

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

will be hotly contested during floor consideration.

I urge my colleagues to stand up against nutrition program block grants. Welfare reform without that reform will hurt the poor.

EXTENSION OF WAIVER OF APPLICATION OF EXPORT CRITERION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

The United States has been engaged in nuclear cooperation with the European Community (now European Union) for many years. This cooperation was initiated under agreements that were concluded in 1957 and 1968 between the United States and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and that expire December 31, 1995. Since the inception of this cooperation, EURATOM has adhered to all its obligations under those agreements.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 amended the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to establish new nuclear export criteria, including a requirement that the United States have a right to consent to the reprocessing of fuel exported from the United States. Our present agreements for cooperation with EURATOM do not contain such a right. To avoid disrupting cooperation with EURATOM, a proviso was included in the law to enable continued cooperation until March 10, 1980, if EURATOM agreed to negotiations concerning our cooperation agreements. EURATOM agreed in 1978 to such negotiations.

The law also provides that nuclear cooperation with EURATOM can be extended on an annual basis after March 10, 1980, upon determination by the President that failure to cooperate would be seriously prejudicial to the achievement of U.S. nonproliferation objectives or otherwise jeopardize the common defense and security, and after notification to the Congress. President Carter made such a determination 15 years ago and signed Executive Order No. 12193, permitting nuclear cooperation with EURATOM to continue until March 10, 1981. Presidents Reagan and Bush made similar determinations and signed Executive orders each year during their terms. I signed Executive Order No. 12840 in 1993 and Executive Order No. 12903 in 1994, which extended cooperation until March 10, 1994, and March 10, 1995, respectively.

In addition to numerous informal contacts, the United States has engaged in frequent talks with EURATOM regarding the renegotiation

of the U.S.-EURATOM agreements for cooperation. Talks were conducted in November 1978; September 1979; April 1980; January 1982; November 1983; March 1984; May, September, and November 1985; April and July 1986; September 1987; September and November 1988; July and December 1989; February, April, October, and December 1990; and September 1991. Formal negotiations on a new agreement were held in April, September, and December 1992; March, July, and October 1993; June, October, and December 1994; and January and February 1995. They are expected to continue.

I believe that it is essential that cooperation between the United States and EURATOM continue, and likewise, that we work closely with our allies to counter the threat of proliferation of nuclear explosives. Not only would a disruption of nuclear cooperation with EURATOM eliminate any chance of progress in our negotiations with that organization related to our agreements, it would also cause serious problems in our overall relationships. Accordingly, I have determined that failure to continue peaceful nuclear cooperation with EURATOM would be seriously prejudicial to the achievement of U.S. nonproliferation objectives and would jeopardize the common defense and security of the United States. I therefore intend to sign an Executive order to extend the waiver of the application of the relevant export criterion of the Atomic Energy Act until the current agreements expire on December 31, 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 9, 1995.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. MARKEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Member of Congress:

Washington, DC, March 7, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House that a staff person in my office has received a subpoena for testimony and documents concerning constituent casework. The subpoena was issued by the Middlesex County Probate and Family Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

EDWARD J. MARKEY,
Member of Congress.

□ 1050

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE KWEISI MFUME, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS) laid before the House the following communication from the Honor-

able KWEISI MFUME, a Member of Congress:

Washington, DC, March 8, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia for materials related to a civil case.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

KWEISI MFUME,
Member of Congress.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 956, COMMON SENSE LEGAL STANDARDS REFORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 109 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 109

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 956) to establish legal standards and procedures for product liability litigation, and for other purposes. No further general debate shall be in order. The bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 1075. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those specified in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order specified in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 1 hour.