

plus years of our country, only served 1 or 2 months a year up here in Washington. And they went back home and did their businesses and did the ordinary things they do in the community. And, very frequently, they only served one or two terms. It was a rare exception for them to serve longer.

Then beginning about the middle of this century, moving on until now, Congress became a full-time, year-around job, partly because the size and scope of the Federal Government became exceptionally big.

□ 1300

While I would like to reduce it, we are not going to immediately reduce it. The truth of the matter is, when that occurred there became a different breed of attitude in Congressmen here in the sense that men and women could not do the jobs back home. They basically had to give them up.

Today, there are actually laws in the books that prohibit certain occupations like attorneys and accountants from practicing their professions, and most Members of Congress today have no outside earnings outside of those investments that a few may have.

Mr. Speaker, today we have a career-oriented Congress, Congressmen who come here thinking that they have to give up a job. And many of them, for security reasons or otherwise, are looking to stay here for longer periods of time.

That has been the pattern with committee chairmen, requiring you to be in service for 12, 15 years to be one, and sometimes committee chairmen serving for 15 or 20 years. That is wrong, and it has led to rather poor decision-making.

Members seeking to make a career out of this place tend to want to please every interest group to get reelected, not to get campaign funds but to please the groups to get votes, to please the groups that are basic to them, whatever group that may be, however small it is. The idea being if you do not displease anybody then you are going to get them to vote for you next time since they are the ones that are the squeaky wheels paying attention.

Consequently, that is why we have so much trouble balancing the budget and getting some common sense in government around here.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me only logical then that the way we can reform and the only way we can truly reform permanently Congress is to change the Constitution to make things balanced again, much like the Founding Fathers had originally thought it should be.

The best way, the only way to do that is to set term limits. I propose a 12-year limit on the House and Senate. My version of the term limit amendment that will be out here as the base bill for a vote tomorrow is one which says that we serve 12 in the House and 12 in the Senate as a permanent deal.

There is no retroactivity. There is no preemption of the States. Whatever the

Supreme Court decides in the pending cases and the Arkansas case before it will be the law of the land. If they decide against the States, then the 12-year limit will be uniform. If they decide for the States, there will be somewhat of a hodgepodge potentially out there.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is I think that a difference between the House and Senate terms, say 6 for the House and 12 for the Senate, would make the House an inferior body to the Senate. It would make it weaker. That does not make sense to me.

I would urge my colleagues to vote for term limits and vote for the 12-year version.

#### DISAPPOINTMENT WITH WELFARE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, as the only Member of Congress who has been a single, working mother on welfare, I am very disappointed by the welfare plan that House Republicans approved last week.

I am disappointed because we had a real opportunity to fix our broken welfare system, and instead, House Republicans approved a plan that guts the system and shreds the safety net for 15 million children. The same safety net that enabled my family to get back on our feet 27 years ago.

As someone who came to Congress to improve the lives of our children and families, defending them from attacks by House Republicans is not the way I intended to spend my time.

Poor women and their children did not sign on the dotted line of the contract on America, but they are certainly in line to suffer its disastrous consequences.

The bill does nothing, absolutely nothing, to prepare welfare recipients for jobs that pay a livable wage.

There is no job training. There is no education. And while the Republicans have put some money toward child care, following intense pressure from the Democrats, there is still not nearly enough.

And, their bill literally takes food out of the mouths of our kids.

In my district alone, Marin and Sonoma Counties in California, almost 7,000 school children will be denied a school meal.

I have only one thing to say about their plan to wreck child nutrition programs:

"States don't get hungry, children do."

And, starving our children is not the solution to the welfare mess.

I am also disappointed that Chairman HENRY HYDE and I were not given the opportunity to offer our amendment to federalize child support collec-

tion. We believe that federalization is the best way to collect outstanding child support, and we will continue our bipartisan effort to make sure children receive the support they are owed.

Mr. Speaker, the choice comes down to this: We either punish families because they are poor, or, as was the case with my family, we invest in them so they can get off welfare permanently.

As this bill moves to the Senate, it is essential that harsh and punitive measures in the House welfare bill be removed. We can get families off welfare without punishing women and children. We can produce a welfare bill that is worthy of widespread bipartisan support.

#### PATENT PROBLEMS WITH GATT

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to draw public attention to a great miscarriage of justice that will happen to American citizens starting June 8 unless the Congress acts now.

Most people do not understand the importance of patent rights for the American people, but let me be concise and just say that as we are entering this information age and this new era of technology unless we guarantee the protection for the creativity and genius of the American people and for the investment of American investors in new technology, America will fall behind.

Mr. Speaker, in the past, America has always led the way economically because we protected people's property rights, including their intellectual property rights. In fact, most people do not know the U.S. Constitution includes a strong provision about patent rights. So from the very beginning our Founding Fathers, like Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, who were themselves innovators and technicians, ensured that our country would place a great deal of value on the protection of new inventions and intellectual property rights.

In fact, for 150 years the tradition has been that American citizens would have 17 years of protection in which they would own any new technology that they invented. Well, that is what has happened for 150 years.

Unfortunately, last year during the GATT process, during our negotiations with other powerful interests around the world, a provision was snuck into the GATT implementation legislation that was not mandated by the GATT treaty itself. Let me repeat that. Something was put into the legislation for the GATT which is about an international trade agreement that was not required by what we had agreed to with those other trading partners to be in the GATT legislation.

What that provision was, was something that reduced the number of years of patent protection for American citizens. Today, we have 17 years of protection, as we have had for 150 years. If one files a patent, no matter how long it takes that person to be issued a patent, that means when a patent is finally issued the investors will have 17 years to recoup.

The change that was snuck into GATT says that once someone files for a patent the clock starts ticking, and he only has 20 years. No matter how long it takes for that patent to be issued, after 20 years that person no longer owns that technology.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what that means? That means that our most innovative Americans who created new technologies will see that their patent rights are reduced dramatically, the people producing new technology.

What was snuck into the GATT language over my strenuous objection and many others was this law that will mean billions of dollars that would be coming to Americans who invent new technologies now will stay in the corporate bank accounts of multinational corporations and Japanese corporations. Billions and billions of dollars that used to come to Americans are now being kept overseas. Our people were betrayed. Their rights were reduced.

Now, if you ask our Patent Office why that happened, why did they sneak that in there, why did they keep Congressman like myself in the dark until 10 days before GATT was actually put before this body and wouldn't tell us what was in there concerning patent rights? Well, we have got to do something to correct the patent system because they have something called the submarine patent in which some patent holders, some people who have applied for patents, maneuver through the system and actually have a longer period than the 17 years of protection because they manage to have the patent not issued.

The submarine patent problem can be corrected administratively and should have been. It is like a hangnail on your toe. An infected tow with a hangnail feels really bad, but the last thing you want to do when you have a hangnail is to cut your foot off.

Instead of correcting the hangnail problem, what our leaders have done is use a hangnail as an excuse to cut the feet off of the American investor. When that happens, we are not going to be moving forward. We are not going to be able to compete because we are not going to be able to outrun the foreign competition. Mr. Speaker, what will happen when this change takes effect is that American inventors will lose control of their technology after a few short years.

I am asking my Members and my colleagues, my friends here in the house, to join me in sponsoring H.R. 359 which will restore to the American people a guaranteed 17 years of protection. We

can then move forward to correct some of the problems at the Patent Office. We can do so administratively and without costing the American people billions of dollars.

Let us protect American intellectual property rights and join me on H.R. 359.

#### POTENTIAL CUT IN STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, my message today goes out to college students, their parents, educators across our country and across the State of West Virginia.

Last month, we had to fight the battle of school lunches and, incredibly enough, unbelievably, there was actually a proposal and it passed on the floor of the House to eliminate the school lunch as we know it. And this involved parents and educators and school children across our country.

This month, I am warning people in advance. You had better be fighting for your student loan, your guaranteed student loans that keeps you in college, the one that the Federal Government helps subsidize your education knowing that that small amount of subsidy is going to be repaid time after time and time again in increased earnings and increased tax revenues. Because, yes, incredibly enough, under the Contract With America this, too, is at risk.

Last month, the school lunch; this month, the school loan.

So we are going to see probably the school loans cut. Because why would the student loans be cut? They would be cut for a tax cut. They call it a middle income tax cut.

And if you earn over \$100,000 a year, yes, it is a tax cut for you. If you are below \$30,000 a year, you are going to see almost nothing. If you are below \$13,000 a year, you are going to see nothing at all.

So what we are going to see is that middle-income people are going to see their student loans cut so that the upper incomes can have their taxes cut. It does not sound like a good deal to me.

So when those students this month take their final exams, be careful. They could be more final than you think. When school lets out this summer, let us hope that they are not letting out for good.

So I am calling on students across our State and across the country to mobilize, to say, "No. Enough is enough. This is a growth. Those loans are growth. They are not simply deficit spending."

The changes that have been proposed and talked about could cost as much as \$20 billion over 5 years. The most important one is the interest subsidy that

goes to children below a certain income level by which while they are in college the Federal Government pays their interest rate. Once they are out of college, then they are responsible for repaying that rate. It is estimated that eliminating that subsidy could cost students anywhere from 20 to 50 percent more on the cost of their loans.

Now, like a lot of people in this country, I worked my way through school. I had to work my way through college, and I had to work at the same time. If you saddled me at the time with an 8 or 9 percent interest rate, I could not have made it; and a lot of others I think are in my situation as well. So this is penny wise and pound foolish.

Many of our veterans remember that the single greatest economic accelerator was following World War II when this country put money into the GI Bill of Rights and sent millions to college. What we saw was an explosion of technology, of growth, of development, particularly in our economy, and so this would be.

What the Contract With America puts at risk is the Stafford loan program, the work study program, supplemental education opportunity grants, the Perkins loan program; all on the chopping block.

The impact on West Virginia would be severe. Thirty-five thousand students alone in our State have these subsidized loans by which the Federal Government is assisting to pay the interest while they are in college. That calculates to about \$11 million annually in interest. Yet that \$11 million could jeopardize the college careers and future careers of many of our West Virginia students.

Already, West Virginia colleges are well aware of the impact if these kinds of cuts should pass this Congress. As I had one college president tell me, "It is going to make the difference in our college as to whether many of our students can attend or whether they are not going to be able to attend."

Mr. Speaker, are we really going to cut the future off for many of our students like this? Middle-income parents, middle-income students need to be aware of what is out there, need to be aware that they have to mobilize and the time is short.

Because when this tax cut package hits the floor next week, and I presume it is going to pass and get muscled through like everything else has been muscled through the last 100 days, when this tax cut package passes, they are not going to tell you what the cuts are. But the cuts come right after that, and those cuts are going to involve student loans as sure as I am sitting here.

Nobody would believe that they would go after student lunches. They did. Now they are going after student loans. It is time to mobilize. Time to make ourselves heard. It is time to let the word go out: We want the country to grow.

One of the single greatest accelerators and one of the single greatest