Now, we all hit bumps in the road, and there should be ways to assist people at such times. But if one is given something without working or paying for it, it should be deemed as a loan that would be paid back or worked off, not as a bottomless pit of money distributed with no strings attached.

Everyone should be merely entitled to an opportunity to succeed. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when the word ''welfare'' is used as frequently as the word ''dinosaur.''

SCHOOL NUTRITION

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by the devastating cuts in children's programs which the Republicans are pushing through the House.

There are many cuts to choose from—but none is more galling than the attack on child nutrition.

Over the next 5 years, the proposed Republican block grants will cut more than $2.3 billion from school breakfast and lunch.

And, as if that were not enough, the block grant increases the proportion of Federal school food funding that can be used from State administrative costs.

How can a hungry child hear a teacher over the growling of an empty stomach?

How can a malnourished child keep healthy enough to stay in school?

Republicans have been telling us that these cuts are necessary to reduce our deficit. Yesterday evening the Committee on Appropriations voted on cutting taxes and reducing the deficit. Democrats voted yes in every instance. Republicans voted no in every instance.

STATES MUST BE GIVEN A CHANCE TO SOLVE SOCIAL WELFARE PROBLEMS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, freedom and responsibility. These are two of the most important goals of our welfare programs, and right now, these are the two goals we have not achieved.

For over 3 years the Federal Government has thrown more and more money into entitlements that just continue the cycle of poverty and dependence. Throwing more money at our problems just does not work. Our social safety net has become a black hole from which there is often no return.

Let us give the States a chance to solve their own social welfare problems on their own. Giving the States back the right to take care of their own people makes good sense. The welfare needs of Idaho or Wyoming are certainly different from those of New York.

Congress should learn to appreciate the diversity between States and let each one tackle poverty and hunger in its own unique way.

We have had our chance. Now let us have the States show us what they can do.

GUAM HARDEST HIT BY BASE CLOSINGS

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out the schizophrenia being experienced at the Pentagon these days.

Under the Secretary of Defense's recently released list of base closures to be considered by BRAC, Guam is the hardest hit American community on the list. It targets Guam for more personnel cuts than large States such as California, Virginia, and New York. The reductions represent between 5 and 10 percent of the entire work force on Guam, and as much as a quarter of Guam's economy could be adversely affected. Let me repeat: Up to 10 percent of the entire work force will be thrown out of work. If this magnitude or cut were undertaken in California, almost 1.5 million jobs would be affected.

To compound this problem, the Navy is trying to have it both ways. They are closing down facilities, saying they do not need them, and at the same time holding on to all the ports, drydocks, floating cranes, and other equipment in case they need the harbor in the future. This schizophrenia will leave our community in a straitjacket without the tools for our own economic survival. The military has the schizophrenia and we suffer the consequences. We need our facilities back.

NUTRITION BLOCK GRANT PROPOSAL

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask a simple question of my colleagues across the aisle—Since when did the Government have the right to use the taxes of low-income people to subsidize families who live in $400,000 houses and earn $300,000 a year? I always thought they supported giving money to the needy and making the wealthy pay their fair share. Well, that is just what the Republican nutrition block grant proposal does. Eighty percent of the funds will be used to provide meals for low-income children.

Democrats have been ranting and raving for years that we should not subsidize the rich. Here is the perfect opportunity for them to offer bipartisan support to a proposal which does just that. An Omaha World Herald editorial drove the point home well. School lunch bureaucrats would have you believe that children from upper-income families are paying the total cost of the lunch. Wrong. Full price for these children means the Government is subsidizing their lunches 30 cents for each lunch.

I think upper-income children can afford this extra 30 cents. We do not need to subsidize middle- and upper-income school lunchers. We need to subsidize the poor.

The proposed changes in the nutrition programs are a way to make sure that those who can pay their way will, and those who cannot get help.

THE DIFFERENCE A SINGLE VOTE CAN MAKE

(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, what a difference a single vote makes. Due to the two-thirds requirement in the Constitution, the Senate failed to pass a balanced budget amendment. One vote. One vote per precinct elected John Kennedy. One vote in March 1995 may have saved Social Security.

The truth is, Congress, the Constitution cannot be mended with microwave legislation. Good legislation requires a two-thirds burn in that crock pot. There is an old saying, if you want to cook it right, cook it long. Social Security does not deserve a microwave treatment.

COMMONSENSE LEGISLATION TO PROTECT OUR CHILDREN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats portray us as a cold, callous, and insensitive group. How can someone truthfully claim that? In the past 58 days, we have done more to ensure a brighter future for the citizens of this country and especially the children.

We have worked night and day to pass a comprehensive crime package, a slew of regulatory reform bills, a balanced budget amendment, and unfunded mandate reform with the intention of getting the Government back on track by transferring authority to State governments. We have increased funding and have allowed greater growth for the School Lunch Program than in past years.

We are conscious of the need to protect our children from an ever increasing crime rate and a debt-ridden Government, while in turn creating a comfortable and productive environment for them to learn.

We will continue to work hard by passing commonsense legislation for the benefit of our prized and most important resource—our children.

SCHOOL NUTRITION

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to praise our Speaker, one of the foremost figures in the field of American literature, and one of our most famous authors. He has been making generous contributions to organizations which pay children $2 for every book they read. At the same time his colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle are taking money away from needy children who need subsidies for their lunch.

The teacher is teaching school children a lesson at this time. He is showing there is money to be made in book deals, perhaps enough to buy their own lunch. I would like to share some information that I find important in this callous regard to our children.

The leadership nutritional block grant would terminate all nutrition standards. Seven hundred thousand Michigan children eat school lunch every day. More than half qualify for free or reduced price lunches. Michigan will lose $107 million a year.

With one hand, the Speaker has offered school kids a book deal do encourage learning. With the other hand, he is taking away their lunch money which provides them with an absolute necessity for proper learning, and that is decent nutrition.

At the rate Republicans are taking money from kids, the kids are going to have to read an awful lot of books to stay fed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Do the rules of the House permit Members to walk in the well, be present in the well while a Member is speaking in the well?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should not cross in front of Members while they are speaking in the well.

Mr. VOLKMER. Is it permissible to walk on the other side of the well while a Member is speaking in the well?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should not walk between the Member speaking and the Chair.

Mr. VOLKMER. What I am trying to point out to Members on the other side, we have never done it on this side, is not to get your papers up and get ready to make your 1-minute while a Member is speaking in the well.

□ 1015

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we will again address private property rights. And there is only one issue: whether or not we will obey the fifth amendment.

For those who haven't read their constitution lately, I would like to quote these 12 profound words.

The final clause of the fifth amendment states the following: ''* * * nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.''

This is a simple statement that requires little explanation. Just as a thief need not destroy the property he steals to be guilty, neither must the Government necessarily require a landowner to vacate his property for it to be taken for public use.

Mr. Speaker, without these 12 words, we would be little better than a socialistic society.

I, personally, subscribe to the axiom that if a man has done nothing wrong he has nothing to fear. Unfortunately, many law abiding citizens have a great deal to fear from the Federal Government.

Why? Because our environmental agencies create laws and regulations that destroy the value of their property.

In my district, millions of acres of timber lie unharvested because the government exercised its authority to save the spotted owl.

The Government has the authority to take my land. It also has the authority to save owls, but it does not have the right to do so without justly compensating you or me for it.

Mr. Speaker, let's reaffirm the fifth amendment, protect private property rights, and pass H.R. 925.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk of reform and of change in this body over the past month. Some of it real; much of it for show; much of it cynical; and even some of it counterproductive, such as the current talk about cutting child nutrition programs not to reduce the deficit but to provide tax cuts for the very wealthy. But there has been one issue of change that there has been too much silence about, and that is the most fundamental need of all, and that is to reform our campaign spending laws in this country so that we have meaningful, real democratic elections rather than auctions, which is the direction this country is going now.

I am proud to join several of my colleagues in introducing legislation this week which would break the gridlock that currently exists over campaign spending reform by following the military base closure commission model in creating a bipartisan commission to recommend campaign reform legislation. In 1 year Congress would have to vote on its recommendations up or down, no excuses.

Let us clean up the political process and return it to the people of the United States.

THE REAL VICTIMS

(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 want to read something to my liberal colleagues on the other side of the aisle who profess so much compassion for America's children while defending the current welfare system.

This is from Bill Bennett's article in the current Commentary magazine, which I would recommend that all my colleagues read, Bennett writes:

> Between 1962 and 1992, welfare spending in the United States increased by over 900 percent in 1992 dollars. At the same time the poverty rate dropped by less than 5 percent—and illegitimacy rates increased over 400 percent. Children are the real victims of this national tragedy. They are being conditioned into the same habits of dependency they are surrounded by, resulting in an almost unbreakable cycle of welfare.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we get one liberal Democrat after another parading to the well to tell us how wonderful the current system is and how much the children need it.

The liberal Democrats may need it, but the children do not.

REFORM AT THE EXPENSE OF SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

(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, the Republican meat ax has fallen once again and this time not just on chicken and meat but on tomatoes, on beans, on carrots, on milk, and on orange juice. The latest target is the school lunch and breakfast program.

Now some of them are going to argue, we have not cut it. Ask them then why is there a 20-percent transfer out provision in the block grant? Ask them why is there no inclusion of price increases for food? Ask them why, why is there no inclusion of a recession or unemployment rates? Those are basic questions and, furthermore, ask them why is there not the provision for entitlement for a child in poverty to be eligible.

I am all for cutting billions, but let us cut billions from star wars and space stations and not nickel and dime our lunch programs to death.

WELFARE REFORM

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