

□ 1545

Those who are quick to criticize or condemn what we are trying to do to save Medicare and Medicaid should exercise a little caution. It is wrong to scare our senior citizens this way. No one has proposed cutting any benefits. This will not happen. In fact, as the budget goes along, we are increasing it 7 percent a year.

Now, let us talk about the First Lady. During the debate on the ill-fated Clinton health care bill, this is what she said. "We feel, confident that we can reduce the rate of increase in Medicare without undermining quality for Medicare recipients."

For the past year, the administration officials have been singing a different tune, it appears. So both the President in 1993, and the First Lady in 1993, when they talked about their health care bill, they talked about we feel confident, "That we can reduce the rate of increase in Medicare without undermining quality by slowing the growth."

In fact, let us even look at one of their Cabinet officials, Secretary Shalala. What did she say about this? She said, "Our argument is that if you are slowing down growth here and that is below what is happening in terms of cost out there, it is a real cut." So when the President proposed slowing down the rate of growth in Medicare and Medicaid, it was not a cut, but now that our budget contains something similar, very similar, they say it is a cut. As I stated earlier, only in Washington could an increase of 7 percent a year be called a cut, a cut be called an increase.

Defense spending is misconstrued by the President. I heard the President say, well, you know the Republicans are slowing the growth of spending on defense and that argument is applicable to Medicare. But we really have reduced spending in defense. President Clinton describes defense spending as a slowdown in spending growth cuts. The reality is that since 1987, defense spending has not kept pace even with inflation, whereas the program that we have here with Medicare, what the Republicans proposed and passed on the House floor, is 7 percent, twice inflation.

I want to be sure that we all understand the President's position on Medicare and defense spending. Medicare will grow again at twice the rate of inflation, yet the President says that is a cut. Defense spending was 2 percent of the budget in 1987. Mr. Clinton has put it at 15 percent in his 1997 budget. Even though defense spending has sustained sharp decreases in spending since 1987, this is categorized as an increase by the administration; that is, the Republicans are increasing spending in defense when, in fact, if you look at 1987 compared to 1997, there have been sharp decreases.

How can anyone possibly who knows these facts want to believe what the President says? This is one time that

old saying "actions speak louder than words" could be applied.

On another issue, let us take a look at what President Clinton said during the 1992 Presidential campaign about welfare. One of his major campaign themes was, I want to change welfare as we know it today. Most recently in a radio address, he has said, quote, Wisconsin has submitted to me for approval the outlines of a sweeping welfare reform plan, one of the boldest yet attempted in America. All in all, Wisconsin has the makings of a solid, bold welfare plan. We should get it done. Those are his exact words. Well, what did President Clinton do? Well, he did veto two of the welfare bills that we submitted to him.

Why do we not take a look at the President's position on the need for a balanced budget? In his State of the Union Message in 1993, he made the following statement:

My budget plan will use independent budget office numbers, CBO. I did this so that no one could say I was estimating my way out of this difficulty. I did this so the American people will think we are shooting straight with them.

Well, what did he do? Well, after many other broken promises and with no proposal of his own, he vetoed the balanced budget that we presented to him in 1992. The President, while on the "Larry King Show," stated emphatically, I will balance the budget in 5 years. As we remember all too well, he could not decide whether to balance the budget in 5 years, 7 years, 10 years or somewhere in between. He also refused to negotiate with us for a 7-year balanced budget using real numbers scored by CBO. He finally agreed after many, many months of negotiations.

Previously during his State of the Union, he said that this budget that we offered was acceptable. Well, what did he do during the budget negotiations in the latter part of 1995? He said CBO numbers are unacceptable to us because it commits us to accepting Republican cuts. Let me read that again: CBO numbers are unacceptable to us because it commits us to accepting Republican cuts. First of all, the President said he wanted to abide by CBO numbers and, second, they are not Republican cuts that he talked about. It is increasing at 7 percent a year.

Now, when President Reagan took command of the White House, he kept his word and delivered on his promise to cut taxes. He believed, just as President Kennedy did, that tax cuts would stimulate the economy. It worked in the early 1960's, and he believed it was just what the economy needed. President Kennedy felt that way. In the 1980's, the American economy boomed. While President Reagan kept his side of the agreement, the Democrat Congress doubled spending during the same period. Ironically, President Reagan was constantly being accused by his critics of cutting the budget.

The President campaigned, President Clinton campaigned, for the Presidency

saying that he would give the middle class some much needed relief by lowering their taxes. Well, what did he do? He gave Americans the largest tax increase in the country's history, \$245 billion to be exact. Some of my colleagues and the people who are watching perhaps can remember that quiz show from the early 1960's which was hosted by Johnny Carson. The show was called "Who Do You Trust?" My colleagues, I bring this to your attention because we have heard during the early start of this campaign the cry that Republicans are cutting Medicare. This is far from the truth. We have heard the President say that we have defense spending going up when, in fact, it is decreasing as a percent of the gross national product.

We have heard the President say he wanted to balance the budget in 5, 7, and 10, and then finally came reluctantly to agree with our 7-year balanced budget. He talked about welfare, making it workfare, but he vetoed two welfare bills. He talks about a middle-class tax cut during his campaign, yet he has not provided the same. In fact, after he was elected, he gave us the largest tax increase in American history.

So Mr. Speaker, the 1996 Presidential race might be based on the same question that Johnny Carson issued when he hosted his show, a quiz show in the early 1960's. The show of course was called "Who Do You Trust?" Whom do you trust to lead this country for the next 4 years? I think it is clear that our candidate, Senator Dole, could be trusted and, based upon the information I have given to you today, I ask all the Members, who do you trust?

#### AMERICANS SUPPORT TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, during the last campaign, many of us campaigned on the whole issue of term limits, and it is something that a lot of the American people have asked for. In fact, all the polling information demonstrates that between three-fourths and 85 percent of the American people support some form of term limits.

Earlier in this Congress, we had a vote for the first time in the history of this Congress, I think, we had a vote on term limits. Unfortunately, we were unable to get the two-thirds majority necessary to pass that by.

We went back to some of our offices, I went back to my office and talked to some of the people on my staff and said: What could we do in terms of if we can't get a term limits bill passed this year, what possibly can we do to take some of the fun out of it?

We also had heard a lot in our campaigns and we hear at our town meetings. I, for example, have had 75 town

meetings in my district, and another issue that comes up frequently is the whole issue of pension reform. We read about some of our retiring colleagues or some of the former colleagues that have retired from this body, and we hear about six-figure pensions which they will receive for the rest of their lives, adjusted for inflation, and, frankly, I think that is an outrage that a lot of the American people feel.

So we came up with a relatively simple bill, it is H.R. 1618, which would change the way that pensions for Members of Congress are accrued. That bill now has, I think, 57 different cosponsors. I am going to be going up to a meeting in the Committee on Rules in just a few minutes to see if perhaps we cannot get a modified version of that adopted or at least made in order for adoption onto the legislative appropriation bill.

But I want to talk a little bit tonight about legislative or congressional pensions and what has happened over the last number of years, because I think some of our Members do not quite understand that the whole history of congressional pensions is really not that old of a history. In fact, until January 1942, there was no pension for any Member of Congress. As a matter of fact, in January 1942, the Congress for the first time passed pensions for Congress into law, but it was repealed 2 months later. It was repealed because of the public outcry.

Again in 1946, the Congress came back and instituted a pension for Members of Congress, and I would like to read for the benefit of Members what they said in the preamble to that bill. They said that, and I quote, "It would contribute to the independence of thought and action. It would be an inducement for retirement of those of retiring age or with other infirmities, and it would bring into the legislative service a larger number of younger Members with fresh energy and new viewpoints concerning the economic, social and political problems of the Nation."

That was in 1946. Frankly, what we see today is an awful lot of Members who are staying long beyond their years and, frankly, we should encourage early retirement.

So my bill is relatively simple. It says that if Members stay longer than 12 years, they cannot continue to accrue additional pension benefits. We would limit pension accrual for Members of Congress to only 12 years.

Consider some of the annual pensions that some of our colleagues who have retired already are currently receiving, and I want to be bipartisan about this: Former Speaker of the House Tom Foley is currently getting a pension from the taxpayers of \$123,804; Dan Rostenkowski, who will soon become a constituent of mine in Rochester, MN, will be receiving a pension of \$96,462.

But I want to be bipartisan. Former Minority Leader Bob Michel will be receiving a pension of \$110,538, and that will be adjusted each year for inflation.

As a percentage of their last years' salaries, Mr. Foley will be getting 72 percent of his last year's salary, Mr. Rostenkowski, 73 percent, and Mr. Michel, 74 percent.

Now, according to Money magazine, the average private-sector employee gets a retirement of about 27 percent of their last year's income.

The National Taxpayers' Union calculates that the lifetime benefits for these retiring Members, for example, two of our Members who are retiring this year, one a congresswoman from Colorado, her lifetime benefit, if you accrue this over the lifetime of what she is assumed to receive, will be \$1,182,573. Another of our colleagues, a gentleman from Massachusetts who is retiring this year, the total cost of his accrued benefits amount to \$3,461,869.

Under the bill that we are introducing, H.R. 1618, and that we have introduced and the bill that we would hope to get offered as an amendment to the legislative appropriation bill, the maximum amount that a new Member of Congress, beginning with the 105th Congress, could receive at today's salary would be \$27,254. Now, compared to people in the private sector, that is still a generous benefit, Mr. Speaker. On the other hand, compared to what former Members and current Members of Congress are receiving, that certainly is a step in the right direction.

So if we cannot have term limits, I believe that we ought to take some of the fun out of staying here for long periods of time and go back to what the Congress said in 1946 when they introduced the whole notion of pensions for Members of Congress. There is tremendous public support for this basic idea. We have had national polling done by the Luntz Research Cos., and they concluded that 78 percent consider this a good idea or a top priority. Two-thirds would be more likely to reelect a Member who voted for this pension reform.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to perhaps take this issue up again tomorrow.

#### SAFEGUARD THE PROTECTIONS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] is recognized for the balance of the pending hour as the designee of the majority leader.

□ 1600

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to speak of an issue of grave importance to all of us as Americans. If you like the North American Free Trade Act [NAFTA] and you like the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trades [GATT] you are going to love the upcoming reforms to one of the most important tenets of American ingenuity, the protection of intellectual property, our ability as a nation to protect our ideas, our inventions.

Ladies and gentlemen, this issue is of paramount importance. I rise to alert

millions of my fellow Americans about the importance of this Nation's patent system. It was so important that our Founding Fathers saw fit to include the protections of intellectual property in the U.S. Constitution.

The greatness of America has been defined largely by American ingenuity, by people like Henry Ford, Eli Whitney, the host of inventors who have made America number one in the world. Our dominance throughout the 20th century has largely been because American ideas have been protected from foreign intrusion. American inventors, who schemed at their kitchen tables or out back in their garage and came up with a new invention, those ideas were protected by patent law.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening because we are about to give away American ingenuity. This administration, in its move to provide for a one-world global economy, is about to forsake the uniqueness that is American ideas. The uniqueness that is American ideas. Our patent system is about to be changed if Americans do not come to the defense of the existing patent system that protects American ideas. We call it the Moorhead-Schroeder Steal American Ingenuity Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is not one of those glamorous subjects that so enthralls the public that they sit captivated on every word. But like the American Revolution, like the Civil War, like the movement from an agrarian society into an industrial society, if we do not step forward and protect our right as Americans to have new ideas, to invent the kinds of products and services that have made America unique, we will move into the 21st century a lesser nation, as Japan and China and every other industrial world moves to steal American ideas.

Specifically, what am I talking about? Mr. Speaker, for over 100 years that young individual who was out back in the garage working on that new idea, and once that idea took root, would send in all of the schematics and all of the parts of that idea that made it unique to that person and file it in Washington with the U.S. Patent Office. The U.S. Patent Office would then have one of its examiners review that patent, that unique idea, that notion that was just so individual to that individual and their ability to invent a new product that nobody else had come up with that idea.

Well, as the examiner looks to that invention and the uniqueness of that intellectual property of that American citizen, the presumption has always been that it is owned by that American individual who was out back in the garage coming up with a new product.

As they reviewed the uniqueness of this American idea, prior to giving the patent, it was protected. No foreign nation could sneak in and grab that idea and copy that idea. No multinational corporation with a legal department of 100 lawyers could sneak in there and grab that idea, certainly not with the