

When we do, the losers who pay will not be American families, they will be the lobbyists left alone when the lights go out at their party.

THE COMMON SENSE LEGAL REFORM ACT WILL RESTORE THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF LAW

(Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend just a couple minutes this morning talking about my second year in law school, not the first year; the first year we studied the traditional principles of law and I understood those. In the second year we started to get into the more recent developments that we have seen in our legal system, and those, frankly, I did not often understand.

These are principles, for example, that allow someone who is only responsible for 10 percent of the damages caused to someone to be liable for 100 percent of all the payments that have to be made. It allows someone who is drunk to recover full damages, even though it was his drunkenness or the fact that he was on drugs that caused his own damages.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is something I did not understand, and 15 years of practicing law confirmed to me that our legal system is dramatically out of whack. That is why I am so happy to be here today as we debate the Common Sense Legal Reform Act.

This act will do many things, but most important, Mr. Speaker, it will restore the principles that our law used to be based on back to the law today, principles of personal responsibility, principles of right and wrong. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

A PLEA FOR RESTORED FUNDING FOR LIHEAP

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to be poor in this country; it is not easy to be old; and it is not easy to get through a harsh New England or Midwestern winter if you are either.

For that reason, we enacted the low-income energy assistance program, or LIHEAP. In fiscal year 1993, more than 5 million households benefited from funding under LIHEAP. More than 70 percent of these recipients have annual incomes of less than \$8,000.

In my own State of Connecticut, not only are our winters harsh and our economy in deep difficulty—our fuel costs are disproportionately high. The average price of natural gas in Connecticut is 291 percent higher than it is in Alaska. Without LIHEAP, many families may be faced with the starkest of choices: Heat versus gas for the car, or clothes for the children, or a roof over your head.

It is not easy to be poor, or old, or sick. And it's not easy to be overlooked. Let us not ignore these people least able to speak for themselves. Let us restore funding for LIHEAP.

GOP KEEPING ITS PROMISE TO CHILDREN

(Ms. DUNN of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are keeping their promises—and that includes the promise to help millions of children currently forced to live on welfare because one of their parents has abandoned them. This Nation's No. 1 natural resource is its children, and they deserve the protection that Republicans offer them in our welfare reform plan.

For decades our Nation has seen a huge welfare bureaucracy continue to grow while Congress stood idly by failing to hold parents accountable for the precious children they have brought into the world and then carelessly chose to abandon. We cannot allow this tragic status quo to continue.

Under the Republican welfare reform bill States will finally get the assistance they need to track down deadbeat parents—especially the 30 percent who move out of the State often to avoid paying child support. Our proposal will help to find these individuals and require them to pay the \$34 billion they owe in child support to the children they have deserted—children who might have been kept off welfare if the parent had kept his commitment.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tough approach but a fair one. And, above all else, it is the approach that can save children from falling into the welfare trap of a lifetime of dependence on the Government.

We can end the status quo. Let us help States find those deadbeat parents, and let's keep our promise to the children.

COMMENDING BISHOP ROY LAWRENCE HAILEY WINBUSH

(Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, when men look through the halls of time, it is leaders in our community who literally stand out, those who shake the very ground on which we walk.

It brings me great pleasure to take this moment to recognize a leader not only in my State, but a leader in this entire Nation, Bishop Roy Lawrence Hailey Winbush, who was recently elected the chairman of the Congress of the National Black Churches, an organization that has an active participation of over 65,000 churches nationwide.

Bishop Winbush took this esteemed position it will be 40 years ago. He

served as a community leader, and made an incredible mark on this country as a leader who recognizes and represented the cities of Alexandria, Lake Charles, Lafayette, Monroe, and Shreveport.

Bishop Winbush also is a general board member of the Church of God in Christ, an organization that represents over 5 and a half million members nationwide. Bishop Winbush is also a public servant. When faced with the problem of crime, community, and family, President Clinton requested his presence, along with others, to address the problem within the African-American community.

I am happy to say this gentleman lives in my community, and I commend him today.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS INCREASED, NOT CUT

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, that the other side continues to accuse us of cutting funding for child nutrition programs is ludicrous. I voted in committee to increase the funding child nutrition programs are receiving, yet people are calling my office worried that we are gutting these programs. We are increasing the funding and eliminating the wasteful Federal bureaucracy to send more money to the States. The charge that we are cutting funding is patently false. Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask that Americans look at the facts. It is a fact that we are putting more money in to child nutrition. It is a fact that our bill dismantles part of the Federal bureaucracy. And it is a fact that many Democrats receive significant campaign contributions from Federal bureaucrats every year. All I ask is that Americans consider the facts.

IN OPPOSITION TO CHILD NUTRITION AND SUMMER JOB CUTS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hands the Constitution of the United States of America, which has in some parts of it the opportunity for all of us to pursue happiness and to establish equality. I simply ask, who is working for the children?

It is interesting to hear expressions about how much these block grants and these votes will provide more dollars for school breakfasts and lunches. In fact, they really do not. What they actually do is cut the dollars, because they do not take into consideration the increased need of our children and our mothers, who are in fact fighting every day to survive.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against the runaway legislative freight train that threatens to crush the lives of millions of America's children. In particular, as a Representative for the 18th Congressional District in the State of Texas, I acknowledge that there are businesses, small businesses, there are working people, middle class, but I also say that my district has a wealth of children who are in fact in need of school breakfasts and school lunches.

My Republican colleagues indicate and are the conductors of the unconscionable train. Mr. Speaker, we must realize that we have to stand for the children. We cannot lose \$670 million in my home State of Texas alone between now and the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, let us not cut nutrition for our children, let us stand up and fight and uphold the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I must rise today to speak against the runaway legislative freight train that threatens to crush the lives of millions of America's children.

My colleagues from the other side of the aisle are the conductors of this unconscionable train, and they continue to drive that train at breakneck speed through this body without any consideration about what and who they will leave lying bloody on the tracks behind them.

Their agenda—already declared immoral by Cardinal John O'Connor—will slash child nutrition programs—more than \$670 million in my home State of Texas alone between now and the year 2000.

And now, as if nutrition cuts were not horrific enough, the mad conductors of the runaway train have set their sights on summer job programs. Bear in mind, these are the same folks who complain about welfare dependency and cycles of poverty. Do they not see, Mr. Speaker, that denying some 600,000 needy young people a summer job will only make it that much more difficult for them to get the work experience they'll need to break out of poverty?

Mr. Speaker, I fear these Republican conductors do not see the damage their runaway train will wreak because they are blinded by their zeal to cut taxes, with no real focus on the deficit of working Americans.

For the sake of America's children, this train must be stopped.

□ 1130

TIME FOR COMMONSENSE LEGAL REFORM

(Mr. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this body began the monumental task of reforming America's legal system.

Mr. Speaker, for too many years ridiculous legal judgments have been handed down in frivolous lawsuits where the only real winners are the lawyers.

Mr. Speaker, some have suggested that we should leave this up to the individual States to decide. I am a true

federalist at heart and I believe that in States where the State statute is stronger than the Federal law that State law should prevail. But there are States where the abuses of the judicial system have run amuck.

Case in point, Alabama. Steve Flowers is a 13-year veteran of the Alabama legislature and chairman of the Insurance Committee for the Alabama House.

In 1987 Mr. Flowers was the primary sponsor of Alabama's legal reform legislation, but he now strongly favors Federal legislation in this area.

Why? Because in 1993 the Alabama Supreme Court in *Henderson versus Alabama Power Company* ruled that the Alabama legislature did not have the authority to impose limits on punitive damages.

Mr. Speaker, in the first 11 months of 1994, juries in Alabama awarded more than \$170 million in punitive damages, not including wrongful death actions.

The time is now for true common-sense legal reform. This body must act now to turn the tide of lawsuit abuse and pass this measure to protect hard working Americans from the long arm of the trial lawyers.

CONTRACT PUNCHES HOLES IN CONSTITUTION

(Mr. WATT of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when I showed up yesterday with my hole puncher in one hand and the Constitution in the other hand and represented that the Contract With America was beginning to punch holes in the Constitution, I got calls yesterday saying, "Are you crying wolf?" So I went back and here is the record.

Line item veto, article I, section 1.

Effective death penalty action, habeas corpus, article I, section 9.

National Defense Revitalization Act, this review commission, article II, section 2.

Exclusionary Rule Reform Act, fourth amendment, punched a hole.

Takings legislation, fifth amendment, punched a hole, America.

The Contract With America is punching holes in our Constitution. As the Speaker comes in here to punch a hole in this contract, they are punching a hole in the Constitution of the United States.

WHAT IS REALLY GOING ON

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. I wonder if that applause coming from the other side of the aisle, if those Members who applauded, if perhaps they also voted back on the first day of Congress, of the 103d Congress, 1992, to seat delegates, to allow them to vote in the Committee of the Whole in contravention of article I,

section 2 of the Constitution, punch-punch.

We continue to hear the same thing over and over and over, and it just begins to make you wonder if you repeat it long enough and loud enough, if the big lie might not take effect, might not actually stick.

The fact is that we are increasing the amount of money that goes to School Lunch Programs. Everybody knows that on both sides of the aisle, including when one takes into effect demographics and changes in population.

What is amazing, though, is that the same lie would be repeated. So what is it all about? Is it not really just about power and the loss of constituencies and the loss of bases? I think that is really what is going on here.

Clearly those friends of mine on the other side of the aisle have been supported for years and years by the Federal employees PAC's, and that is really what is going on here.

SUPPORT FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, we are pedaling backward fast, crushing kids as we go. Cut the heat at home, cut the lunches at school. There is no escaping the cuts, kids.

Have we forgotten the shameful revelations of hunger and poverty that produced the American majority for school lunches, WIC and low income energy assistance? What about that contract?

Contracts are supposed to be win-win propositions. Tax cuts for the wealthy paid for with lunch money from kids is a rotten tradeoff. As \$5 billion wallop at WIC and child nutrition programs is child abuse.

If Washington cannot afford to feed hungry kids, cash-starved cities like the District will hardly be able to pick up the pieces—or the children. It is time we stopped eating our young and their lunches.

THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX REPEAL ACT OF 1995

(Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Alternative Minimum Tax Repeal Act of 1995. It is my sincere hope that this legislation will provide a starting point for this Congress to consider eliminating economic distortions caused by the Tax Code and encourage new investment in manufacturing.

This legislation would repeal the alternative minimum tax that was created as part of the Tax Reform Act of 1986. This tax is a major impediment to