away from you in benefits." Then we wonder why people do not work their way out of welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to point out that the best welfare in society is a job, and we will work on that. I come from the county that started workfare in 1978, and it was called cruel. It was called heartless. It was called right wing radicalism. But as somebody who grew up in the neighborhood and operated the system, it was the most humane proposal we ever had, and it is time we bring dignity back.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you as somebody who administered the programs, you take off the Federal strings, you stop telling us how to run the system, and the people at the State and local level will provide the services that the so-called people who claim to be liberals always say ought to be provided.

We are going to give free lunches to our children. We are just not going to give it to the Federal bureaucrats.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCINNIS] at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Encourage each person, O loving God, to examine the issues that they encounter and on which they must act, and to have discernment as they face the decisions of the time. Help us to be forthright in our desire for knowledge realizing that the gift of truth is not to be scorned, but with virtuous hearts and sincere minds we should seek to understand the issues of life and endeavor, in all things, to remember the words of the Proverbs that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the Holy One is insight." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 831. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to repeal the provision permitting nonrecognition of gain on sales and exchanges effectuating policies of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4. An act to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93-191, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment as members of the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards the following Members of the House:

Mr. THOMAS of California, Chairman; and Messrs. ROBERTS of Kansas; NEY of Ohio; FAZIO of California; CLAY of Missouri; and GORDON of Tennessee.

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states the following:

On the first day of Congress, a Republican House will require Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else; cut committee staffs by one-third; and cut the congressional budget.

We kept our promise.

It continues that in the first 100 days, we will vote on the following items: A balanced budget amendment—we kept our promise; unfunded mandates legislation—we kept our promise; line-item veto—we kept our promise; a new crime package to stop violent criminals—we kept our promise; national security restoration to protect our freedoms—we kept our promise; Government regulatory reform—we kept our promise; commonsense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits—we kept our promise; welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence—we kept our promise; congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature—we are starting this today; family reinforcement to protect our children; tax cuts for middle-income families; and Senior Citizens' Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty.

This is our Contract With America.

CONSTITUTION AND BILL OF RIGHTS DOES NOT APPLY TO IRS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the brass of the Internal Revenue Service has now testified they oppose changing the burden of proof in a tax case for civil matters. They say it would tie their hands by extending the same rights under the Constitution given to any other court proceeding. They would actually have to show evidence

and cause, and it would make it difficult for them to collect money.

Let us look at it another way; what is the IRS really saying to us? The Bill of Rights and the Constitution are great, they are really great but not for the IRS. They should apply everywhere else but do not put it on us.

Let me tell you something, folks, we could ensure that those questions they need answered could be answered, but when it gets into a courtroom every American should be treated fairly and the Bill of Rights should stand by every American.

I do not buy it. I think it is time for Congress to begin to run our country again.

WHO REALLY CARES ABOUT OUR CHILDREN?

(Mr. FUNDERBURK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, who really care about America's children?

Mr. Clinton and the congressional minority claim that they do. This is the same White House whose budget will add \$250 billion to our existing \$5 trillion debt over the next 5 years. This is the same Democratic Party which killed the balanced budget amendment, and fought tooth and nail against a minuscule 1 percent cut in Federal spending this year. This is the same crowd which has saddled each and every child in America with \$17,000 of debt the minute they are born.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what real concern is. It is enacting \$100 billion in real spending cuts in foreign aid, the Federal bureaucracy, Amtrak, Legal Services, the arts, and welfare. So you see Mr. Speaker, there is one party which cares enough to spare the future generations of American children from the suffocating burden of debt. We were sent here to safeguard the future of every poor, middle, and working class child. We will show we really care about our children by gutting Federal spending and ending business as usual.

TERMS LIMITS A BAD IDEA

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, term limits are a bad idea whose time has not come. We already have term limits. They are called elections every 2 years. We do not need another constitutional amendment to change what the voters already have done, and that is change the Congress and the political system.

Since I came to Congress 12 years ago, 75 percent of the House has changed. If you want entrenched bureaucrats, if you want lobbyists and if you want staff to run the Congress, then vote for term limits.

It is also hypocritical for Members to vote term limits but exclude themselves from the law.

Mr. Speaker, campaign finance reform is what is needed. Let us put elections on a more equitable basis, let us have a gift ban, let us have ethics reform, but let us not use term limits as the ruse for the problems that exist in this country.

Term limits are a bad idea and I am proud to say that.

PASS TERM LIMITS

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, last week the bipartisan majority passed a welfare reform package that overhauls the current welfare system to offer hope for the future. Today, we are continuing to keep our promise with the American people by bringing to the floor an historic vote on a constitutional amendment on term limits to make Congress a true citizen legislature.

Everyone here knows that a constitutional amendment needs 290 votes to pass the House. The Republicans cannot do it on their own. We will deliver at least 80 percent of our Members on the term limit vote, but we need at least 50 percent of the Democrats to vote yes, also. Today I challenge the Democrats to deliver the necessary votes to pass term limits. It's in the Democrat hands to pass this.

So what is it going to be—yes, or no.

Let's pass term limits and make Congress a true citizen legislature that's accountable to the people.

TERM LIMITS

(Mr. PETERSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the last speaker. We should pass term limits. This week we will debate term limits all week long.

This is a subject whose time has come. There are several proposals out there. One of them is mine and I am not a latecomer to term limits. I supported term limits in 1989, the first time I campaigned for office, and I have stood fast on that ever since. On January 11 of this year I dropped a bill on term limits, restricting to 12 years, but different from everybody else's. I said it should apply to me and every other Member of this House.

That is the argument we are going to have this year, and this week we are going to be asked to stand up and be counted. America says term limits applies to us. If they are angry at Congress, can it not be that they are angry at us?