

you look at this election, it made a tremendous difference.

The 1994 elections brought people like Mr. FOX, my colleague here, who arranged this series of special orders here tonight, and I very much appreciate all of his work on terms limits. It has brought wonderful people like Mr. FOX here. It has brought people like Mr. HILLEARY, who has an amendment on the floor tomorrow. It has brought people like my two colleagues from South Carolina, Mr. SANFORD and Mr. GRAHAM, that are strong supporters of term limits.

But that election, for all that change and particularly that management change, really reflected a great deal of continuity in this body. Here is again why we need term limits. The 1994 election, of those who wanted to come back, 90 percent were reelected. In 1992, of those who wanted to come back, 88 percent were reelected. In 1990, of those who wanted to come back, 96 percent were reelected.

It is very important to look at those who wanted to come back, because the change we have gotten, particularly if you look at 1992 and 1994, has been as a result of open seat elections. In other words, people deciding to retire or leave for whatever reason, they left, they left an open seat. As a result, we had an open seat election.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is here with me tonight. When we were elected, both of us came in 1992, we both, maybe one of the best arguments against term limits, because both of us happened to defeat incumbents. That was very rare in 1992, 88 percent of those who wanted to come back, and again, 1994, 90 percent of those who wanted to come back came back.

This indicates we have got a permanent Congress. That permanent Congress needs to be changed by term limits. If we enact term limits, we will have a different kind of Congress, we will have a Congress that is more accountable to the American people, and a Congress that would not take much time to pass a constitutional amendment on term limits when they realize that 80 percent of the American people want it. The percentages are maybe reversed in here. It is hard to get people to vote for term limits inside here. But tomorrow I think we will do just that.

SUPPORT TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will have an historic debate on the floor of the House. We are going to take another step in reforming the place where we do the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, if we reflect back on what we have accomplished so far during this year, on opening day we made the agreements, and we have now im-

plemented cuts of committee staff. We have reduced the number of committees. We have cut committee budgets. We passed a bill which would apply the laws that apply to the private sector now also make those apply to Congress. That bill has now gone through the Senate and has been signed by the President.

We went on to reform the House. Republicans decided as we took control that we would limit terms of committee chairmen and chairwomen. We also decided that any individual Member could only chair one committee or one subcommittee. What we have been able to do is disperse power so that people like my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. INGLIS, and myself, who have only been here two terms, that within the second term that we are here, would have the opportunity to chair subcommittees. So we are creating more opportunities for more influence among more Members of Congress.

We went on to reform our process, additional reform for the House. This House of Representatives can be proud that we passed the balanced budget amendment. We can also express our disappointment that the other body failed to pass the balanced budget amendment. We have passed the line-item veto, and it looks like we are going to make progress in being able to take that through a conference committee and a Republican Congress providing a Democratic President with a line-item veto.

Tomorrow we will have an historic debate. We will do something that many States have not had the opportunity to do, or that they have not had the courage to do, is we will have a debate, and we will have a vote on term limits.

To date, what has happened with term limits around the country is that 22 States have considered state-imposed term limits, and in all of those States, they considered it through a process which I believe soon we are going to have to consider here on the floor of the House, is that they have returned power back to the people through an initiative and referendum process. They have not turned power back. What they have actually done is they have invited the people to participate with them in the process. It is interesting to note that the only place where this kind of activity on term limits has taken place is where States have invited the people to participate with them in the legislative and law-making process of that State. No State legislature has passed term limits.

Where we now go is tomorrow we are going to have the discussion on this floor of the House. I hope at the end of the day tomorrow that we will be able to say that we have taken another step in the reform process and that we will have had 290 Members of this House who have been willing to step up and say that we endorse and recognize the importance of term limits. We recognize the input and the value and the di-

rection that the American people have provided to us that says we believe that we need a flow in and a flow out of Members of the House of Representatives.

Remember, only 18 percent of the American people believe that we are doing a good job. I think maybe the recent polls show we may be all the way up to 32 percent. One of the primary reasons for that is they believe and they recognize that the policies and the directions and the laws that come out of this House bear only slight resemblance to the problems that they see in their local communities. They believe that by having Members coming in and flowing out, we will have better laws and better process; we will have Members coming in, moving out of real jobs, coming to Congress, and then moving back after they recognize that they have served here for a period of time. I do not think it is really all that important whether it is 6 or 12 years. I personally prefer 12. I will also vote for the 6-year-term proposal because the voters in my State have instructed me to support and to work for the passage of 6 years, but most importantly, to work for and push the concept of term limits for the House of Representatives. Mr. Speaker, it will be an historic debate. I am looking forward to the debate, and I am looking forward to Wednesday night when we can celebrate the passage of term limits.

PROPER ALLOCATION OF TAX DOLLARS REQUIRES EXPERIENCED LEGISLATORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, a large part of what we do here in the House of Representatives relates to budgets and appropriations. I would say 75 percent at least of what we do is related to the budget and appropriations process. It is the most important thing we do, and I think that there needs to be far more discussion of the budget and appropriations process. It is a highly complex process, it is a very important process and the details are very important also.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with term limits is that it trivializes the functions of the Congress. It makes it appear that this is an easy job and it is easy to understand what goes on here. The budget and appropriations process alone is a tremendously difficult job, and no one would recommend for a difficult job related to their health care that they go and seek the surgeon who has the least number of years, that nobody wants to have open heart surgery done by a surgeon with 15 or 12 years experience. On the contrary, most people seek the most-