

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-