

these people tell viewers across America who are making \$5 and \$6 an hour or \$20,000 and \$30,000 a year that they should be making more sacrifices as taxpayers so we can have money for the NEA.

I have nothing against the arts. I have personally contributed to the arts in my community. We need symphonies, community theatres, and local museums. Unlike the Hollywood hypocrites I have put my money where my mouth is.

But I am definitely opposed to further taxpayer funding of the arts. There are other priorities in the Federal budget that are just more important, especially when the arts can and should be supported privately by those with the means to do so.

The other problem with a government-funded arts program are the bizarre things that get funded when you trust bureaucrats with taxpayer dollars. I am not talking about the morally obscene grants, like the pornographic Mapplethorpe photos and the Annie Sprinkle nude show—although those are definitely outrageous examples of abuse. I am talking about more mundane examples of waste and abuse.

Let me give you an example of a typical NEA grant. My hometown newspaper, the Springfield News-Leader, did a story on March 20 on a constituent of mine who recently received a \$20,000 NEA grant to aid him in his work as a poet. A lot of people contacted my office and talked to me personally about this article.

I will call this individual Mr. Grantee which is not his name.

Mr. Grantee of Willard, MO is a creative writing professor at Southwest Missouri State University making \$42,000 a year—a salary funded by the taxpayers. His wife works on the government payroll as a nurse for the public school system. He says his \$20,000 NEA grant will supplement his income so he won't have to teach summer school, allowing him to concentrate on his poetry.

Mr. Grantee says: "I will have less stress. I have a clearer creative mind." A \$20,000 government grant would relieve a lot of stress for a lot of people, including those who don't already draw a government-paid family income of \$60,000 or more a year.

Mr. Grantee, a very honest fellow, says he has already incorporated the money into his family budget. He says he used some of the funds to buy a dishwasher and an airline ticket to a conference. He also says he plans to buy a personal computer. I can think of a lot of Americans who wouldn't mind the government buying them appliances or paying for their personal travel.

We are promised by Mr. Grantee in the article that he will produce at least one book of poetry and that he will even begin work on a second before the grant money runs out—books he intends to commercially publish, no

doubt, and for which he will receive royalties.

I have nothing against Mr. Grantee personally, and I regret the need to use him as an example. But this sort of routine grant is exactly what is wrong with the NEA. When there are so many competing budget priorities, when hard-working taxpayers are already so burdened, I just cannot justify taking money from families—many of them making less than Mr. Grantee—to buy college professors dishwashers and supplement their Government salaries to relieve them from the stress of paying bills.

Frankly, it is an outrage. While the flaky, politically correct Hollywood crowd on the West Coast may look down on my unsophisticated concern for the average taxpayer, the time has come to defund the National Endowment for the Arts and get the Government out of the art business once and for all.

Worthy art—whether it is Mr. Grantee's poetry or the local symphony—can survive with private support. Those who are spending so much energy and effort now to reserve taxpayer funding can and should turn their energy and effort toward private fundraising. That includes our self-righteous friends in Hollywood.

If the public will not support certain artistic endeavors through their voluntary contributions, I hardly see why I, as their elected representative, should force them to spend their tax dollars on them.

#### TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in strong support of term limits.

There is a pervasive consensus among the American public to see Congress enact them.

The people of Tennessee who I represent are ready to see Congress move beyond power and politics and start functioning as a true representative body of the public.

Term limits will allow that to happen more than anything else.

Already, some 42 percent of the Members of Congress are currently serving under term limits.

And many cities and communities, including New York and Los Angeles—both renowned for politics and political entrenchment—have imposed term limits on their Government officials.

The first doctrine by which this country was governed—the Articles of Confederation—contained term limits.

I believe had our Founding Fathers foreseen some 200 years into the future how the purpose of public service has been interpreted, they would have placed term limits in the constitution.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of term limits will argue that elections such as

this past November exemplify exactly why we don't need term limits.

But the fact of the matter is that over 90 percent of all incumbents were re-elected this past November.

The issue before us tonight is paramount to keeping our word with the American people.

Literally every poll shows they want to see term limits enacted.

As public servants, I believe the words of former South Dakota Senator George McGovern are a grim reminder to us all why Congress needs term limits.

When the Senator left the U.S. Senate after 18 years to open his own business, he had this to say:

"I wish I had known a little more about the problems of the private sector . . . I have to pay taxes, meet a payroll—I wish I had a better sense of what it took to do that when I was in Washington."

I urge my colleagues to support the will of the people and enact term limits.

□ 2000

As I mentioned earlier, tomorrow this House will vote as far as I know for the first time on the floor on a bill that involves term limits. And I know there has been a lot of talk about term limits across the country. Many of us campaigned on that as freshmen. We subscribed to the Contract With America. And I believe most of my freshmen colleagues support this very strongly.

I think, though, there is a real opportunity for us tomorrow to bring to the floor those votes that represent Americans and vote for term limits. I think many believe that term limits will not pass. I think it will pass. I can assure the American public that tomorrow probably 80 percent or more of the Republicans will vote for term limits. The Republican Party can deliver on its votes for term limits.

And if we can get just half of the other side, 50 percent of the Democrats to vote for term limits tomorrow with us, we can see to it that a constitutional amendment is passed and that the American public, which overwhelmingly supports term limits, will have that constitutional amendment passed out of this House of Representatives.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work with us in a bipartisan fashion. Again, we can deliver the 80 percent of the Republicans if they can deliver the 50 percent, the one-half of the Democrats needed. And I believe so strongly in this that if we do not pass this term limits amendment, that many of the people who go up for reelection next year, in 1996, cannot possibly defend their vote against term limits to their constituents, and if this vote tomorrow does anything beyond hopefully passage, it will make everyone in this House vote up or down, yes or no for term limits for the first time ever, not bottled up in committee, but on the House floor for the first time

and then the American public, each constituency, each constituent voter in the district can then see very clearly how their Congressman feels about term limits by looking at how they vote tomorrow.

With the difficulty of defending such a vote I would ask all of my colleagues to consider if they have any doubt about this amendment, consider voting for it. This is what the public wants, this is what is best for this country, and I urge my colleagues to vote for term limits tomorrow when they cast their vote for the first time ever on this House floor.

#### TRIBUTE TO BRIAN SCHLIENTZ

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. Last Saturday my Upper Peninsula representative, Brian Schlientz, died. Brian was 27 years old. He had courageously battled a rare form of brain cancer. His life was brief, but it was filled with church and social activities, academic and athletic achievements, and community involvement.

Some would say success always came easy for Brian. But his greatest success was Brian's love of God, his family, and his country.

It is difficult to articulate success as it applies to faith in God. It is difficult to describe love of family when cancer denied Brian his wedding day 3 weeks ago on March 4.

For some people, it is hard to envision one's love for their country when Brian never served in the armed services; still Brian left his college studies to help me get elected to Congress in 1992. Just to help me? No, but to help his country, for Brian believed with all his heart in life.

He worked so long, so hard, just so a right-to-life Democrat could be elected to the U.S. Congress.

It was Brian's love of God, his family, and his country that propelled him to become an extraordinary person.

Brian is survived by his parents Don and Dorothy, his twin brother Matt and Matt's wife, Tiffany, Brian's sister, Heidi, his brother-in-law, Chad, and his devoted fiancée, Kristy, many relatives and all of his many, many friends.

To his family and to each of us, Brian has his own special significance. He had his own personal impact on all of us. When we gather at Northern Michigan University this Thursday for a memorial service for Brian, a university where he starred in academics and on the football field, we will all have our own personal songs, thoughts, and prayers for Brian and his family. While there is certainly sadness in our hearts, it is quickly being replaced by joy, much like this holy season of Lent in which we sacrifice and we try to cleanse our spiritual life just to experi-

ence the joy and the holy significance of Easter Sunday. So too should we all bask in the joy of Brian's life, the joy of knowing him, the joy of his love for each of us.

Just think of the joy that Brian brought to each of us.

As my Upper Peninsula congressional representative, Brian and I traveled together, we worked together and we prayed together. Brian was a joy to be around. You wanted to be with Brian. He brought out the best in everyone.

As Brian and I would drive the vast distances between the small towns that comprise the Upper Peninsula of Michigan our discussions always seemed to turn to his love for God and the difficulty, yet the strength and the joy he found in being, and working with and for a right-to-life Democrat.

Brian excelled in his position as my Upper Peninsula representative because of his love, joy that he had in God, his family, and this great country.

Although he already had one bachelor's degree in biology and chemistry, Brian went back to his studies so he could become a teacher. But, Brian, you are a teacher. Brian, you have been a great teacher and for all of us, Brian, you will continue to be a great teacher. As you look down upon all of us with that huge smile upon your face, I know that you will grade us not in the classroom, not in our academic and athletic achievements, but in the joy, strength, and love that we bring to each other. For you taught us, teacher, that the joy, success, and accomplishment in life is found in one's love of God, family, and country.

Thank you, Brian, for teaching us and reminding us of the secret: the success and the joy of your life.

#### SUPPORT CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO LIMIT CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for adding a term limitation amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

At virtually every opportunity, American voters have demonstrated their preference for term limitation for their elected officials. They have seen too often how entrenchment of political power yields a political culture that is less responsive and less responsible.

The Washington political and media culture has uniformly lined up in opposition to the term limits movement. That should be our first sign that the American people are on to something positive.

The most frustrating aspect of listening to term limit opponents and most of the media has been their refusal to discuss this issue intelligently, but

rather reject it out of hand. Much like the situation with the balanced budget amendment, opponents of term limits have relied on knee-jerk reactions against term limits rather than thoughtful discussion of the problems in the system and the need for systemic reform.

So, I'd like to address some of the arguments against term limits individually:

One, term limits would deprive the American people of experienced elected officials to address the Nation's problems.

Of all the arguments against term limits, this is the one most often cited by thoughtful term limits opponents. What I would point out, however, is that Congress is enriched when it is filled by persons with experience in all walks of life—not just legislating.

For too long, the way to real power inside Congress has been to come to Washington young and spend decades building up seniority.

Too many districts have been represented by men or women who've spent more of their adult lives in Washington than in the district they are supposed to represent.

By adopting term limits, a person who had worked successfully as a small business person, or a school teacher, or a homemaker could come to Washington later in life and still have the opportunity to play a major role in the process based on merit.

Two, term limits opponents also argue that term limits restrict the choices of the voters, giving us less freedom.

I think anyone who has ever looked at the reelection rates of Members of Congress immediately understands the weakness of this argument. Even in this last election more than 90 percent of the incumbent House Members who stood for reelection were returned to office.

The fact of the matter is that it is extremely difficult to beat an incumbent except in extraordinary years. By placing a limit on length of service, virtually every congressional district in this country would become competitive because local political organizations would not wither away waiting for a 20-term Congressman to finally move along.

Instead, Members would likely continue to face very competitive elections in their first few years after their election.

However, instead of becoming isolated and entrenched, even the most popular incumbent would likely face challenges during his or her later terms by those interested running in the future.

I believe that would drastically reduce the number of uncontested seats and contribute to a substantial increase in competitive races. That, not theoretical arguments about limiting choices, would be the real world impact of term limits.