

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 co-sponsor 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 anytime—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 LAW-SUITS

(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.

**REQUESTING THE NAMES OF SOCIALISTS ON NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL BOARDS**

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest comments by Speaker GINGRICH which appeared in yesterday's newspapers about the editorial boards of many of our Nation's newspapers.

The Washington Post reported that Speaker GINGRICH told a group of business executives Monday night that many newspaper editorial boards contain Socialists. Speaker GINGRICH has been accused recently of exaggerating the truth or making plain misstatements of facts.

Quite frankly, I do not know whether the Speaker is telling the truth in this instance or not. But I am willing to give the Speaker the benefit of the doubt. According, I call on Speaker GINGRICH to name names. Who are the Socialists on the editorial board of the Dallas Morning News? Who are the Socialists on the editorial board of the Fort Worth Star Telegram? Who are the Socialists on the editorial board of the Houston Post? Who are the Socialists on the editorial board of the San Antonio Express News? Who are the Socialists on the editorial board of the Austin American-Statesmen? Who are the Socialists on the editorial board of the New Orleans Times Picayune? Who are the Socialists on the editorial board of the Daily Oklahoman?

If you are telling the truth, name names, Mr. Speaker. We are all waiting.

**WELFARE THAT WORKS**

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

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, our current welfare system reminds me of the old adage about a certain road that was paved with good intentions. My home State of Utah decided to create its own new program that has gone from good intentions to good results.

In order to create its own program, Utah had to get 48 Federal policy waivers, which allowed the State to design a program that fits our citizens, gives innovation a chance, and promotes learning and independence. Utah's program, SPED—the single parent employment demonstration project—moves the focus of welfare from income maintenance to increasing family income. And let me tell you, it works.

In Salt Lake City alone, after 18 months under this new program, the average AFDC grant went from \$352 per month down to \$149 per month while the average family income has climbed from \$697 per month to \$795 per month. And 35 percent of all participants have left the system due to increased earnings.

This program works because it is based on the belief that the State is the most effective tool for providing these services. I hope Congress will give other States the flexibility to find programs that work for them as well as SPED works for Utah.

**LET US BALANCE THE BUDGET WITHOUT PLAYING POLITICAL PROMISING GAMES WITH TAX CUTS**

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Alan Greenspan testified before Congress and said that the dollar plunged to historic lows due in large part to the Federal budget deficit. We in the House passed a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

We need to make the courageous decisions to help balance that budget, but tax cuts, further taking away from lunch programs for hungry children across America, taking food out of their mouths to pay for a tax cut, is not the way to go.

Recently before the Committee on the Budget such economists as Stephen Roach and Roger Brinner both said tax cuts are a bad idea. Let us make the courageous decisions and provide all American people with the best tax cut we can. That is to reduce the deficit. That will create better interest rates to buy a new home, to refinance a home, and to buy a car.

Let us not play political promising games with tax cuts. Let us make courageous decisions to balance the budget.

**NOW IS THE TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET**

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

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Budget yesterday heard from Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan, and when he was asked by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget why it is important that we balance the budget, he said, and I quote 'I would say \* \* \* in the short run \* \* \* that there would be some strain leading to a period in which I think their,' meaning the people of this country, 'real incomes and purchasing power would significantly improve, and I think the concern, which I find very distressing, that most Americans believe that their children will live at a standard of living less than they currently enjoy, that that probability would be eliminated and that they would look forward to their children doing better than they.'

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk this morning about children and the welfare of children. If we really care about the future of the children in

this country, in whose millions of little hands the future of this country will lie, then we will move as a body to balance our budget, and balance it by the year 2002.

This is spoken by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. If there was ever a need to move forward, the time is now.

**LET US NOT QUESTION PARENTS FIGHTING FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S NUTRITION**

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, demonstrators protesting the Republican cuts in school lunch and child nutrition programs raised their voices in opposition loud enough to scare the Speaker away.

What was most interesting however, was not that the Speaker refused to confront his critics, but what the Speaker's later comments revealed about the way his mind works. With regard to the protesters, the Speaker asked, "Why weren't they at work?"

I have never heard the Speaker ask why bankers, who visit Washington to lobby for deregulation, were not at work.

I have never heard the Speaker ask why high rollers who come to lobby for capital gains tax cuts were not at work.

I have never heard the Speaker ask why the people who pay \$50,000 for an exclusive fundraising dinner for one of his pet projects were not at work.

Mr. Speaker, you gave us a rare look at your darkest, most privately held thoughts with that comment. Chanting with bullhorns may not qualify as dialog, but neither do comments such as yours.

Let us not question those parents fighting for their children's nutrition.

**FEDERAL FOOD ASSISTANCE**

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, from Tuesday morning into the wee hours of yesterday morning, the Committee on Agriculture marked up title V of the Personal Responsibility Act.

That bill is now poised for consideration on the House floor.

Leadership of the committee is to be commended for eliminating the mandate for block granting the Food Stamp Program.

A State option on block grants, however, remains and will be an issue on the floor.

Also, during markup, the committee accepted my amendment which requires those who must work for food stamps to be paid at least the minimum wage for their labor.

The Agriculture Committee was also wise to take that course.

But, with action by other committees, the block grant issue continues to loom large and