

I have no objection to my tax dollars supporting the needs of poor people to have food they need to put a decent meal on their table. However, I recently stood in line in a supermarket behind . . . somebody in the grocery store who had food stamps and bought dozens of bottles of soda.

I resent this. And I think it illustrates the absolute need for the use of food stamps to put food on the table and not to buy what most of the working poor would consider luxuries.

The food stamp program should not be abandoned, but it must be put on track so that it helps those who truly need help.

This from the parents of one of our Democratic pages, Joshua Stello, who wrote to me this week.

Dear Mr. Foley: My wife and I would like to thank you for the special attention you have shown our son. We also think he is very special. We both have tried very hard to give him the tools to make a future for himself and others.

Both of us wish to tell you how much we feel a little support and recognition helps us keep that path worthwhile. With so many distractions in the world for our young people, parents need all the support and positive reinforcement they can get from others. This gesture by you goes a long way for us parents, and especially for our son.

I'm sure Josh has told you we have a daughter, Brianna, who is also someone you would like to meet, and we are very proud of. This support lets her know she can also reach for the positive.

I hope that Members of Congress realize how much weight they carry for the impressions of young people. I hope this new wave continues to try and work for a future—a positive example and a future for our young—they need and deserve it, from Robert, Jennifer, and Brianna Stello.

I read a disturbing thing in the paper today in the New York Times. Michael Kauffman: "Man's Best Friend, Fiercest Foe."

As the boys explained, the fights begin when owners sic their dogs on each other in a preliminary round. For less than a minute as the dogs lunge and bite, odds are set and bets are placed. The boys said that as much as \$500 is bet, and people can lose thousands of dollars within minutes.

Then there is a break, they said, which is when some owners set out bound cats to further arouse blood lust in their dogs.

This illustrates, folks, the problem in America is not necessarily what we can do in this Chamber to devise laws that will protect us, but when we start rewarding people like Tanya Harding, who has injured another person, in giving her a movie role; when we start rewarding people who have created vandalist crimes in Singapore, by offering them money to expose their behind where they have been caned; where we tell our young generation that in order to be rich in society, they have to commit some devious crime and a devious act to make people pay attention to you, so you can get in People Magazine or on Oprah Winfrey, there is something seriously wrong in America.

Each and every one of us has a responsibility when we receive letters from our constituents about the direction of this country, but we will not be responsible on this floor unless we debate the real problems that face us out in our communities.

Those problems are many. Those problems are what I am illustrating in the New York Times when people allow live animals to be sicced upon each other, to fight each other in a gruesome display of competition, and reward each other with financial gain by watching this barbaric action.

Our children need a future. They need a better future. There are things we can do as Democrats and Republicans to make Congress work for the people of the United States of America.

The yelling and shouting that has gone on here in the last 95 days is sad, because at times both sides have good arguments, legitimate arguments. Let us continue to work after the 100 days to make America the strong and proud place it is, and give it a chance to survive. I know it will, because both parties need it to.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and, regretfully, was not present for the roll-call vote No. 273 on yesterday's motion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] to proceed in order.

Had I been present I would have voted "nay."

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SCHROEDER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### PRESIDENT CLINTON GOES TO HAITI

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I come to the floor this afternoon to talk about President Clinton and his upcoming trip to Haiti. President Clinton is going to Haiti to celebrate what I consider a policy of failure.

What really concerns me, and I am now a member of the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs and Criminal Justice of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, is the disastrous course this administration has taken in Haiti and the President plans to go to Haiti to celebrate.

Let me tell you that just within the last few weeks, I had the opportunity, with Mr. BURTON, to go to Haiti and to review what is going on there and meet with President Aristide. And let me say to my colleagues in the House that what I saw is frightening. It is the result, really, of a policy that has been out of sync from the very beginning.

Let me review for you just a moment where we have been and how we got to this situation.

First of all, that we failed to enforce and this administration failed to enforce international law. One of the sorriest days in the history of this Nation was when the SS *Harlem* sailed out of the Port-au-Prince harbor and failed to have Haiti comply with international law. Another failure of this administration.

Then what did we do? We imposed sanctions that killed more than 60,000 jobs in that nation that fed hundreds of thousands of people and destroyed permanently those jobs and drove that country and that poorest nation in our Western Hemisphere into the ground.

What is worse than killing the economy, we also allowed during that period of time for the opposition in Haiti to be killed. They murdered and tortured and destroyed any potential future leadership for this Nation.

Next, we sent our troops there. And what has happened now is a cost to the U.S. taxpayer of billions of dollars. And, in the meantime, actually even before we sent our troops there, we had incredible costs to my State, the State of Florida, in a wave of refugees that landed there. But then we sent our troops, and we have had to pay twice for our troops, both for our troops and in a few more days for the U.N. peace-keeping troops when part of our troops are removed. So we have paid for a policy of failure.

Now, that is only the beginning of it. My concern is, what do we do from here as the President marches down there and we leave 2,000 of our troops? What is going to happen?

You know, I had a chance to talk to our commanders. I had a chance to talk to our leaders, our Ambassador and our AID officials about what is going on. Even the young men and women who served, and I met with those individuals from Florida, said, "Congressman MICA, there is no plan for economic development. Our biggest plan that the United States offers is picking up trash in Haiti. That is the job opportunity plan that we have in place there. That is the biggest job opportunity, and when the money runs out for that program, the program runs out."

This is what we have. This is the document that was presented to me by AID and the Ambassador, and it is pitiful. It talks about spending millions of dollars on feeding stations. They are so proud of 2,500 feeding stations. It talks about spending millions of dollars on elections and local governments.

And do you know what there is in here? At the bottom of the page, there are a few paragraphs about economic development. Well, heaven forbid we should spend billions of dollars there and leave this Nation without some ability to create jobs and opportunities for the future.

I submit that this is a policy of disaster, that we are making the same mistake in this country, that we have created a system of dependence and reliance on social and welfare programs that leave people dependent, just like we have done in Haiti and we are doing in this Nation. And now we have a President going there to celebrate a victory. I tell you that he is going there to celebrate a policy of disaster and potential economic disaster.

So I ask my colleagues to join with me to express concern to the administration and other Members of Congress that we do something to create jobs and real opportunities not only in Haiti but also this country.

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

[Mr. MENENDEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. ENSIGN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. DOGGETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. PELOSI addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### TAX BENEFITS

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am from California, the wine country, but we celebrate Wente Brothers and we celebrate Concannon and Stoney Ridge and Sebastiani. But the whine you hear around here is spelled with an "H," and it is the whine that the rich are getting more than they are entitled to and that we have to create

another program for the poor, and we have to transfer money from this group to that group.

We have all of the whines and when we return Government to the people, the very people that gave us this Government, this democracy, we hear the whines. "Oh, we are with you, but. We would be with you on the balanced budget, but there is no safeguard for Social Security."

Where does Social Security go today? It goes to the U.S. Government, every cent of it. If we were going to steal it, we would steal it today. If we reduce the deficit, do we have more likely a need for Social Security or less likely? The answer is, if we balance this budget, we are less likely to impose on Social Security, but the ifs and the buts and the whining are endless.

Yesterday, we heard the fabulous whine, "Oh, we are for term limits if you will make them retroactive." This was coauthored by a gentleman who has only served here 40 years, and he did it with a straight face.

Last week, "We want to reform welfare but not if you consolidate the bureaucracies of the 16 different administrative arms serving food." But, "Oh, you are going to cut food to the poor children and to the elderly."

Well, we finally found out that the COLA is 4.3 percent rather than the 3.1 in the Clinton budget, and there is actually going to be more money down there to feed the poor people, but the starving bureaucrats will get a little thinner if welfare reform goes through, and it will.

Today, the Democrats, who had 40 years to fix the Tax Code, have discovered that people are going overseas to avoid the taxes, these same taxes that they spent 40 years creating. They have driven manufacturing overseas, and then they found out people are actually expatriating to avoid taxes.

In a bill which was created to extend the tax break for self-employed so they could buy health insurance, they wanted to tack on a tax on expatriates.

Well, folks, this was not the Omnibus Tax Bill of 1995. This was a bill to extend tax credits of 25 percent to the self-employed for last year so they can do their taxes by April 15 and to extend it to 30 percent next year.

Thanks to a great gentlewoman of this House, NANCY JOHNSON, we are going to go all the way to 100 percent by the time we are through, because people who own their own business ought to be able to do the same thing a large corporation can do and that is write off all of their health care.

Do not forget this came from the same gang that last year wanted to nationalize health care. They wanted the Government to take it over because it would become more efficient, because Government in Washington knows best.

No, folks, the whining continues. Next week, we are going to hear about the tax cuts of \$500 per child are going to benefit the rich.

Now, we have got to use a little common sense here. Do all of the children belong to the rich? Did I miss something here or could we logically think to ourselves, without the help of Washington, that maybe it is young families that are having children, people on their way up, people who do not have all of the income in the world and have not a whole lot of savings because they are young? That is when we have our children.

This great financial institution known as Gannett published in their newspaper the following chart, and, lo and behold, just as you might have surmised, the young are having children, and they only make between \$15,000 and \$30,000. Twenty-eight percent of children and, therefore, 28 percent of the benefits are going to go to people under \$30,000; 34.9 percent in addition to the 29 percent are going to those who make less than \$50,000. That is with both parents working. Then under \$75,000 add on another 23.1 percent and up to \$100,000, 7.4 percent.

In other words, if you want to soak the rich and reduce the tax benefit to \$95,000 and below, you are going to stick it to 5.3 percent of the people. That is the tax the rich folks that everybody is talking about and that leads us into the capital gains tax.

The capital gains tax, of course, is for the rich. Have you ever heard of a capital gains tax for the poor? People who have savings by buying a duplex may want to pass it on to their kids. They will not pay the capital gains tax because it is too high. They will wait to die.

According to the Wall Street Journal, there is over \$7 trillion waiting for people to pass on, \$7 trillion that would be unlocked if we reduced the capital gains tax.

That is what President John F. Kennedy did. That is what Ronald Reagan did. This tax cut for children is their own money, not a transfer from somebody else. We are giving them a credit to keep their own money.

We will see you next week for this debate, and we will help the families of America with the capital gains tax.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURU] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURU addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### HISTORIC VOTE ON TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we held a historic vote on term limits. It is the first such vote