

that has ever taken place in this Chamber. It was the great day for this country and for this Congress.

The American people have wanted us to have a vote on the floor and an honest debate on the floor on term limits for some time. Unfortunately, it was not until we elected a Republican leadership and a Republican Congress that we were able to bring that vote to the floor.

Now, if you read some of the reports in the papers today, it says that this was a loss for the Republicans. But the fact of the matter is that over 85 percent of Republicans supported term limits yesterday on final passage and almost 85 percent of the Democrats opposed term limits. So what does that tell you about which party is responsive to the American people?

Well over 70 percent of Americans support term limits. They think it is time that we put an end to career politicians, and I could not agree more, but the fact of the matter is constitutional amendments do not pass usually on the first vote. It took almost 20 years to pass a constitutional amendment that allowed our Senators to be elected by the people and not State legislatures.

So we will be back, and it will be the Republicans once again leading the charge, and we will pass term limits very soon.

I could not help, though, being amused by some of the rhetoric that was flying around the past couple of days on term limits. I found out that term limits were the moral equivalent to the Holocaust and to slavery.

Now, I may be dumb, I guess I am just a little slow, I am just a freshman here, but I really could not piece the logic together that would be able to compare term limits to a holocaust that killed 6 million Jews during world War II. Nor could I figure out how term limits somehow could apply to slavery, but I heard it yesterday from the other side of the aisle, a very novel argument. But then again, we have heard this before, haven't we?

While a certain segment of this body continues to move forward with real ideas to change the course of America's history, to return it back to what our Founding Fathers intended it to be, another segment of liberals in this House can do nothing but scare children and try to scare senior citizens.

We tried to cut out a tax break for the rich for Viacom and, when we did, our Ways and Means chairman was compared to Adolph Hitler. Of course, we cannot forget what happened last week when we tried to help children by cutting back on the expansive bureaucracy that is strangling programs so the money does not get to children but instead gets swallowed up by huge bureaucracies.

□ 1515

We saw everybody going around with their ties with children on it. I just thought that that was swell but the fact of

the matter is no positive proposal was put forward.

We are trying to keep the bureaucrats out of our children's life. We are trying to go back to the type of government that Thomas Jefferson and James Madison and our Founding Fathers envisioned 200 years ago when they said the government that governs least governs best.

We try to stay out of senior citizens' pockets, and yet to hear the rhetoric during the balanced budget debate, one would think that the Republicans were enemies of Social Security and somehow the Democrats were the protectors of it.

Let me flash back to 1993 when there was a vote to reach into the pockets of senior citizens on Social Security, to raise taxes on Social Security recipients. And let me ask Members to remember back and try to count up how many Republicans voted to tax senior citizens' Social Security benefits. Let me see: zero, none. Not one Republican supported stealing money from Social Security recipients. It was a plan that was passed with full support of the Democrats and not one Republican.

et, now somehow 2 years later, they talk down to the American public, they are stupid, and say somehow, OK, we went after your Social Security checks 2 years ago, but now we are your friends, trust us this time. All the while they bring forward not one idea on how to balance the budget.

We are \$4 trillion in debt, we are spending \$4 for every \$3 we take in. It is our children who will suffer in the end if we do not stop the demagoguery and start talking about real issues. That is what we have been doing for 100 days, that is what we will continue to do the next 100 days, and I hope somebody on the other side of the aisle has the courage to step forward with real plans instead of race baiting and trying to scare children and scare the old. They deserve more, and they are going to get more from us.

BILLIONAIRE BENEDICT ARNOLDS

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, several references have been made already during these special orders and several references were made during the day, Mr. Speaker, to the question of the conference on the health premium deduction for self-employed, and repealing the tax preference for minority broadcasters.

Some of those who are observing our activities here today may wonder who they are put together, in fact some Members from the Republican Party asked us to provide information as to why we were bringing up the question of billionaires who leave the country in order not to pay taxes and renounce their citizenship, asked us to explain

how that was relevant to a bill having to do with the deductibility of employers, the self-employed for their health benefits.

The reason is very simple: You have to pay for it. In order to pay for it, you must pick and choose how you will offset the cost of the deduction. Everyone is in favor of the deduction; the question is how to pay for it.

We had a choice. We had a choice between eliminating the possibility for minorities, including women, of expanding their capacity to be involved in the communications industries, or we could tax billionaires who are leaving the country and renouncing their citizenship in order to avoid taxes. That is the plain and simple fundamental element that was involved here.

This not merely a question of expatriation in the sense that someone's literary sensibilities were offended, that somehow ideologically or philosophically they found themselves in opposition. Good Americans have the opportunity to contend with these ideas as we are on this floor. They stay and fight, they stay and make their case.

What we have here is not expatriates, what we have here are Benedict Arnolds, Benedict Arnolds who would sell out their citizenship, sell out their country in order to maintain their wealth. That is it.

My good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], came to the floor and indicated that he could not understand why we were excoriating these people. That was the word he used, "excoriating." Of course we were excoriating them. He said that was already current law that took care of this, then went on to say that the current law does not work well enough and that it needed to be fixed.

That is what we were going to do with this bill, we were going to fix it with this bill to see to it that the deductibility was going to be paid for by the billionaires who were renouncing their citizenship. I think that is completely clear, that is what we were going to do.

I remember that when I was a child I think the most potent story that we learned in elementary school was one entitled "The Man Without a Country," the man without a country. And as I remember the conclusion to that story, the man without a country was left permanently at sea, seeing constantly the horizon of the United States, bereft of the benefits of citizenship.

Well, today that has been transposed into the jet set, people who are able to retain property in this country, able to retain income, able to live in this country 120 days a year, able to establish residence in a country or region that will allow them not to pay taxes, enjoy the full benefits of all of the wealth that they have accumulated in the United States of America as citizens, and renounce it at the same time, while we are asked to give more time to the Republican majority to craft

some bill to enable these billionaires' sensibilities not to be abrogated in any way.

We have been passing legislation at freight train speed to overturn all of the situations that would undergird the possibility of feeding our children their school lunches, of seeing to it that our students are able to maintain their financial aid, asking immigrants to come to this country and to achieve their citizenship as rapidly as possible.

Where I live in Hawaii we have immigrants coming in every day who are establishing themselves, working hard, paying their taxes, working forward and eager to the day that they can become citizens of the United States of America. How is it possible for a political party to defend those who have enjoyed the full benefits of citizenship in the greatest country on the face of the Earth, in the history of the world, and defend them when they seek to run away from the responsibilities that every other person in this country is pleased and happy and eager to undertake?

To have billionaires able to renounce their citizenship and have that excused and have them released from being able to pay for it off receipts that are needed in order for the self-employed to be able to deduct their health costs is a blot and a shame on the legislative business of this House of Representatives.

QUESTIONS THE PEOPLE IN MISSOURI WILL ASK SPEAKER GINGRICH

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening at the conclusion of the debate on the term limits legislation proposed constitutional amendment, the Speaker, in addressing the House at the end of his remarks made a veiled threat to me and to other Democratic Members that when the constitutional amendment failed that it would become the No. 1 issue in the 1996 elections. And that as a result of that he was going to come back and be in the majority in 1997, and that the term limits legislation would then become No. 1 legislation, No. 1 bill.

I accept the challenge from the Speaker. I invite the Speaker to come to my district, and we will talk about the term limits legislation.

But I want to warn the Speaker that when he comes the people in my district, as I travel my district, are going to ask him some other questions. They are going to ask him some questions about a little book deal that he has with Rupert Murdoch and those people.

Mr. Speaker, they are also going to ask you about GOPAC and how GOPAC has been run for the last several years and the use of official office expenses, clerical hire, and the workings of GOPAC. And also you are going to be

asked, Mr. Speaker, about use of official staff in the writing of your first book, "Windows of Opportunity," in 1984.

You are going to be asked that, Mr. Speaker, because people now know as a result of an article in the Los Angeles Times on March 20, 1995, that your former staffers, the people who used to work for you, have told a reporter, Glenn F. Bunting and Alan C. Miller, staff writers for the Los Angeles Times, and these are their words, not mine, that in 1984 when the book was being written, the "Windows of Opportunity," that the manuscript for that book was actually done in your official office by some of your official staff, on Government time, Government paying for it, and yet, you and your wife were paid thousands of dollars for writing of that book.

Mr. Speaker, they are going to also ask you about the statements by your former staff members that back in 1989 that there was a commingling of staff work on the course that you are teaching, or were teaching just recently, no longer teaching, but were teaching at the small college in Georgia and that work, preparation, et cetera, was being done, a lot of it was being done at your office, both here in Washington and in Georgia.

There are some of us that are in this House that are very concerned about the fact that the complaints and these allegations have been filed with the Ethics Committee and yet I believe in the 10 weeks I think the Ethics Committee has been in existence, the Ethics Committee has yet to act. And, in fact, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, who is the chairman of the Ethics Committee and also on this floor on January 4 when you were elected as Speaker and sworn in, the gentlewoman seconded your nomination, so there may be some conflict of interest there, so I understand the gentlewoman says there will be not anything done, no action taken at all until after the Easter recess.

For one party, the Gingrich Republican Party in this House to be able to do the contract on America legislation in 100 days, and yet not even have preliminary meetings and decisions made as to whether or not these matters should be investigated and as to whether or not a special counsel should be appointed is beyond me. It just shows me, Mr. Speaker, that there is stonewalling going on here, you are going to stonewall it, you are not going to proceed with the investigation, you are going to tell the American public, people in my district who I represent that you are above the rules of the House, and that the rules of the House do not apply to you.

FEDERAL RETIREMENT AND PENSION SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Min-

nesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a little time this afternoon about some issues. I am going to be sharing time later with some of my freshman colleagues but I would like to indulge my colleagues for just a moment on some personal business to say a special congratulations.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ROCHESTER MAYO AND ROCHESTER LOURDES HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS' BASKETBALL TEAMS

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate two outstanding high school girls' basketball teams from my home city of Rochester, MN. Last Saturday, the teams from Rochester Mayo and Rochester Lourdes won the Minnesota State basketball titles for class double-A and class A schools, respectively. Never before in Minnesota's history have two teams from the same city won State titles in the same year. Coach Bob Brooks of Rochester Mayo and Coach Myron Glass of Rochester Lourdes deserve the highest recognition for their service and leadership. Someone once said, "Sports do not build character, they reveal it." This is certainly true of the girls of Rochester Mayo and Lourdes, who represented their schools and their city with distinction at the State tournament.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you and my colleagues here today will share my heartfelt congratulations to these two great examples of American young women in pursuit of excellence.

I include for the RECORD the name of the team players, as follows:

ROCHESTER MAYO HIGH SCHOOL

Kelly Miller, Coco Miller, Laura Paukert, Kelly Hall, Vicky Ringenber, Jessi Kruger, Nancy Spelsberg, Kjersten Kramer, Elissa Cookman, and Erin Fawcett.

Karen Mueller, Liz Perry, Jennifer Siewert, Beth Volden, Cara Weisbrod, Manager Brooke Halsey, Manager Brenna Paulson, Assistant Coach Les Cookman, and Coach Bob Brooks.

ROCHESTER LOURDES HIGH SCHOOL

Marie Wiater, Missy Sheehan, Rachel Horgen, Katie Shea, Courtney Benda, Laura Rogness, Bridget Garry, Johanne Letendre, Marnie Bowen, and Evelyn Molloy.

Danielle Bird, Katie Griffin, Denise Kruse, Kelly Schwanke, Lisa Graf, Manager Chantal Beaulieu, Manager Brita Johnson, Manager Sara Sherman, Manager Vanessa Woodcock, Assistant Coach Mike Fautsch, and Coach Myron Glass.

□ 1530

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subjects of my special order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.) Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.