

ORIGINAL SPONSORS AND COSPONSORS OF THE
MCCOLLUM AMENDMENT

(Providing that no person who has been elected to the Senate two times shall be eligible for election or appointment to the Senate, and that no person who has been elected to the House of Representatives six times shall be eligible for election to the House.)

(All Representatives who have served more than 3 terms are in *italic*.)

ORIGINAL SPONSORS

McCollum (1980)
Hansen (1980)
Peterson (MN) (1990)
Lobiondo (1994)

COSPONSORS

Lightfoot (1984)
Gillmor (1988)
Allard (Deleted Feb 7, 95) (1960)
Armey (1984)
Bachus (1992)
Baker (CA) (1992)
Ballenger (1984)
Barcia (1992)
Barr (1994)
Barrett (NE) (1992)
Bartlett (1992)
Bass (1994)
Bereuter (1978)
Billbray (1994)
Bilirakis (1992)
Blute (1992)
Bonilla (1990)
Brownback (1994)
Bryant (TN) (1994)
Bunning (1986)
Burr (1994)
Buyer (1992)
Calvert (1992)
Camp (1990)
Canady (1990)
Chambliss (1994)
Christensen (1994)
Coble (1984)
Collins (GA) (1992)
Cooley (1994)
Crane (1969)
Cremeans (1994)
Cunningham (1990)
Deal (1992)
Diaz-Balart (1992)
Dickey (1992)
Doolittle (1990)
Dunn (1992)
English (1994)
Ensign (1994)
Everett (1992)
Ewing (1990)
Fields (TX) (1980)
Flanagan (1994)
Foley (1994)
Forbes (1994)
Fox (1994)
Franks (CT) (1990)
Frisa (1994)
Funderburk (1994)
Galleghy (1986)
Ganske (1994)
Gekas (1982)
Goodlatte (1990)
Goss (1988)
Graham (1994)
Greenwood (1992)
Gunderson (1980)
Gutknecht (1994)
Hancock (1988)
Harman (1992)
Hastings (WA) (1994)
Hayworth (1994)
Hilleary (1994)
Hobson (1990)
Hoekstra (1992)
Hoke (1992)
Horn (1992)
Houghton (1986)
Hutchinson (1992)
Inglis (1992)
Istook (1992)

Sam Johnson (1990)
Kim (1992)
Kingston (1992)
Klug (1990)
Knollenberg (1992)
LaHood (1994)
Latham (1994)
LaTourette (1994)
Lazio (1992)
Leach (1976)
Lewis (KY) (1994)
Linder (1992)
Lucas (1994)
McIntosh (1994)
McKeon (1992)
Meehan (1992)
Metcalf (1994)
Mica (1992)
Miller (FL) (1992)
Minge (1992)
Myrick (1994)
Neumann (1994)
Ney (1994)
Norwood (1994)
Nussle (1990)
Packard (1982)
Paxon (1988)
Pombo (1992)
Portman (1993)
Pryce (1992)
Quinn (1992)
Ramstad (1990)
Radanovich (1994)
Riggs (1994)
Rohrabacher (1988)
Royce (1992)
Saxton (1982)
Scarborough (1994)
Schaefer (1983)
Seastrand (1994)
Shadegg (1994)
Shaw (1980)
Smith (MI) (1992)
Smith (TX) (1986)
Solomon (1978)
Souder (1994)
Stearns (1988)
Stockman (1994)
Stump (1976)
Talent (1992)
Taylor (NC) (1990)
Thornberry (1994)
Tiahrt (1994)
Torkildsen (1992)
Upton (1986)
Waldholtz (1994)
Wamp (1994)
Weller (1994)
White (1994)
Whitfield (1994)
Wilson (1972)
Zeliff (1990)
Zimmer (1990)
McInnis (1992)
Hayes (1986)
Meyers (1984)
Walker (1986)
Deutsch (1992)
Coburn (1994)
Goodling (1974)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 272, I was not present for that rollcall. Had I been here, I would have voted aye. I would like the RECORD to reflect that, immediately following the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO SIT TOMORROW, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 1995, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. IGNLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule:

The Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Small Business, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TERM LIMITS: THEIR TIME HAS
COME

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are almost ready to embark on a great decision of whether we should have term limits for Members of the United States Congress. When George Will writes about term limits, he uses a couple of baseball stories to illustrate his point.

When Earl Weaver was managing the Baltimore Orioles, he used to shove his chin into the chest of the umpire and shout at the top of his lungs: "Are you going to get any better, or is this it?" Well, the American people have decided that their Government in Washington is not going to get any better, something has to be done, this can't be it.

When the Washington Senators were owned by Clark Griffith, he said one day after the opposing teams had hit a bunch of home runs: "Fans like home runs, and we have assembled a pitching staff to please our fans." Term limits are a way of correcting this approach to Government.

The foundation of American thought with regard to Government goes as far back as the Athenian democracy, but I think it owes a good deal to the British political philosopher John Locke, who described government as a necessary nuisance to cope with inconveniences. Locke's view was we didn't need a powerful government to overcome the inability of Americans to deal with each other.

As with George Will, I have changed my mind on term limits. I now believe they are necessary to restore the faith of our Government. Alexander Hamilton, in the Federalist Paper No. 68, wrote: "The true test of a good government is its aptitude and tendency."

As we look over the last 30 years, what has been the aptitude and tendency of this Government? The aptitude and tendency is to borrow, to tax, to spend, and to perpetuate ourselves in office.

For example, this Government has now spent \$5 trillion coping with our welfare problem. We have resulted in a permanent underclass. We have got a Social Security system that is teetering on the brink of bankruptcy.

What have we done for future generations? We have gone into debt \$5 trillion, thinking that what we do now is more important than giving them a responsibility to pay for our overindulgences. Is this it, or can we do better? I have come to believe in term limits only after examining our Government from the inside.

The Founding Fathers were aware of term limits. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Members of Congress know that term limits existed in the Articles of Confederation. While recognizing the inherent problem of perpetuating oneself in office, the Founding Fathers did not include term limits in our Constitution because at that time it wasn't a very fun job. It wasn't pleasant to be in Congress.

At that time, and they were to a great extent correct, the living wasn't good, and it was hot in Washington. It wasn't until after the Civil War that we saw the advent of the career politician in Washington.

Today, as we look at the modern Federal Government, it is obvious that things have changed. We do not have the citizen legislator that the Founders envisioned. We have failed to heed Jefferson's warning about public office. He said "Whenever a man casts a longing eye upon them, a rottenness begins in his conduct."

The Congress and the rest of the Federal Government has become a system of career politicians.

□ 1945

It is a problem where we now depend on this career for our livelihood. Can you imagine the career politician that wants this good-paying job when it comes to the tough leadership decisions that are often asked of Members of Congress? When it becomes a conflict between that career and a good-

paying job and making the tough decisions, too often we see too many taking the easy road to perpetuate their own job in office.

Some people argue that we have term limits now. It is in the ballot box. But the reality evident to anyone who takes a look at this system, it is heavily weighted towards incumbents.

Let us look at this last election, which is such a good example, some people say, of the power of the people to exercise their own term limits. It didn't happen. Most incumbents won. Most of the PAC money went to incumbents.

And it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we do something to make this Government better, more responsive to the people. I suggest that something is to exercise term limits and our votes to include it in the Constitution.

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

(Mr. MFUME addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE NEED FOR TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thought the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] on term limits were excellent.

I am not a convert on this. I came to this Congress in 1976 and declared in January of 1976 to campaign all that year. And in my declaration of candidacy remarks on January 27, 1976, one of the principal things I mentioned was the importance of term limits.

I had gotten out of the Air Force at 24 years of age and hoped to be a younger Member of Congress in my 30's to serve, at that time, I thought 10 years was a good figure, and leave.

I watched the person in my congressional district never get on what we would consider a middle level committee, let alone one of the serious committees like Ways and Means or Appropriations, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Judiciary. Just wasted 18 years, burned him up, did nothing. But he was tall, handsome and the son of a multimillionaire and wasted 18 years doing nothing, accomplishing nothing.

But he had the money to defend his seat and voting as a moderate Republican which staved off any challenge from the left in the general election, it was basically a Republican seat, and always having the money to block a conservative challenger or even a radical activist moderate who might want to do something with the seat.

So I have been for term limits all of my adult life. And I hope, although the odds are diminishing, that we are going to pass it. I hope that our Speaker is right, and that NEWT GINGRICH says Congress after Congress, if we leave

this place in the majority control of the GOP for the next several Congresses, we will get it passed sooner or later.

ROMAN CATHOLIC REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, what I have come to the floor to talk about is something very uncomfortable. I think it is a very good reason for term limits and the end of careerism, and that is that people of my Christian denomination come to this House, Roman Catholics so enamored with hanging on to this \$133,600 a year job that they will waffle on moral issues of principle, sell their souls almost literally, reject the admonition in the Scripture, "What does it profit a man to gain the world or a lousy seat in the House or the Senate and endanger his soul."

They come here and reject Mother Teresa's words about the importance of abortion as a terrible blight upon civilization, one that can literally cause the decline of civilization around the world, and is.

They reject the teaching of the Pope in Rome and the new encyclical coming out the day after tomorrow called *Evangelium Vitae*, the gospel of life. The hammer is coming down from the boss in Rome for those who are loyal to the teaching authority of the church.

Members in this House and Senate will make light of abortion. They will go against every single bishop, no matter how flaky or liberal a bishop on the left might be. There is not a single bishop, 300-plus in the United States, who wavers on what Vatican Council Number II called an unspeakable crime, what the church carefully delineates as intrinsically, inherently evil. They will waffle all over the place on this issue. Others will stay steadfast even if it jeopardizes their seat election after election.

That is why I am going to put in the RECORD tonight the list of all of the Catholics by name in this House and then do no follow-up on it, probably not. But ask everyone who is proud enough of his faith to put Catholic in their biographies and all of our major directories here to tell the press they are a Catholic.

If they are proud enough to do that, then they have an opportunity before we have our first abortion vote in this chamber or in the U.S. Senate to come home to renew themselves, to think about that little boy or girl they were at their First Communion, to think about their Confirmation when they became a soldier for Jesus Christ, to put their soul first, to put not giving a bad example to young people all across this country first, and to come home on that first vote.

We know how difficult it is in this Chamber and the other when you vote against your conscience and you have flipped, flipped out morally and voted against the teaching of your church. We know how difficult it is to flop back. Nobody wants to be a flip-flopper.