

his brief meeting with President Clinton resulted in a promise to review the relationship between our nations. No doubt their personal exchange expedited the review process, resulting in removal of constraints between our governments and resumption of high level dialog.

The Honorable Jim Bolger has been Prime Minister of New Zealand since 1990. Although the breakthrough in bilateral relations with the United States has been a significant accomplishment during his tenure, certainly Prime Minister Bolger must also be commended for the dramatic and dynamic revitalization of New Zealand's economy. Under Prime Minister Bolger's leadership, New Zealand has undergone comprehensive economic reforms, changing from one of the most insulated and restrictive economies in the OECD to one of the most open and competitive.

Today, New Zealand stands as a model for the rest of the world as to the benefits of free market reforms. The country's annual GDP exceeds 6 percent, inflation has been curbed at 2 percent, unemployment is rapidly declining along with foreign debt, while government budget surpluses are increasing.

To accomplish this feat, New Zealand has undertaken several initiatives, such as liberalizing trade by slashing tariffs and removing imports quotas, encouraging financial liberalization by eliminating controls on prices, interest rates, and wages, while introducing a floating exchange rate, broadening the tax base, by implementing a value-added tax, while cutting corporate and personal tax rates, reducing government budgets by privatizing public enterprises and removing subsidies, and substantial deregulation across most sectors of the economy, with a monetary policy targeting price stability as the major objective.

These free market reforms have culminated in the World Competitiveness Report in 1994 ranking New Zealand first for long-term competitiveness among the advanced economic nations of the OECD.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of this historic trip to Washington, it is my distinct privilege and pleasure to congratulate Prime Minister Bolger and the good people of New Zealand for their unwavering commitment to democracy and outstanding economic accomplishments of its government.

On this great occasion, Mr. Speaker, I submit to my distinguished colleagues in this Chamber, to join me by welcoming Prime Minister Bolger and members of his delegation to our Nation's Capital. As my Polynesian cousins, the Maoris of New Zealand would say, "Kia ora."

Tinei mauriora! Tena koutou, tena koutou, tena koutou katoa. Te whare e tu nei, temarae e takoto nei, tena korua. Nga hau e wha, nga iwi e tau nei, tena koutou katoa. The breath of life! Greetings, greetings, greetings! To

the House, to the land, greetings to you both. People of the four winds, people gathered here, greetings to all of you.

UNITED STATES OCCUPATION OF HAITI

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today is day 191 of the United States occupation of Haiti. The United States occupation of Haiti is scheduled to end in 3 days. The invasion will be over.

What will we be leaving behind in Haiti besides one billion United States taxpayers' dollars? Are we leaving a stable and secure government? I think not. Unfortunately, the evidence is in, and we are leaving a mess. We are leaving 2,500 of our troops there to do some peacekeeping with some other troops from some other countries in a situation that is far from optimistic.

There is a requirement that Congress has put on the White House for regular reporting about what is going on, and I asked for that report as we neared the end of this occupation time.

The White House tells us that things are fine in Haiti. Quoting from a letter from President Clinton to the Speaker, dated the 21st of March, it says: "Overall, Haiti has remained calm and relatively incident-free since the deployment of United States and MF forces. The level of political violence has decreased substantially since the departure of the de facto government," et cetera, et cetera.

I think it is time that the folks in the White House started reading the newspaper. Things are not quite that way.

I go back to a New York Times article that came out just as recently as this Sunday, and I say, quoting, "Only a week before the responsibility for maintaining security here is to shift from the United States to the United Nations, the Haitian government is struggling to contain a sudden surge in crime and street violence. Frustration over the crime wave, which has included slaying of political figures as well as robberies and break-ins, has led to a series of vigilante attacks against suspected lawbreakers," et cetera, et cetera.

Reading on from the same New York Times article last week, that was a week ago, after a series of daring daylight holdups and car thefts, the capital was hit by spasms of vigilante violence. Over 2 days, 21 suspected thieves were beaten, stoned or hacked to death by enraged groups, mainly residents of working class neighborhoods.

This seems to belie the statement that calm has returned to Haiti. This seems to belie the statement that we now have a secure and stable environment, as the United Nations asserts. I guess it is all right for them to assert it since we are maintaining the maxi-

mum exposure, we as the Americans, and our forces down there.

I think that the media is breaking down the misrepresentations that are coming out of the administration on why we are in Haiti and what we are about there. What is important for Haiti is that we do establish democracy and we try to help it in an intelligent way.

The implications for our upcoming elections, given this wave of violence and the breakdown that is going on there, are not good. Candidates have been killed.

We have got elections for parliament in June. We need a parliament in Haiti. We do not have one; and, in fact, we have a de facto dictatorship. We have no justice system and no parliament, so we have a de facto dictatorship.

And where people are being discouraged, they are not only being discouraged, they are being assassinated if they run for office. That is pretty strong discouragement.

The implications for business, we have had 20,000 of our combat troops down there. If we cannot get prosperity, security, and create an investment climate with that kind of stability, what is going to happen when those troops leave in 3 days?

So, clearly, we are not doing well in the area of encouraging investor, and unfortunately the facts show that very well also.

The implications for security are not so good, either. President Aristide, quoting him from another newspaper report, said, "Mr. Aristide was particularly critical of the remaining Haitian police and judicial authorities, whom he described as, 'cowardly and derelict in their duties'."

When the President of your country gets up there and says you cannot count on your police, that does not contribute to calm. When he goes further than that and says, "Look, folks, you better be prepared to take care of yourselves and the workers down in the slum part of Port-au-Prince, down in Cite Soleil, are encouraged to go out and take care of themselves, that means they are down there sharpening their machetes."

And indeed we do have exactly that report, that the people in Cite Soleil are back, going back to protect their homes, are sharpening up their machetes and are preparing for even more violence. This is not a stable and secure environment by any stretch of the imagination.

We do not have a parliament. We are pulling out American troops. We do not have a government that has got any confidence in its police force for stability. The justice system is breaking down.

They found that when they went to one prison out of something like 527 inmates only 15 of them had actually been convicted. So they turned loose 200 people who are actually people who should have been brought to justice but the system had broken down. And then

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 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