

the decent folk in Haiti were enraged that they were turning criminals loose on the streets. That is another system that has broken down.

It is critical in a democracy to have the three branches of government working, and in Haiti not any of the branches of Government are working. Rather than delude ourselves and declare victory, let us look at the real situation and get a foreign policy that is comprehensive, works and does build democracy in Haiti and stop kidding ourselves with these false reports from the White House.

#### THE CONTRACT IS HURTING AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, it is day 83 of the Republican contract. And every day a Republican has come down on this floor and told us what part of the contract they passed. But what they have not told us is what it did to us. So I am here to tell you who got hurt in the contract and who didn't. Who are the winners. Who are the losers.

Well, kids got hurt. Changes in the School Lunch Program made it harder for them to learn.

Single parents got hurt. Child care was cut. Now working families, maybe just a single mom or a single dad at home, they won't have somebody to look after their kids when they are out working.

And then pregnant women, they got hurt. At a time when good nutrition is essential, we cut the WIC Program. Children will suffer, and the taxpayer will suffer because they will be paying for those expensive low-birth-weight babies.

Seniors got hurt. Housing assistance, heating assistance, those programs got cut in the contract.

Students got hurt. If they were hoping to go to college, they will find fewer student loans to help them.

And the disabled, they got hurt. Fewer will receive assistance, and many parents with disabled children will have their stipend eliminated. Consumers got hurt. Their ability to redress wrongs has been reduced. All poor people got hurt, and most middle-income people got hurt.

The Coast Guard got hurt. That means less safety for boaters and fishers, less drug interdiction. And, of course, the environment, that got hurt. Clean air and water safety, that has been cut. Fish and wildlife programs cut.

And veterans, they got hurt. Their medical benefits and housing assistance has been cut.

The taxpayers got hurt.

And, most of all, America got hurt.

Well, now I want to tell you about who did not get hurt. Who were the winners under the contract?

Well, the very wealthy, they did fine. There are tax breaks coming their way.

The Pentagon did fine, no cuts, not even the \$1 cut I asked or the \$8 billion cut I asked.

Corporations didn't get hurt. They did fine.

Polluters did fine.

I suggest to my Republican colleagues when they go back for the Easter break that they realize that they represent all Americans, not just the wealthy, the polluters, and the corporations.

#### CAPTIVITY IN IRAQ OF DAVID DALIBERTI

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the treatment of David Daliberti and his fellow American, William Barloon, by the nation of Iraq. After accidentally straying across the Iraqi border, these two men were tried in a questionable court and sentenced to a prison term that lends new meaning to the phrase "cruel and unusual punishment."

Mr. Daliberti and Mr. Barloon are private United States citizens employed by an American company doing business in Kuwait. On their way to visit friends with the U.N. peacekeeping force patrolling the border, they were misdirected by the U.N. Iraq-Kuwait observer mission and found themselves in Iraqi territory. As even their Iraqi court-appointed attorney said at their trial, they were carrying no weapons, no cameras, no maps, no compasses—nothing that could indicate these men were anything other than innocent victims of an unintentional mistake. And, according to the Polish diplomat who attended the trial on behalf of the United States, even the judge in the case was sympathetic to their plight. Nevertheless, Iraqi law is Iraqi law and the men were sentenced to 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to see these men used as political pawns. If the statement yesterday by the Iraqi Parliament leader is truthful, it is a good sign when he said, and I quote, "we don't think that we are going to facilitate the question of the sanctions through detaining these two Americans."

As Mr. Daliberti and Mr. Barloon languish in an Iraqi prison, I urge the White House, State Department and foreign diplomats working on our behalf to spare no effort in securing their release at the earliest possible date. I also recommend that the Clinton administration dispatch a high-level delegation to Iraq to negotiate for the release of these men. And although I am fully aware that we have no diplomatic relations with Iraq, I call upon the Iraqi authorities to do the right and

humane thing and release these American citizens today.

The trial of these two men was wrong, their sentence was unfair, and their release is imperative. The wives and families of these men, especially Kathy Daliberti with whom I've already spoken to express my support—are counting on their Government to employ whatever means necessary to bring them safely home.

#### TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would ask today whether you would like to fly with an experienced pilot or an inexperienced pilot? Or would you like to go to an experienced dentist or an inexperienced dentist?

Today, I rise in opposition to all the proposals that will be debated here for term limits on Members of this body as a direct undermining of our Constitution. There are many days here when I know I am the only voice the people in my district have here in the Congress of the United States, and I know that I am better, I am smarter, I am more experienced than I was when first elected.

I think it is important to say for the record that the problem of politics in Washington isn't the number of years that people are elected. It is the amount of money that is being put into campaigns, trying to influence people's views when they get elected here.

Campaign financing reform is not in the contract. It is one of the important missing elements in the contract. It does not matter if you serve here for 6 years or 60 years. If we do not limit and control the money that is controlling this political process, term limits won't matter.

For you say in whose interest is it to have term limits? In whose interest is it to have juvenile representation here, to have constant upheaval where Members do not even know one another on the floor?

There has been a two-thirds change in this Chamber just in the last 6 years. In whose interest is it to have this place in constant upheaval?

We have had turnover. People have been thrown out of office. But, for one, I do not want to give up JOHN GLENN in the Senate. Who knows more about the defense of this Nation? Or RALPH REGULA of Ohio on trade or SAM NUNN and JACK MURTHA on defense?

Or even though I do not agree with these gentleman, JOHN CHAFEE in the Senate and BILL ARCHER in this House on tax and budget policy? Or PAT LEAHY on agriculture or NICKY RAHALL on mining or ALAN SIMPSON with that acrid sense of humor that sometimes keeps us in balance here or OLYMPIA SNOWE in the Senate or LEE HAMILTON or DALE BUMPERS or RON DELLUMS or

RICHARD LUGAR on foreign policy or JERRY SOLOMON on veterans?

I, for one, do not want to undermine the Constitution. I, for one, want a blend of experience and people who cannot be bought in this Chamber.

I do not support term limits. It undermines the Constitution, and we ought to stand up for what is right for the American people and once and for all put a limit on campaign spending.

#### CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as we are drawing near to this 100-day closure, I think it is very important to talk about what we have done and look at this.

I think for children what we have done has been absolutely outrageous. It is like we tied them to the tracks, the railroad tracks, and let the contract roll over them like it was a huge, huge freight train.

Why do I say they were tied to the tracks? Well, first of all, we did things that were not quite as serious, I suppose, but the taking away of things or the cutting of the wings of Big Bird and some of the only decent programming on television, cutting of nutrition programs all across the board, the absolute zeroing out of summer jobs for adolescents in the city, strangling the National Service Program which was a way many young people got their college education. We absolutely almost zeroed that out totally, attacking math and science programs in the public schools when heaven only knows we need that, taking on student loans, one of the main ways that young people today are able to get their college education.

Yes, all of those things have been put on the table, and all of those things have been chopped during this first 100 days. And why? Why? To create this great crown jewel of the contract, tax cuts, tax cuts for the special interests that sent people here. It is tax cuts for the rich, and the kids pay the bill.

And I think there is something terribly wrong with that math, and so I am not happy about this first 100 days.

But there is another part of this first 100 days that I think is very troubling. For everyone else in the contract, this contract went rolling along like mad, but when it came to the politicians' interests, the contract comes to a screeching halt.

Watch it come to a screeching halt today on term limits. You are going to find that is the one area of the contract they are going to decide to amend or play with or whatever.

Now I do not happen to be for term limits. I believe the Constitution and this great Republic have lived over 200 years without this and so I do not

think it needs to be there. But many people played on the cynicism that was out there and said this was important.

And yet we are seeing cynicism piled up at the door of this body every single day. We are seeing admissions in Time magazine that they are letting special interests into Members' offices to write the legislation and to write amendments.

Never seen that before. Absolutely rotten, I think. And that may be why kids were on the line. They do not have anybody giving big money that could get into Members' offices and write this legislation.

We saw the gift ban turned down. On the very, very first day of this body, the gift ban got turned down. Nobody wanted to stop the gifts. Well, I did, and I think that is an important reform that we needed.

We have seen nothing moving on campaign finance reform that the gentlewoman from Ohio was talking about that is so important. And we have seen the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct play all sorts of games with the rules. They have changed the rules. And we see ethics violations that are allegedly being piled up at the door, and nothing happening.

So it is very interesting. For everyone else, you are going to get your crown jewel. Special interests, you are getting to write the legislation. The kids are going to pay the bill. And for politicians things aren't going to change.

I do not think that is what the American people had in mind when they started into this whole contract. But I certainly hope they look at this and look at it very carefully.

Because I think if we are going to see more of this after this 100 days, we are in deep trouble in this country as we are breaking all sorts of commitments we shouldn't be breaking to the only hope we have for the next century and that is our children, that is our young people, and to treat them this way and this rashly in the name of paying back the folks who paid the campaign winners' bills in the last election is positively wrong morally and every other way.

#### 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. I have heard quite a bit of discussion our here today about all the pain that is going on. I have not seen much of it, quite frankly, in the first 100 days except the difficulty of spending the hours that it takes for us to write those programs into law, at least get them passed through the House and sent on to the Senate that we promised as Republicans in the campaign to do.

As you know, I am sure my colleagues do, nothing that we have sug-

gested is all that dramatic a departure except that we are sending things back to the States where I think, and most of us on this side think, that there is much greater wisdom about how to do those things than there is here in Washington, especially things like crime fighting, which is primarily local, and welfare which can be best handled by those back home who know how to do it.

But the money and the resources are going back there. Nobody is going to be destitute because of what we are doing, a lot of hand wringing going on about what we have not gotten to. Well, gosh, we have done more in the first 100 days than any Congress in 50, 60, 70 years has, maybe in the history of this country.

But I come to the point of what we are going to discuss today and tomorrow as the legislative agenda, and that is term limits.

Some on the other side of the aisle, including a couple of the speakers this morning, have alluded to the idea somehow we are not going to be able to fulfill this part of the contract. I do not know if we are going to get to 290 votes, but I know if about 50 percent of the Democrats would help us, we would get there.

We have 85 percent or better of the Republicans who are going to vote for term limits out here, hopefully vote for final passage. I believe they will on whatever version. But in order to succeed it takes two-thirds of the Congress.

We have only 230 Republicans. And quite a number, 30 or more, out of conviction really genuinely do not believe in term limits, are going to vote no.

We need to get a balance on the other side. Fifty percent is at least what it is in the populous out there. Because with nearly 80 percent of the American public supporting term limits, we know that is evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans in the general public, but it has not been in this House.

And maybe that is a reflection of why this is the first time in history we have had a term limits debate out here. The Democrats have controlled the U.S. House of Representatives for 40 consecutive years, and only with a lot of pressure in the last Congress did they even hold hearings in committee, let alone consider bringing a bill to the floor of the House for debate that would provide a constitutional amendment to limit the terms of House and Senate Members.

It is time to make this change. It is time to do it deliberately. And let's think about why for a minute.

First of all, if we look back in history, the Founding Fathers of this country could not have envisioned when they wrote the Constitution the kind of full-time Congress we have today or the career orientation that Members have developed.

If you think about it, Congressmen in the early days, in fact for the first 100-