

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the 1-minute period today we heard a number of Republicans get up and boast extravagantly about the number of Republicans that voted for term limits last night and boasted that it was something like 85 percent of all the Republicans who did it.

When you look at the term limits proposal that was offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], to limit terms to 12 years, and make them apply to Members who are serving here now, how many Republicans voted for that? The answer is less than 1 out of 4 voted for that. If I was a Republican, and I was busy cutting student loans and cutting school lunches so that I could cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans; I would be in here talking about term limits, too, because you see term limits is not the Republican program, it is the Republican strategy: Talk term limits while you are busy eliminating the ability of middle-class Americans to grab themselves by their bootstraps and lift themselves up to a better way of life than they have had in the past. Term limits is a Republican strategy, not the Republican program.

The program remains what it always has been, make the rich richer and the poor poorer and the middle class have a harder time catching up.

PRESIDENT CLINTON DID AN END RUN—AROUND CONGRESS

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, no amount of class warfare can obscure the fact to the American people that the Republicans voted for term limits, the Democrats voted against term limits. But today I would like to speak about another issue.

As we are discussing the Contract With America, billions of dollars are being drained from a fund that was established to stabilize our currency. Where are these taxpayer dollars going? They are being sent without so much as a vote of Congress to the bank accounts of Wall Street speculators and to the efforts to prop up a corrupt Mexican elite. While we are trying to balance the budget by cutting spending, President Clinton did an end run around Congress to transfer billions of dollars of taxpayer dollars to this Mexican bailout scheme and ten's of billions of more will be spent unless we put a stop to it.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, the only way to put a stop to it is to sign a discharge petition, and I hope my colleagues will join me in signing the Stockman discharge petition, and I hope the public will see whether their Congressman's name is on that discharge petition.

THE TERM LIMITS VOTE—NOTHING MORE THAN A BIG POLITICAL SHOW

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, when I hear NEWT GINGRICH and the rest of the Republican leadership characterize yesterday's vote as historic, it makes me laugh. There was nothing historic about the vote yesterday; in fact, the whole exercise was nothing more than a big political show designed to confuse people into thinking that House Republicans really support term limits.

I have always been skeptical of the legislators who claim they are for term limits but have been in office for 15 or 20 years. The best test of any politician's credibility on term limits is whether they are willing to put their careers where their mouths are and limit their own service. Yesterday, when we voted on an immediate term limits amendment, only 54 Republicans were willing to support the bill.

Until recently, I had no real proof that the Republican leadership would not work aggressively to pass term limits legislation. Yesterday changed that. The party discipline that the Republicans showed when cutting school lunches or home heating oil for the elderly and working poor was absent on term limits yesterday. If House Republicans really wanted to pass term limits they would have allowed a vote on the Sanford-Deal statute which would have only required a majority vote for passage.

As someone who has unconditionally supported term limits for all Members of Congress—including myself—I viewed yesterday's charade as an insult to those of us who really support term limits.

Most House Republicans do not really support term limits, they just like to campaign on them. The public should not be fooled by career politicians who claim to be for term limits as long as they do not apply to themselves.

FULFILLING OUR CONTRACT WITH SENIOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, next week this House will fulfill our Contract With America, and, more specifically, our contract with senior Americans. We promised to vote on raising the punitive Social Security earnings test limit so seniors would not be penalized for working.

Next week, during the consideration of our tax relief bill we will fulfill that promise. We will also vote on repealing the unwarranted double taxation of Social Security benefits that was imposed by the 1993 Clinton tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall the Clinton tax bill. That is the special extra tax that President Clinton and the Democrat Party placed on,

quote, "wealthy seniors" with incomes in the range of \$30,000 to \$40,000. Well, instead of taxing, quote, "wealthy seniors" living on fixed incomes like the Democrats do, the Republican Contract With America provides seniors with much needed tax relief to help with the increasingly high cost of long-term health care, among other things. Our bill also helps families stick together and encourages them to help one another by providing a generous tax credit for family care givers.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican tax bill is good for seniors and it deserves this House's support now, before our seniors grow any older or any poorer.

WHY WEYRICH IS WRONG

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week Paul Weyrich, one of the founding fathers of the modern-day right wing, wrote in the Washington Times that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] and the other Republican members of the Ethics Committee should resist the temptation to appoint a special counsel to investigate the Speaker. Appointing an outside counsel, Weyrich argued, would bring a cloud over the Speaker and affect his ability to govern.

Mr. Weyrich is wrong, just dead wrong. There are, indeed, very serious charges hanging over the head of the Speaker. But only an outside counsel, an independent objective individual, can clear the air and remove this matter from the realm of partisan politics. This is the route the Ethics Committee has taken in every high level case since 1979.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] and the other Republicans on the Ethics Committee should not be subjected to threats by Paul Weyrich or by anyone else.

We need an outside counsel to investigate the Speaker and the committee should proceed without delay.

SEEKING BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR A MIDDLE-CLASS TAX CUT

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, to a carefully assembled crowd of special interest groups, power brokers, government bureaucrats, Democrat Party stalwarts and the other sycophantic apple polishers, the President kicked off his reelection effort with his Atlanta economic summit. Boasting on his economic record to this tough audience, the President somehow failed to mention that interest rates are higher than when he was first elected. The public debt is expected to rise another \$1 trillion, trade deficits are at an all-

time high, and the dollar is losing value overseas. but, more importantly, he did not respond to the charge of Dan Rataczak who said that real income of Americans has fallen, which means that, while one may be making more, than their actual spending power has fallen. Perhaps, if the President and the Democrat Party acknowledged this, then they would join the Republican Party in working for a middle-class tax cut because, after all, cutting taxes is not Congress sending Government money to the people. It is just that we are not going to take the people's money in the first place.

I hope that we will get some bipartisan support on this much needed tax cut.

DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH INSURANCE SHOULD GO TO EMPLOYEES OF THE SELF-EMPLOYED TOO

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, just when we thought we had seen it all in attempts by the Republicans in Congress to give tax breaks to their wealthy friends, they have gone beyond the pale. It is hard to imagine, but today the Republicans will bring a conference report on H.R. 831, a bill to provide a 25-percent deduction for health insurance for the self-employed. That is good. But they rejected the opportunity, the amendment, that would have allowed that tax deduction to go for the employees of the self-employed. Instead in the bill they insisted that the conferees drop a Senate provision that would have closed a tax loophole for billionaires. Under current law the wealthiest Americans can take advantage of a tax loophole by renouncing their citizenship, thereby avoiding taxes on gains made while they were U.S. citizens. These people made their money benefiting from our country, from the security, from the democracy, from the work force, and, yes, even from the tax laws in this country. Now they are given to give up their citizenship. They are given a tax break at the expense of the employees of the self-employed.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage, this is a shame, this is downright unpatriotic.

THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S CONSISTENT POLICY TO KILL JOBS

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that President Clinton has proposed the bulk of his new cuts in NASA and the Small Business Administration. I say that it is fitting because President Clinton wants to be consistent. He wants to ensure that we continue to produce low-paying and part-time jobs, the cornerstone of this administration's approach to economic development.

This week President Clinton tells Congress to cut NASA. He wants to kill thousands of high paying research and development jobs, destroy America's lead in the next frontier and cripple our chances for future high tech employment. This week our President recommends to this Congress to gut the Small Business Administration, another great choice to kill even more jobs. Small business is the greatest creator of jobs in our country and the largest employer in our Nation. Then he goes to Atlanta—read here in today's newspaper, where he says we need to create more jobs and talks about job creation. This is after he has made two bad choices this week in his consistent policy to kill jobs, darken our children's future and promote a welfare state.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 831, PERMANENT EXTENSION OF THE HEALTH INSURANCE DEDUCTION FOR THE SELF-EMPLOYED

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 121 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 121

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 831) 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. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely simple rule. It waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 831, the bill to permanently and retroactively extend the tax deduction for health insurance for the self-employed, which the House passed on February 21. The rule also provides that the conference report be considered as read.

It is my understanding that the only points of order that lie against the conference report are the 3-day layover requirement and scope violation. There are also a few technical points of order under the Budget Act that are being waived, but I want to emphasize that the conference report is deficit neutral over the 5-year period.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should only waive the 3-day layover requirement when absolutely necessary, but this is one of those times. It is imperative that H.R. 831 be enacted into law before the 1994 tax filing season ends on April 15. Millions of self-employed Americans are depending on us to restore the tax deduction that allows them to keep themselves and their families covered by health insurance. This bill provides a 25-percent deduction for 1994 and 30-percent deduction thereafter. We have left them dangling in uncertainty for months now, and we must pass this conference report now to ensure that this tax deduction will be available to the millions of farmers, small businessmen, and other self-employed Americans who are counting on it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of March 29, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	19	76
Modified Closed ³	49	47	6	24
Closed ⁴	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	25	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).