

major corporations. Let us not take food out of the mouths of babies.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 956

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to address H.R. 956, common sense product liability reform. In the last 40 years we have passed one product liability reform bill. What has it done? It was passed for single-engine aircraft. And in the Fourth District of Kansas it has created 7,000 jobs, thanks to the vision of Russ Meyers who heads up Cessna Aircraft.

In 1977, we were building over 13,000 aircraft in the single-engine aircraft business. And Cessna was building over half of those. By 1986 they had to quit building aircraft because of lawsuits. By 1994 they were down to 600 single-engine aircraft and many of them were built overseas.

Product liability reform works and the choice is clear. If you protect trial lawyers who are getting rich from lawsuits—they get over 50 cents of every dollar in the cost of a lawsuit—or you created jobs. It is lawsuits or lunch buckets. I support more lunch buckets and less lawsuits. Let us pass H.R. 956.

REPUBLICANS AND TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in a move that demonstrates the gulf between the rhetoric about the Contract With America and the reality of what it means for Americans, the majority ducked a vote on term limits.

And they did it for a simple reason. They know they are not serious about it.

For all of their talk about citizen legislators, their term limit bill is really about one thing—protecting their power. So I say to the Republicans: Stop hustling the American people. If what you really want is term limits and not limitless headlines, send us a real bill.

If letting the American people decide every 2 years who should represent them doesn't sit too well with Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. ARMEY and Mr. MCCOLLUM—three term limit supporters who have now been citizen legislators for a total of 44 years—then I say give us a real term limits bill.

Make it retroactive.

If you want the headlines, then clean out your desks and head for home the day we pass the bill. When the citizen legislators who have been here for decades show me they are that serious about term limits, then I am with you.

TORT REFORM

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a confession. There was a time in my life when I was a member of both the American Bar Association and the Association of Trial Lawyers of America. But I resigned from both organizations some years ago when I came to realize that the interests of the legal elite do not always coincide with the public interest. I am happy to say that redemption is possible, and I am here to urge courage in the fight for legal reforms.

Now, I can also tell my colleagues that not all trial lawyers are bad, at least most of them are not. They serve a necessary function in our society and no one here is arguing to put them out of business. Granted there are some lawyers who are convinced that their lifestyle depends upon defending every excess of the tort system, no matter how senseless, no matter how much it adds to the cost of everyday goods and services. But we are on the side of the ordinary people of this country, the consumers.

Maybe our response to the lawyers who do not like these reforms is: If you do not like it, sue us.

IT'S THE TRADE DEFICIT, CONGRESS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the value of the dollar is so low, the dollar could walk underneath a closed door with a top hat on. And it is not really all that cerebral. The problem in America is a trade deficit and Congress has the blinders on.

For the last 15 years we have had trillions of dollars floating around overseas. The supply is so great, the dollar is not in demand, and the dollar is dropping. It is the trade deficit, Congress. Not budget deficits. We cannot separate the two.

And to tell my colleagues the truth, we have a trade program that is so misdirected, if we threw it at the ground it would probably miss.

We will not balance the budget, Congress, with minimum wage jobs and highly skilled American workers in unemployment lines. Think about that. I think the whole country is saying, "Beam me up."

Congress, get at that trade deficit and we will solve the budget deficits in America.

PRODUCT LIABILITY'S CHILLING EFFECT ON MEDICAL RESEARCH

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

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to my colleagues' attention an article from Sunday's Washington Post entitled "America, the Plaintiff."

The story starts out like this. Suppose for a moment that a small drug company miraculously discovers a vaccine that can prevent cancer. Suppose that the drug is cheap, easy to administer and has a single, albeit serious, drawback: One in 10,000 people who take the drug may experience acute vision loss. Should the company bring the product to market, figuring that a relative handful of people may go blind, so that millions of lives can be saved?

This is a question that pharmaceutical manufacturers ask every day. Each day they must weigh their hopes to save human lives against the threat of being punished over an FDA-approved product. How many times will we miss the opportunity to have a cure for cancer, or AIDs, or even the common cold, because a manufacturer knows that one product liability suit will jeopardize the future use of the product and possibly the company.

I hope you will keep this story in mind when you consider your vote today in our lifesaving bipartisan amendment to encourage manufacturers to market FDA-approved products.

REPUBLICANS TAKE APPLES AND MILK AWAY FROM CHILDREN

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the Republicans announced that they were going to close down the school lunch program and fold it into a block grant program, I went to my favorite expert in my district, my wife, who is a schoolteacher, to ask her what she thought.

She said, I think we should have welfare reform and I understand why people are upset with the Food Stamp Program, but this is the food that these kids eat every day. It is not like they take this food out onto the street and sell it. There is no black market for school lunch programs. Why do the Republicans want to take apples and milk away from 6-year-olds in the United States?

Why could I not answer that question for my wife? In the Halls of Congress I am still waiting for the answer. Why do the Republicans want to take milk and apples away from 6-year-olds in the United States of America?

THE FACTS ON REPUBLICANS AND NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I will depart from my prepared text directly

to answer my good friend from Wisconsin. First of all, my friend, you know it is an out and out falsehood; we will not take apples nor milk nor any food out of the mouths of the children of this country.

Once again, let us engage in some elementary mathematics. We propose, as Republicans, to up the budget spent, to up the allocation to \$200 million over what President Clinton asked for in the food program. We propose an increase of 4.5 percent for next year.

We propose giving the power to feed these children to people on the front lines fighting the battle. I wish my friends on the other side would stop this demagoguery and deal with the facts, Mr. Speaker. Those are the facts and that is the difference we will make for America.

TRYING TO HAVE IT BOTH WAYS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1993, the Ethics Committee explicitly cautioned Speaker GINGRICH to avoid using congressional resources in conjunction with his course on American civilization. He rejected that advice and promoted the course from the House floor.

Now that he is being challenged on that he is trying to use the Constitution to defend his speech on the House floor.

The Speaker cannot have it both ways.

The same Speaker that barred the gentlewoman from Florida, Congresswoman CARRIE MEEK, from discussing the Speaker's book deal on the House floor is now saying that a Member can say virtually anything on the House floor because it is protected speech under the Constitution.

Speaker GINGRICH said yesterday in his press conference: "It is totally legitimate for a Member of Congress to stand up on the floor of the House and say virtually anything. Nothing the Ethics Committee advises can supersede the constitutional provisions of speech and debate."

The speech and debate clause of article I of the Constitution, however, is solely designed to protect Members of Congress from being questioned in any other place, meaning that a Member cannot be prosecuted or held liable for anything he or she says on the House floor. We all know the House has rules that explicitly forbid Members of Congress from doing this, as the Speaker was advised by the Ethics Committee in promoting his book.

□ 1015

OVERTURN EXECUTIVE ORDER ON STRIKER REPLACEMENTS

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, with the stroke of a pen, President Clinton yesterday shattered more than 50 years of labor law by issuing an Executive order to prohibit the hiring of permanent replacement workers for companies with Federal contracts.

For 50 years Congress has maintained a careful balance between the powers of labor and management at the bargaining table. We have often fought long and hard on this floor to ensure that neither side had an unfair advantage.

The long arm of organized labor—which represents less than 12 percent of the private labor force—now has privileged status among American workers—something Congress has fought hard to avoid. Some might even say that it is payback time for organized labor, since they gave campaign contributions to Democrats versus Republicans by a ratio of 9 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, the President yesterday slapped the face of Congress, and I am ready to settle the matter as a gentleman. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 1179 that would nip this Executive order in the bud by making it null and void.

FARM BILL AWAITS WHILE POST OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE REMAINS VACANT

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton nominated Dan Glickman to be his Secretary of Agriculture on December 28, 1994, over 2 months ago. Here we are in the first week of March, and no hearings have been held on Mr. Glickman's nomination and it could be many weeks before the Secretary is confirmed.

News reports indicate that the nomination is stalled because of unanswered questions. This is unfortunate as there is no proof of any wrongdoing.

This Congress will begin holding hearings on the 1995 farm bill in the next few weeks, and the Clinton administration has nobody in charge of its agriculture policy. In fact, it would appear that agriculture policy generally is of minor concern to the administration. How can we write a fair and reasonable farm bill or establish agriculture policy when the lights are out in the Agriculture Secretary's office?

IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING FOR LIHEAP

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of continued funding for LIHEAP, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

LIHEAP is a block grant that provides funding for programs that assist low-income households with heating during the winter months. On February 22, the House Appropriations Committee voted to eliminate funding for the entire program. Lack of funding for this program would effectively destroy the ability of 5.8 million American families to pay their energy bills. Cutting LIHEAP would effectively put people—children, seniors, disabled, and the working poor alike—out in the cold. In my State, Pennsylvania, 466,000 households would be affected.

At a time when the crux of all the rhetoric coming from the other side of the aisle is the need for input and control for those on the State and local level—why is it that LIHEAP, a successful block grant providing an outstanding example of a Federal-State partnership with the built-in flexibility that allows States to design programs to respond to the heating needs of their citizens being decimated? The irony of this situation is rich, Mr. Speaker, but irony will not keep you warm—at any time—and especially not during a Pennsylvania winter. The constituents of western Pennsylvania did not send me to Washington to participate in ideological shell games that employ a bait and switch mentality. All of us were sent here to ultimately improve the quality of life for those we represent.

I urge for continued funding for the proven successful Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

CONGRESS MUST CORRECT THE PROBLEM OF FRIVOLOUS LAWSUITS

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, as a lawyer, I am the last person to suggest that everybody in my profession is a money-grubbing, scum-sucking toad. The actual figure is only about 73 percent.

Ha ha, I am of course just pulling the Speaker's honorable leg. The vast majority of lawyers are responsible professionals, as well as, in many ways, human beings.

But we really do need to do something about all these frivolous lawsuits. We have reached the point where a simply product such as a stepladder has to be sold with big red warning labels all over it, telling you not to dance on it, hold parties on it, touch electrical wires with it, hit people with it, swallow it, and so forth, because some idiot somewhere, some time, actually did these things with a stepladder, got hurt, filed a lawsuit—and won.

My feeling, Mr. Speaker, is that anybody who swallows a stepladder deserves whatever he gets. And I am sure the vast majority of the American people would agree with me. The minority would probably sue.