

people out there who do not want their young people's lives wasted in the future needlessly.

Maybe these soldiers, these toy soldiers, it is okay to risk their lives because they do not mean much, but our young men and women, they do matter.

President Clinton, please do not veto this legislation.

#### WITH APOLOGIES TO DR. SEUSS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, during much of the debate on the defense bill just passed, I listened either here in the Chamber or watched it on television from my office and spent some time between debates composing a little doggerel.

With apologies to Dr. Seuss, I would like to share it with you:

On the eighth of November, Election Day last fall.

The voters decided to take a look over the wall.

At first, Democrats stood silent, but finally we said,

With a very sad shake of our collective head, "On this side of the wall we are all Dems, But on the far side of the wall live the them.

But the voters said it's high time we knew, What kind of things the them would do.

Even after 40 years, the wall isn't so high. Why, the voters can look the them square in the eye.

And when the them came close, the voters heard 'em say, "Star Wars, Star Wars, it's up, up and away."

And at that very instant, voters remembered the reason they had stayed on their own side of the wall season after season.

The them love to spend and spend, but only on weapons that skewer.

Not Head Start or Pell grants or highways or sewers.

So, on tiptoe the voters stand quizzically watching the them,

As the them dash about in their 100-day fit, So, on 101 they can at last sit.

And the voters note that the them look frightfully mean,

As they try to spend billions on their Star Wars machine.

Voters had walked to the wall with great vim and vigor,

Only to find the them as always with their hands on the trigger.

For 2 more years the voters will watch and the voters will wonder,

Why the them spend tax money that might blow the world all asunder.

At the end of the time, the voters will step back from the wall,

Hoping a little look didn't hurt much after all.

And then they will remember when all is said and done,

These are the very same them that scared the voters back in 1981.

□ 1510

#### FRIVOLOUS LAWSUITS IMPACT AMATEUR SPORTS, LEGAL REFORM NEEDED

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest an editorial found in Monday's Wall Street Journal article by Creighton Hale.

Mr. Hale is the CEO of Little League Baseball and he made a very good case for the need for legal reform.

One example he gave was this:

Imagine the situation: The batter hits a pop fly to center, but your centerfielder is playing the position for the first time. He moved there because the regular kid has the flu. The pop fly hits him in the eye.

As the coach, what do you do?

Pull the infield in and play for the plate?

Call time and head for the pitcher's mound?

How about try calling a lawyer?

You see, in a real life case similar to the one just described, the centerfielder's parents filed suit against the coach who stationed their child under the ill-fated pop fly. They sought compensation for pain and suffering, as well as punitive damages.

In another case described by Mr. Hale was litigation that resulted from two boys colliding in the outfield.

They picked each other up—and then sued the coach.

Another player sued when a stray dog intruded on the field of play and bit him.

And in one of the most outrageous cases I have heard of a woman won a cash settlement when she was hit by a ball that a player failed to catch.

The irony here is that the player was her own daughter.

The Little League has seen its liability insurance skyrocket 1,000 percent over a 5-year period. From \$75 per league annually to \$795 per league.

We, in effect, have asked little league coaches to take on major league liability risk.

Our legal reform umbrella must cover civil defendants of all stripes whether it be the Little League team that plays in the park down the street or the large corporation that employs the little leaguer's parents.

Frivolous litigation has reached the point that we cannot even measure it with dollars anymore.

Already the special interests are mobilizing to stop any attempt to help the Little Leaguers and Girl Scouts.

George Bushnell, president of the American Bar Association, has resorted to name calling.

The rules of this body will not even allow me to repeat what he called congressional Members who would dare attempt legal reform of this nature.

I say we have struck a nerve.

We are not here to pander to the special interest within the legal community.

Rather, we are here to enact real legal reform for the American people.

And reform we shall have.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

#### THE SO-CALLED PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Personal Responsibility Act.

For years now, Mr. Speaker, Democrats, Republicans, welfare recipients, and Americans on opposite ends of the political spectrum have all agreed on two things; No. 1: The welfare system is broken, and No. 2: We as Americans must change welfare as we know it.

This bill as I read it, Mr. Speaker, fails in several ways to address the problem.

First, the bill erroneously assumes that the problem with welfare is that these people just do not want to work.

The reality, however, is that 70 percent of those who receive welfare benefits are children. The remaining 30 percent are the mothers of these children and disabled persons.

Second, and most importantly—this body, as it has done in the past, is attempting to base new public policy on the same false premise—that these people just do not want to work! Therefore, to encourage them to work—cut them off.

The reality, Mr. Speaker, is that the problem with welfare is this body's total abdication of its responsibility to deal openly and forthrightly with the cause of welfare—the lack of a real job paying a livable wage.

If we did address this problem openly, Mr. Speaker, we would find that what

most welfare recipients want is an opportunity to work—not a welfare check!

This bill, Mr. Speaker, does nothing to empower people. It does nothing to address those very important secondary impediments to welfare mothers going to work, the need for day care for their children so they can go to work, and the need for health care for their children.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the bill fails to invest the resources in job training and education necessary to equip welfare mothers to compete for the jobs that are available.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only thing this bill guarantees to our children, is that once their parents have used their allotted benefits—that's it! There is no other safety net for these families or their children.

So no matter what happens to the Nation's economy or the economy of your State, no matter what happens with your personal circumstances, regardless of your efforts to secure employment, that is it—no more benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would abolish the entitlement status of those essential programs that protect our children from hunger and homelessness.

What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that no longer are poor children guaranteed that they will grow up with a roof over their head and food in their mouths.

In fact what our children are guaranteed, Mr. Speaker, is that their basic health and nutrition needs will now be subject to individual State priorities and each new Congress views about their mothers and their willingness to work.

What we have done in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to decide that welfare and single mothers and their children are the root of all evil in this society and if we are to ever balance the budget we must get these pariahs off the rolls.

The reality, Mr. Speaker, is that 70 percent of all welfare recipients are off welfare in 2 years and only 12 percent of all welfare recipients stay on welfare more than 5 years. So why this body would base welfare policy on the 12 percent of people who have not, will not or cannot get off welfare is beyond me.

This bill would require, or as we like to say in Washington—mandate—that States deny AFDC permanently to families where the children were born after this bill's passage to unmarried mothers younger than 18. States would also have the option to deny assistance to children born to unmarried mothers younger than 21.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would allow States to eliminate all cash benefits to families who have received aid for 2 years and—permanently—bar such families from any future aid if the parent had participated in the work program for at least 1 year. After 5 years, States would be required/or mandated to terminate permanently the family from cash assistance.

The State even if it wanted to continue cash payments would be directed by Washington to deny this benefit.

In both of these cases, Mr. Speaker, the Contract on Americans would allow children and families to be left without any cash help or a public service job even when the parent was willing to work but unable to find private sector employment.

An even more ominous provision in this assault on America's children, Mr. Speaker, would take the savings generated by denying assistance to unmarried teens and their children, and use those same funds to build orphanages for those children or group homes for those children and their teen parents rendered destitute by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is open season on poor American children and the people sent here to protect them are running roughshod over them with careless indifference or conscious disregard.

My district, Mr. Speaker, has 61,000 children living below the poverty line. I am not interested in orphanages and group homes, I am interested in jobs that will employ the parents of these children.

What is required, Mr. Speaker, is an honest appraisal, free of finger pointing, free of race baiting, free of vitriolic attacks on lobbyless women and children, and most important, Mr. Speaker, a real commitment to creating jobs.

□ 1520

An even more ominous provision in this assault on America's children is that it would take the savings generated by denying assistance to the unmarried teens and their children. As we debate this issue coming up next week on the floor of the House, let's take a hard look at the Personal Responsibility Act and hold it responsible.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE FROM TODAY UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT AND ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM TODAY UNTIL WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 30) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 30

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, February 16, 1995, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 21, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, February 16, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon, or at such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, on Wednesday,*

February 22, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly exciting to see what has been happening in this town since January 4. It seems for the past 40 or so years we have had an institution in Congress that was not responsive to the needs of Americans across the country; that did not seem to care about what was going on in the lives of middle class Americans, from Maine to California, from Florida to Washington State. In fact, things had gotten so bad that just a few months back only 18 percent of Americans thought Congress was doing a good job.

Today, only a month and a half after the 104th Congress convened on January 4th, almost 50 percent of Americans now believe Congress is doing a good job and we are on the right track. And for good reason. Look what has happened.

Of course, there are things we have not addressed yet. There are problems we have not had time to work out. But let us look at what we have done in just a few short weeks.

We have undertaken real institutional reform, reform that all Americans are in favor of, even the most simple basic reform that Congresses in the past have ignored. They have not listened to what Americans have wanted.

We started with the Shays Act. The first day it was passed, and it is an act that makes Congress abide by the same rules and regulations that they force on individuals, on families, on businesses, on States, on the rest of America. I cannot tell you how many times I heard people across my district and across the country pound their fist into their hands, angry, saying why can they pass laws, and then conveniently exempt themselves from it? What makes Congress and the Members of Congress feel so arrogant that they somehow believe that they are above the law? Why does Congress not do what the overwhelming majority of the American people want them to do. Is this not a representative democracy?