

Well, if that is a little bit difficult to understand, then let us look at this chart instead. On this chart, this shows how much each family gets. Families with more than \$200,000 per year of income would get, on average, \$5,000 of tax reduction. And 49 million families, about 45 percent of all Americans, that have under \$30,000 of income per year, they would get on average \$57 a year, or about \$1 per week would be their share of this tax cut.

Now, they claim they are not going to make the deficit larger, so we are going to be debating this next week the so-called rescissions bill, a \$17 billion rescissions bill.

Well, Madam Speaker, in NEWT GINGRICH'S America, Republican will cut infant mortality prevention and prenatal nutrition and children's foster care and safe and drug-free schools for children, education for disadvantaged children, and domestic violence prevention and shelters for homeless families. But they will not do it with my vote.

Next week, in NEWT GINGRICH'S America's these radical-right Republicans will cut vocational and technical education and Americorps, the National Community Corps, school dropout prevention, college scholarships and summer jobs. But not with my vote.

And next week, in NEWT GINGRICH'S America, these Republican extremists will cut rental assistance for low-income families and public housing maintenance and safety and home heating assistance for 6 million American families, every one of who happens to lie in this lower category. But not with my vote.

In NEWT GINGRICH'S America, to go back to this we are going to take \$16 billion of cuts, over \$300 for every single family in this category, and transfer it to families in this category.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ELIMINATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, French economist Jean-Baptiste Say is famous as the author of Say's Law, sometimes summarized as "Supply creates its own demand." In economic circles, this law is still the subject of debate.

Here in Washington, however, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has been proving Say's Law for the past 30 years. We keep increasing spending on public housing, and the problem just gets worse.

Contrary to popular belief, housing assistance was not cut during the Reagan years. Discretionary Federal assisted housing outlays have grown from \$165 million in 1962 to \$5.5 billion in 1980 and \$23.7 billion in 1994, result-

ing in 55 percent more families being assisted today than in 1980.

Has this dramatic growth solved the problem? No. Today, after HUD's budget has grown by over 400 percent in 15 years, only 30 percent of the families eligible to receive housing assistance are doing so.

And what kind of housing are they receiving? The 1992 report on severely distressed public housing found many public housing residents afraid to leave their own homes due to prevalent crime while others were living in decaying conditions that threatened their safety and health.

According to HUD's own statement of principles issued January of this year, "the rigidly bureaucratic, top-down, command-and-control public housing management system that has evolved over the years has left tens of thousands of people living in squalid conditions at a very high cost in wasted lives and Federal dollars."

Three decades of HUD and homeownership is down, homelessness is up, and millions of low-income Americans are condemned to live in substandard housing which would be unacceptable if it were owned by anyone else.

Say's Law indeed.

Quite simply, HUD has failed its mission of providing decent, low-income housing to America's poor. On the other hand, it has done an excellent job of providing jobs to over 4,000 Washington bureaucrats who oversee the hundreds of programs within the Department.

For these reasons, I have introduced legislation to abolish HUD by January 1, 1998, and consolidate its needed existing programs into block grants and vouchers.

If it is truly the job of government to subsidize low-income housing, then let's do it without the middle man. Rent vouchers allow low-income people to choose their own home, rather than have some bureaucrat choose it for them. Block grants give money directly to the States and local governments—that much closer to the taxpayers who pay the bills.

These reforms are in line with the recommendations recently outlined by HUD itself. The administration's own reform plan proposes eliminating all direct capital and operating subsidies to existing public housing authorities and converting these funds to rent certificates.

For years, conservatives and liberals alike have been championing similar reforms, and it's good to see the current administration jumping onboard.

On the other hand, the administration's effort falls short of the bottom line. Bill Clinton proposed to consolidate HUD's 60 public housing programs into three general funds. He then requested an increase in HUD's budget.

Madam Speaker, America's poor do not just suffer from a surplus of bureaucrats telling them where to live and what to do. They also suffer from excess government that destroys jobs and opportunity.

With \$200 billion deficits projected into the next century, it isn't enough to just consolidate many little programs into a few big programs. We have to reduce the size of Government overall. We need to eliminate entire departments. We need to abolish HUD.

It is time to admit that Uncle Sam makes a lousy landlord and end this 30-year experiment in socialist domestic policy. As Bill Clinton said in his State of the Union Address, "The old way of governing around here actually seemed to reward failure."

Let us stop rewarding HUD's failure by abolishing HUD and eliminating the unnecessary bureaucracy. The alternative is to continue investing in instant ghettos and Federal bureaucrats.

That's a solution we have tried for 30 years, and it just has not worked.

#### VA RESCISSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, the strength of our national defense has always depended not only on the size of our armory, but in the people who serve. Stock piles of bullets, bombs, and ships are of no use without the brave men and women who are willing to put aside personal hopes and dreams for a time to serve the common good. We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to these Americans; and one of the ways we have done this is to provide health care services to our veterans. Unfortunately, these services are now the subject of proposed budget cuts.

The rescissions that target Veterans' hospitals, and more specifically remove funding for ambulatory care facilities at Veterans' hospitals, will reduce access to general health care for our veterans, and will make it more difficult to deliver important preventive health care services at these facilities.

The construction of the ambulatory facility at the VA hospital in Hampton, VA is also considered a top priority by the 177,000 patients that currently receives its services. As the fourth oldest hospital in the system, the VA Medical Center in Hampton provides outpatient and inpatient care to veterans who have defended our country in its time of need. This veterans' facility and the others across the country are able to return the favor by meeting health care needs of these dedicated veterans.

The six projects under attack in the GOP rescissions, are not new projects. Several have been under consideration for congressional funding since 1989. The funding has been approved in the past. It is only now, as the new majority looks for ways to finance tax cuts, that the ambulatory care facilities are at risk.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans who use these facilities are not wealthy, or

even middle class in some circumstances. The services they receive at the VA hospital constitute their sole access to health care. As we move from inpatient care to primary care in the general delivery of health care, it is important that we continue to offer similar services to our veterans. These preventive services reduce the need for costly inpatient services. In the long run, this will go further toward saving taxpayer dollars than the assorted tax cuts being proposed by the majority.

I call upon my colleagues to vote to restore the funding to the VA ambulatory care projects when the rescission package is brought to the floor next week. These projects make sense, and send a clear message that we are committed to our veterans and to their well-being. It is the least we can do to thank them for their service.

---

#### TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I want to call the attention of our colleagues to the fact that 1 week from today the U.S. House of Representatives will have a historic first. We will have an opportunity for the first time in the history of this country to vote on a term limits constitutional amendment, an amendment that would limit the length of time that Members of the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate may serve in these two august bodies.

This amendment proposal will have many variations to be voted on out here, and there are certain preferences that some of us have as to one version or another. I know for one, I have been working for years in an effort to get a 12-year limit on both the House and the Senate. Six 2-year terms in the House and two 6-year terms in the Senate. Actually, I prefer that we lengthen the terms in the House and have three 4-year terms.

Whatever the debate may be over the number of years, the important bottom line is that we move along with the process and get a final passage vote that gets us to 290 and makes a bold statement out here.

The reason why we need term limits seems apparent to most people. A record 77 percent of the American people favor term limits. Sometimes the poll has been as high as 80 and other times as low as 70. But that is strong support for term limits which has been there for years and years and years.

What the American people have seen, that many in Congress have not admitted to in recent years, is the fact that we really have become very career-oriented in this body, in the House particularly but, to a large extent in the Senate as well.

Members here are serving full time, a way that the Founding Fathers would not have envisioned. A year-round Con-

gress is something, again, that the Founding Fathers had not envisioned.

Back years ago, we had a situation where Members came here for a very brief period of time at the beginning of the year, as in Senate legislatures, and serve for a couple of months, go home, and not come back again for another year. At the same time, Members served rarely more than two terms as Congressmen in the House and they went home and were citizen legislators in the true sense of the word.

Today's Government is too big for this. We are going to have, for the foreseeable future, a full-time U.S. House and Senate doing the will of the public, a job that is intended to be done. But at the same time what has happened that goes along with this that I think is a real problem is that Members are becoming increasingly concerned that it is a full-time job and a career as well. Not all feel that way, but a substantial number do. We need to take the career orientation out of Congress and put a finite limit on the length of time that you can serve here.

The reason why this seems to me to be important is because those who are constantly seeking reelection, viewing it as a career, are inevitably consciously or unconsciously going to try to please every interest group to get reelected. Believe you me, there is an interest group for every proposal that comes before Congress and certainly for every spending proposal. That is a good reason why we have not had a balanced budget.

In addition to needing to mitigate the career orientation of too many Members of Congress, we need to put a permanent rule in place, something in the Constitution that would limit the power of any individual Member to control a committee or to be involved as a chairman or been in a powerful position for too long a period of time. Only a term limit amendment can do that.

Then, term limits would provide also a certainty we are going to have new, fresh ideas here regularly, coming forward out of the public.

I would suggest to my colleagues who oppose term limits and say we need to have the experience and wisdom here of Members who are very good and talented, I would say, yes, there are a few, but there are thousands and thousands of other Americans who can replace those whom we turn out, who could come here, serve their country just as well and would serve just as well as those of us who might think a few of those Members are very talented who are here.

I happen to favor 12 years, as I have said. I think that makes more sense. Twelve years in the Senate and 12 years in the House rather than 6 years in the House or 8 years in the Senate or some other number that is appropriate.

My judgment is that if we go with a number different from the Senate and the House, that we are going to weaken this body as opposed to the Senate.

When we have conference committee meetings and we have other opportunities to debate the issues of the day with the Senate, they will have the more experienced Members in the room, they will have a tougher staff situation, and the House will be weakened. That is not good public policy.

I also happen to think that 6 years is too short. I think you need to be here a couple of terms before you are chairman of a full committee, you need to be in 6 years before you come into the leadership, because this is a full-time job right now whether we like it or not. It is a big Government. I think you open yourself, as term limits supporters, to the critics who oppose term limits altogether who will say the staff will run this place if you support the 6-year version. Twelve years in both bodies makes a lot of sense to me.

But the bottom line is we need, those of us who support term limits, to stick together. Our latest whip check shows we have about 230 Members openly pledged to support term limits in one form or another, coming out here for a vote next week. It is truly remarkable. Two Congresses ago we only had 33 Members of Congress willing to openly support term limits. In the last Congress we got up to 107. In this Congress now it appears that we are going to have at least 230 Members saying, "Yes, we want term limits in one form or another," and I hope all 230 and 60 more which we need to get to the two-thirds to pass the amendment, will be here for whatever version emerges on final passage, whether 6 or 8 or 12, whatever. I urge all Members to seriously consider term limits, remember it is a historic vote out here next Tuesday.

---

#### VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION 1995 RESCISSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, cutting funding for veterans to pay for tax cuts to the wealthy is wrong. Clearly, my Republican colleagues from the House Appropriations Committee disagree. Last week, under the continued assault of the Contract With America, veterans learned that Republicans cut \$206 million from the Department of Veterans Affairs budget to help pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.

These cuts represent more than just money—they represent the breaking of a solemn promise Congress made with sick and disabled veterans across the Nation last year. These cuts target some of the most vulnerable groups in our society—aging World World II and Korean conflict veterans and other who have sacrificed so much for our Nation.

This funding is sorely needed. The Department of Veterans Affairs has been counting on this assistance to pay