

anybody else in this House of Representatives or Senate, knows what is best for the children in their own hometown, in an individual school district, in an individual home.

Would you agree?

Mr. HOSTETTLER. I would most assuredly agree with you.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. And I like your chart by the way. I did not get a chance to tell you that. But I think all the people that vote for the remainder of the welfare bill under block grants, but refuse to make this needed change should rethink their vote, because we think we need to be consistent; consistent with the Contract With America, consistent with the wishes of the American people, and consistent with the ideas and principles of the conservative party, the Republican party. Given America back to Americans. Thank you for letting me talk with you.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Thank you very much, sir.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSTETTLER. The Rules Committee is graciously allowing me to do my special order, and I would like to continue and conclude at this time. But there will be an opportunity later.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman will not yield.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for putting it so well. The local, State, and county governments know best. That is where our tax dollars come from, and we need to return the idea that they know what is best. Theirs is the resource of the money. Let them do things in their locales that they think is best.

There is a quote that says, "Welfare is a narcotic. A subtle destroyer of the human spirit." Who said this Mr. Speaker? Was it, A, Charles Murray; B, Ronald Reagan; or C, William F. Buckley? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is none of the above. The quote is from Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Who would you say, Mr. Speaker, has been least effective in meeting the needs of the poor? A, Mother Teresa; B, the United Way; C, the Salvation Army; or D, the Federal Government? If you formulated your answer based on dollars spent, you would probably choose one of the top three. But in answering the question, Who has been least effective in meeting the needs of the poor, the answer is clear. The Federal Government has failed.

Why, then, would we think of a federally run food stamp program as the ultimate social safety net as some are calling it? Marvin Olasky, in "The Tragedy of American Compassion," writes how charity workers deal with applicants for assistance. They start with the goal of answering one question: Who is bound to help in this case? Charity workers then called in relatives, neighbors or former coworkers or coworkers.

Relief given without reference to friends and neighbors is accompanied by moral loss. Mary Richmond of the Baltimore Charity Organization Society noted, and I quote, "Poor neighborhoods are doomed to grow poorer and more sordid whenever the natural ties of neighborliness are weakened by our well-meant but unintelligent interference."

Another minister said, quote: "Raising the money required specially on each case, though very troublesome, has immense advantages. It enforces family ties and neighborly or other duties instead of relaxing them."

The Federal Government does not do any of these things. The proposed plan for food stamps, while less of a budget strain than the current system, continues on with the Federal tradition of throwing money at the problem.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would ask that Members consider the idea of block granting food stamps and the idea that the Federal Government does not always know best and that State and local governments can best meet the needs, along with private and religious charities, to meet the needs of our neighbors. And I give back the balance of my time.

SAVE THE CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for yielding. And I am sorry the prior gentleman would not yield to me, because I had several things that I thought would have been a very interesting discussion.

I heard what he said about State and local government and that is where the money is raised, but he is asking us to raise it at the Federal level and then give it back to them to spend however they want with no strings attached.

And so I think I am the one standing here as the real conservative. I figure if they want to spend money with no strings attached, they ought to raise the money. Why in the world are we going through this system and then going up and down the elevator?

I think if we are raising the money here and we are giving it to localities to spend, we should be saying there should be nutritional guidelines. We should be saying to farmers who get subsidies from us that they ought to have a buy crop insurance rather than wait and if there is a disaster, the Federal Government bails them out.

If the State and local government want total say in how they spend money, then they have the right to go raise that money and they are on their own. So I found that really amazing.

I also wanted to point out to him, he was citing Governor Engler of Michigan. And on the wire service at this moment there is a story about Gov-

ernor Engler saying that conservative micromanagement is just as bad as liberal micromanagement. And he is pointing out that between the prison bill and the Republican welfare bill and many other things, they are micromanaging, but only they are micromanaging in their way. So let us clear the air of some of this politics.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise and say a few things. No. 1, I have on this Save the Children scarf. A lot of us are going to be wearing these next week. We never thought we were going to have to wear them for saving American children, but that is what we are doing. We are going to have to wear them to save American children because all of the sudden we are watching all sorts of programs that were their safety net being totally dismantled in the name of all sorts of political smoke and rhetoric that is blowing everywhere. And I think that is very unfair.

An awful lot of the cuts we pass today, and the things we will be doing next week, are going to go—and I am a Democrat, so I do not have as fancy a chart as he does—they are going to go for tax cuts. They are going to go for tax cuts, and these are supposed to be great things for America's families.

Yes, they are great if you make over \$100,000. If you make over \$100,000, this tax cut is going to mean \$1,223.23, on an average, per person. That is great.

However, if you make less than \$100,000, guess what? It is going to mean \$26.05. So for most Americans, I think this is a real distortion of what is happening.

I think too, when you look at where this comes from, again, what you see is 63 percent of the cuts that we are talking about are coming from only 12 percent of the programs. This is not across the board.

□ 1530

They are not cutting DOD. They are not cutting the space program. In fact, there are programs in the space program that went up as much as 400 percent. They are not cutting those programs. No, no, no. You are cutting children. Obviously children caused this debt. I do not remember that. I do not think children had anything to do with this debt. And I think to jeopardize their future is positively outrageous.

When you look at low income programs, you again see that when you break it down to discretionary low income programs, they got 15 percent of the cuts; other discretionary programs only got 1 percent of the cuts. Now, tell me how that spells fair? I do not think it spells fair at all.

I had a few other things to say on this 72d day of the contract. I know the gentleman from California wants to talk too. I will be yielding to him very shortly. But here we are on day 72 of the contract. We are seeing all sorts of ethics violations piling up in front of the Committee on Ethics. We are seeing all sorts of legislation that has not

really been thought out, coming down a conveyor belt like a bunch of cream pies hitting us in the face. They look like they were written by interns. They are admitted to have been put together by pollsters. No one knows how it is going to happen. It is stalled over on the Senate. They are busy ironing their togas and seeing if they can get around to dealing with this stuff, and everybody is hoping on them bailing us out.

This very day from my congressional district I am very sad to say that by the vote we passed today, we cut out all summer jobs for kids. Now, if we are going to go around and tell kids what to say no to, we better have something to say yes to. Last year we had 4,200 kids in the summer job program, and we had the safest summer we have seen in Colorado in a long time. Well, bye-bye. It is gone, and it is now March. Kids are going to get out of school in 2 months. I think that is outrageous.

We also lost training programs for 2,300 adults and another 1,500 youth programs that went all year-round.

The Denver public schools tell me what we did today, the Goals 2000 cuts are unbelievable. They will affect 35,000 elementary school children in Denver alone. And what will they affect? They are going to take away the science-related teaching. Oh, that is great. We are going to live in the 21st century without science-related teaching? That is terrific. Well, today we did it to 35,000 kids in my district in elementary school. If I sound mad, I am mad.

Let me tell you what else they did. In the Eisenhower Grant cuts they cut the math and science training for 2,000 teachers in my districts. I think if anything we need more math and science teachers in K through 12. We know if America is going to be competitive, that is one of the areas we are very weak in. So what do we do? We cut it.

I cannot understand this war on kids. I absolutely do not understand this war on kids, except they do not have political action committees to donate money to people running. They do not even vote, so I guess we figure they are the most vulnerable. But when you look at America's kitchen tables, they do everything they can to hold children economically harmless as long as possible. Here we put them in harm's way, rather than touch ourselves or touch some program that we are trying to preserve.

Now, many people will say oh, she is a liberal, she wants to vote for spending, and on and on and on. I will put the spending I voted against up against anybody else's spending, any day. One of the things I voted against over and over again was a thing called the super collider. Well, guess what? We were told we will never find the 8th quark, you are part of the flat earth caucus. This is absolutely terrible. We got to have a super collider.

Well, you know what? They found the eighth quark and we defunded the super collider. We found it without that massive program. Meanwhile, we

are going to cut science teachers for our kids so we will not even have scientists to look for that type of thing in the future if we keep going down this path.

We have heard all sorts of nostalgic talk about what is happening and where we are going. This session was begun with the Speaker throwing out the first orphan. Today we see him talking about how we are returning to Victorian values.

I remind people that those are beautiful pictures of Queen Victoria in her castle. But unless you were part of Queen Victoria and her family, the Victorian era was not such a good time. When you look at Dickens in his *Tale of Two Cities*, he talks about it was the best of time, but it was the worst of time; it was an age of wisdom, but it was also an age of foolishness; it was an age of light, and it was an age of darkness. I think we all remember that great novel, that reminded us that there was a Victorian underworld; that belief in the family was also accompanied by a high incidence of prostitution and all sorts of other things.

So what really happens is in the good old days we tend to only remember the good old part and we forget some of the bad old part. I do not think the Speaker or anyone in this body wants to go back to those kind of days. We have made a lot of progress in this country. We have said that our young children have the right to be safe, to be fed, and a right to dignity and a right to an education, and that should depend upon their citizenship, and not who their parents were. If our new message is to the kids, too bad, you should have picked richer parents, then we are in real trouble.

I know the gentleman from California wants to speak, and I am just about ready to yield to him, but I just want to remind everybody that the basic difference between what America was about and what other countries were about is we always said that in America you were what your children became, and in other countries you had no choice. You were what your parents were. So there was no option for you to grow out of that class or grow out of that rut that you were born into.

Here, the great American dream was the dream of your children becoming, your children doing bigger and better things that you than you were ever able to dream about. But they cannot do that if they are not well fed.

I want to tell you if I vote for money for nutrition programs, I want them to be nutritional. I do not want to give them to 50 States and say spend them any way you want, have a nice day. We collect it and send it to you.

I think most States do a good job, but some would rip it off. That is true with every other thing. If we have the responsibility of raising it, we have the responsibility of seeing that it is spent sensibly and correctly. And whenever there is any fraud, waste or abuse, we ought to attack it.

The gentleman from California has some fancier charts than I do. He got his made, so let me yield to him at this time, and I thank him for waiting patiently.

Mr. TUCKER. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding. I would submit to her that no matter how fancy my charts are, they could not in any way overcome what she has already said to this body, because you have been so accurate in your depiction about what is going on here. I would like to just take a few moments to really just dovetail on what you have said.

There is an attack on our children. If I have to wear one of those scarves, I guess I will too, certainly to make the point that there is a very insidious attack on our children right now.

So many talk about the Contract With America. But obviously there must be a contract out on our young people. That is why I want to talk this afternoon and this day about some of these attacks, and particularly in the wake of what we are going to be dealing with next week as it relates to what some call welfare reform, or as it is related in one of the plans of the Contract on America, the so-called Personal Responsibility Act.

I rise in strong opposition to this so-called Personal Responsibility Act. For many years now, Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans alike have talked about the fact that there are welfare recipients and Americans on opposite ends of the political spectrum and have all agreed on two things: No. 1, the welfare system is broken. We understand that. But No. 2, Mr. Speaker, and most importantly, we as Americans must change welfare as we know it and we must change it fairly.

The bill, as I read it, Mr. Speaker, fails in several ways to address the real problem. First, the bill erroneously assumes that the problem with welfare is that the people on welfare, the welfare recipients, just do not want to work. They are a bunch of lazy, shiftless, no good people who just do not want to work. That is what they want America to believe.

The reality, the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that 70 percent of those on welfare who receive welfare benefits, oh no, they are not welfare shyster fraudulent mothers. They are not crooks. They are not ripoff artists. They are children. They are our Nation's children. Seventy percent of them, I am going to say it again, because it is worth repeating, 70 percent of all welfare benefit recipients are children.

I have one of these charts just to illuminate this point. You can see there that the lion's share, and I think that is a good term since the kids like the Lion's King, I will throw that in, that the lion's share of welfare recipients are our children. Seventy percent. And that is significant. It is more than significant, because as we started talking about the facts, we need to dismantle

this notion that it is just a lot of adults bilking the system. Somebody has to stand up in this House and in this well to protect America's children.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado, has said it so aptly and so appropriately, that it is a battle to protect our children.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. We still have child labor laws as I remember, right? So the gentleman's point would be if we wanted everybody on welfare to work, we better quickly repeal the child labor laws.

Mr. TUCKER. I appreciate the gentlewoman's point. The remaining 30 percent are the mothers of these children and disabled persons. Second and most importantly to this body, and this body, as it has done in the past, is attempting to base new policy on the same false premise, and that premise is that if we cut these people off of welfare that will encourage them to work. We give them more pain, we give them more punishment; that will encourage them to work.

The reality, Mr. Speaker, is that the problem with welfare is this body's total abdication of its responsibility to deal openly and forthrightly with the cause of welfare. Once again, we run around here so often talking about the problems of America and what we have to do to solve them, but very infrequently do we get down to the real root causes of the problem. We put Band-aid solutions on things and we try to in some way shift the burden and say that now it is the States' problem, not our problem, but we never get to the root cause of the problem.

Well, what are we talking about? The problem is that these people, the recipients of welfare, need a job, need a livable wage, and that is something that is not in the Contract With America. That is something that we are not addressing ourselves to.

If we did address this problem openly, Mr. Speaker, we would find that what most welfare recipients want to do is they want an opportunity to work. They do not want a welfare check. They want to work. There is dignity in work. There is self-sufficiency in work. There is no shame in work. They just want an opportunity to work.

Now, this bill, Mr. Speaker, that is coming up next week does nothing to offer that. It does nothing to empower people. But it does everything to cut them off. It does everything to turn their backs, our backs on them. It does nothing to address those very important secondary impediments to welfare, mothers going to work. That is the need for day-care for their children, so they can go to work.

This past weekend I was home in my district, and I was talking to a young woman who had had a serious struggle with crack addiction, cocaine addiction. And one of the things that she said in one of these encounter groups, and she was recovering and realized that years of her life had been taken away, she had three kids and through

some programs out there, very needy programs, programs that are in jeopardy because of the kind of rescissions we made this week on the House floor, through these programs she had an opportunity to pick herself up, she had an opportunity to finally have some straps to pull her boots up by, and she said that it was very important that she had child care. Because without child care, she could not realize her dream of one day becoming a nurse. She thought her dreams had all turned to nightmares, but she needed some support.

Child care is not in this Personal Responsibility Act; it is not in that bill. So without child care, once again, we are not getting to the root causes of the problem. We are merely sweeping the dust under the rug.

There is another thing that is not in this bill, and that is health care. We need health care for these welfare recipients, if we are going to make people whole. Yes, we had a debate last year about health care and some people said we were doing too much, some people said the Government was too involved in it. But one thing nobody could deny was that at least 37 million Americans did not have health care, and millions more were under-insured.

There are a lot of Americans out there. Some of them might be your relatives, your cousins, your friends, your family. They do not have health care. It is very difficult to survive. It is very difficult when something, God forbid, should happen to you or your loved one, and there is a choice between actually working, living, and being able to get some type of treatment.

□ 1545

Further, Mr. Speaker, the bill fails to invest the resources in job training and education necessary, vital to equip welfare mothers to compete for the jobs that are available.

So what we are saying is, in essence, this; that if we are going to have a serious, comprehensive, effective and a real and a valid Personal Responsibility Act, then let's give people something that they can be responsible with. Either we are going to provide them with jobs or we are going to provide them with the job training that will help them get the jobs that are already out on the job market. It has got to be one or the other, because you can't just cut people off and not provide them with something that they can get onto.

It reminds me so much of the debate that goes on about drugs and this whole notion of how we are going to get our young people to get off drugs and get away from crime, which we know that so many of our crimes are drug related, and that is, it is not just a question of what we are telling our young people to say no to. It is a matter of what we are telling them to say yes to.

The same people who take this House floor telling our young people, say no to drugs, drugs are bad, say no to them,

but yet they are the same people who will cut AmeriCorps, who will stand on this floor, punch that machine and cut a program that will allow our young people to go out and to move into higher levels of education by being able to collateralize that with giving back to their community with community services, teaching and working in community centers. It is double minded and it is double tongued.

We cannot have it both ways. Either we are going to invest in America and invest in Americans or we might as well just be honest and say that we are not our brother's keeper and we do not care about our fellow man anymore.

We have got to provide this means of jobs or this means of job training. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that the Personal Responsibility Act as a bill guarantees to our children is that once their parents have used their allotted benefits, that is it, it is over, no mas. There is no other safety net for these families or their children and my colleague spoke about that so readily.

This is what we are talking about. Someone has to stand up and be responsible. If we are talking about the Personal Responsibility Act, doggone it, the U.S. Congress has got to take some responsibility first and we have got to lead by example. We have to take responsibility for our Nation's children.

So no matter what happens to the Nation's economy or the economy of any particular State, no matter what happens with your personal circumstances, regardless of your efforts to secure employment, it doesn't matter. That is it, no more benefits. When you are cut off, you are cut off that is no kind of way to have a responsible government.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would abolish the entitlement status of those essential programs that protect our children from hunger and from homelessness. We talk all the time about wishing that we had less homeless people, but the reality is that with every action, there is a reaction. With every act, there is a consequence, and Mr. Speaker, if we pass this Personal Responsibility Act without child care, without health care, without jobs and without job training, without some type of entitlement status and guarantee for these people who, for whatever reason, on a temporary basis can't do better, then what we are doing is, we are just turning our backs on them and we are advocating and promoting homelessness.

Now, we all do not see it right now, but the streets will be flooded with people without a job, without a home, languishing and laying in the streets, and where does the responsibility for that Responsibility Act lie? It lies right here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that no longer are poor children guaranteed that they will grow up with a

roof over their head and food in their mouths. Oh, yes, America, land of the free and home of the brave. We are going to take care of our little ones, take care of our elderly, and yet with this Personal Responsibility Act, with one fell swoop, we send these young children without a roof over their head, without clothes on their back, and without food on the table.

Somewhere I remember some great man once said, "suffer the little children and forbid them not." What we will do if we pass this act, we will push those little ones aside. We will push them out. We will turn our backs on them. In fact, what our children are guaranteed, Mr. Speaker, in this bill is that their basic health care and nutrition needs will now be subject to individual State priorities at each new Congress' view about their mothers and their willingness to work. No guarantee.

What we will do in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is decide that welfare and single mothers and their children are the root of all evil in society, and if we are to ever balance the budget, we must get these pariahs off the road. No guarantee.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I want to thank the gentleman for his very, very, wonderful statement, and I thought his point about child care was excellent.

When I was one of the cochairmen of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, back when we were allowed to have those, back when we were freer, I guess, we asked the Government Accounting Office to look at what happened in programs that gave women, the mothers you are talking about, the 30 percent, a 100 percent voucher for child care reimbursement, did it affect their work. Guess what—158 percent of them on their work. You don't have to be a rocket scientist to figure this out, but the gentleman is absolutely right.

Those mothers, most of them would like to go to work, but you can't leave your children at home, and if you would give them a child care voucher, then they can. But your point is, they are not, so you beat on them for staying home, and yet, they let the children home alone, you beat on them for doing that. There is nothing they can do that is right, and I thank you for pointing this out. You are doing a great job.

Mr. TUCKER. I thank the gentleman for pointing that statistic out because certainly this Congress, though it might be cutting conscious, though it might be conscious of making the budget leaner, it should not make Government meaner.

We have a responsibility to Americans and we have a responsibility particularly to our children. When the gentlewoman was talking earlier about the assault on America, the assault on our children, the assault on lower- and middle-income programs and people, and she was mentioning with quite a bit of dexterity the cuts that came down on this floor, I would like to, in

one of these charts, show another example of some of the cuts that happened.

The same people who talk about the Responsibility Act, the same people who talk about that word responsibility, this is what is being done to America. It is not a Contract With America. It is a contract on America. It is Robin Hood in reverse. It is taking from the poor and giving to the rich. We all know what it is all about. Yes, I would like to have a tax cut. Everybody would like to have a tax cut, but not on the backs of the needy and the poor people in this country who can ill afford, who can least afford to be burdened any further.

Look at the kind of cuts that we are talking about. We are talking about programs like the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, a program whose function was pure in its concept. It was to help low-income people who could not afford to pay their energy bill, who could not afford to pay that heating bill in the cold months of the year, these people on fixed incomes who just need a little help. Not welfare. They just need some support. A \$1.3 billion cut. And what is the consequence of that? Low-income elderly people freezing in the wintertime. America, land of the free, home of the brave.

What about this cut? Job training programs, oh, yes, there is another wasteful welfare program. Let's not train our people to work. Let's not train our people to be prepared for the 21st century, as the gentlewoman from Colorado pointed out. We talk about the supercollider, but yet we do not want to teach our young kids basic science. Look at this cut, \$2.3 billion cut, and the consequence of that cut, what is the consequence? Almost 800,000 youth, once again, an attack and an assault on our young people, almost 800,000 youth, adults, will be displaced, and displaced workers will not get job training and summer jobs.

Do not blame the Democratic Party when you see all these young people out there in the streets and you want to know why somebody is stealing the hubcaps off your cars, why somebody is burglarizing your house, why somebody is putting graffiti all over across town and your property values are going down. Do not blame us because your young people in your community do not have anything to do this summer, do not have any training and cannot get a job, because of the \$2.3 billion cut that just cuts job training programs and disallows these young people or displaced workers, and you might be some of those displaced workers. I had a lot of them out in California from the aerospace industry trying to find a job, trying to redirect their careers.

Third one, look at this one, a \$1.6 billion cut of the safe and drug-free schools, Goals 2000 and School-to-Work Programs, all laudable, well worthwhile programs, meritorious programs, what happens? A \$1.6 billion cut. The consequence? More drugs in our schools

and fewer dollars to fight crime and drugs.

Nobody likes to see the deficit balloon. Nobody likes to see the debt go up, but at some point we have got to take responsibility about the things that are important for this Nation. These programs are not throwaway programs. These programs are programs that say, if you don't pay me now, you are going to have to pay me later. It is just that simple, and I don't know where anybody gets off thinking for one moment that just because you cut, that this problem goes away. The problems go away; they come back compounded. You are going to pay 10, 20, 30 times more trying to clean up the mess.

Mr. Speaker, the reality of welfare is not only that 70 percent of all welfare recipients are our Nation's children, but the reality of welfare is that 70 percent of all welfare recipients are off of welfare in 2 years and only 12 percent of all welfare recipients stay on welfare for more than 5 years, and I happen to have a chart to elucidate this.

As you can see, 50 percent of all the recipients leave welfare in 1 year. Of all welfare recipients, 70 percent get off of welfare in 2 years, and 88 percent, far above the majority, leave welfare within 5 years. What are we saying? These declarations, these representations that say that all these people, it is just a lifelong thing, they are bilking the system, it is a career, these people are career rip-off artists, this is a program that not only deals with our young people, but it also deals with people who have hit some hard times, and I believe that everybody out there is just one step away from hitting some hard times, or at least most Americans are.

Most Americans live from paycheck to paycheck. At some point in time, those who are lower and middle income have some hard times. Yes, they may need 1 year; yes, they may need 2 years; yes, they may need a few years, 5 years, but the reality is that welfare is a transitional program.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am so glad to see the gentleman's chart, because I think every one of us who have been trying to discuss this issue gets so frustrated by the misinformation and the disinformation floating around, and it reminds me of last week when we were all trying to deal with the product liability bill and people kept talking about the Girl Scouts, the Girl Scouts, how the Girl Scouts wanted this, and if you remember, the Girl Scouts were in the Wall Street Journal day after day saying, no, no, no, no, no; that is all being made up.

We need like a truth squad on this floor. So I am glad that the gentleman from California is being a truth squad and pointing it out. That is not to say there are not some people who abuse it, but it is a very, very small percentage. It is not like a huge largess spraying out there.

□ 1600

Most people are embarrassed to be on welfare, cannot wait to get off welfare, and want to do everything they can to improve themselves.

Mr. TUCKER. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution. Certainly she is correct, that we have to set the record straight. There has been so much. If there is an abuse here, it has been the abuse of information, it has been the abuse of the truth to the American public; people telling others welfare is just the biggest ripoff there is.

The reality is that, yes, there are those in our society, in segments of our society, who are in need and who need transitional help. This shows us just how temporary the transition is.

Mr. Speaker, why would this body base welfare policy on the 12 percent of people who go over 5 years? If 88 percent of the people are off by 5 years, there are only 12 percent of the people who stay on welfare over 5 years. Why this body would base welfare policy on that 12 percent of the people is beyond me.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, the Personal Responsibility Act, would require, or, as we like to say in Washington, it would mandate that States deny AFDC permanently to families where the children were born after this bill's passage to unmarried mothers younger than age 18. States would also have the option to deny assistance to children born to unmarried mothers younger than 21. What that means is that the States would have an option to punish the children, to punish the children, just because a mother had them under age.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague indicated, the children do not have a right to pick when they come into this world. They do not have a right to pick who their parents are. However, because of the distorted and perverse notion of responsibility that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are proffering, the children, once again, will end up having to pay for the pregnancy of their parents.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would allow States to eliminate all cash benefits to families who have received aid for 2 years, and would permanently bar such families from any future aid if the parent had participated in the work program for at least 1 year, so they can dance around this. They can give them a work program for 1 year, and after that they can forever and ever bar them from any future participation or future benefits in the program. It is just a loophole to getting them off the basis of support.

Such families would definitely suffer. After 5 years, States would be required or mandated to terminate permanently the family from cash assistance. The State, even if it wanted to continue cash payments, would be directed by Washington to deny the benefits.

In both of these cases, the contract on Americans would allow children and

families to be left without any cash help or a public service job, even when the parent was willing to work but unable to find work in the private sector.

There is an interesting situation and an interesting scenario. Here is a scenario where someone is willing to work, cannot find work, but they are still going to be cut off and still going to be punished by this new wonderful Responsibility Act.

An even more ominous provision in this assault on America's children would take the savings generated by denying assistance to the unmarried teens and their children and use those same funds to build orphanages for those children, or group homes for those children and their teen parents rendered destitute by this bill.

So many people talk about what is going on in Washington: the 100 days, we are moving forward, we are moving fast. Yes, we are moving fast. We are moving nowhere fast. As my colleague said, it was the best of times.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Maybe we are moving backwards fast, back to the Victorian age.

Mr. TUCKER. That is right, we are moving backwards fast, because backwards is nowhere, it is a place called nowhere. We are moving so fast that we do not realize that we are moving backwards, and backwards is nowhere to be. It is nowhere we want to be, because it is where we have already been, and that is why we left it.

Mr. Speaker, we know what happened in the days of orphanages. We have these people who take the floor and somehow try to glamorize Dickens, somehow try to glamorize Boy's Town, somehow try to glamorize the concept of an orphanage. That is like trying to glamorize a whorehouse; it is nice, it is a place of comfort and refuge.

No matter what words you put on it, no matter what semantics you use, no matter what window dressing you use, an orphanage is still an orphanage. Why can we not, as a country, wake up to our responsibility, to our children in this country, and realize, yes, we have to cut the deficit.

The argument that our colleagues use for cutting the deficit, do you know what the argument they use is? It is always our children, "We don't want to mortgage this debt on our children. We don't want to have the ignoble responsibility of going down in history as that generation that left a multi-billion dollar deficit and multi-trillion dollar debt to our children. We are mortgaging our children's future."

That is what we hear on the floor of Congress every day. Therefore, if they are so concerned about our children, why don't they show it?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is going right to the core of it. What we are doing in the name of the children, we are also doing it to the children. You have a financial deficit, and to deal with that, we are going to create a human deficit.

We are into this very mean thing where the adults are saying, "We are not going to give up anything we have, thank you very much, take it out on the children." Hey, where is that fair? These kids did not create that deficit.

There is no one in this country, I think, that feels we can compete in the 21st century without more education and without kids that are healthy and well fed. We know if they are healthy and well fed they do better in school. We can go on and on and on.

Yet, what are we doing? They are the first out of the budget, the first out of the budget. Again, that is why we are wearing "Save the Children" scarves. I know we have a tie for the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER], so we will tie one on you and get you enlisted on this.

Mr. TUCKER. Thank you. I will wear it. I think the gentlewoman expressed the point so aptly, that our children do not have the big lobbying firms. They are not this powerful special interest that can come up here and fight. That is why we have to be a voice for the voiceless; that is why we have to talk about this, because it is our Nation's children that are being exploited.

Mr. Speaker, is it not interesting that when we talk about that kind of deficit, what we are talking about is the fact that we cannot only be concerned about being economically bankrupt as a government, but we also have to be concerned about being morally bankrupt. If we turn our backs on our Nation's children, this Nation, this great Nation, will not progress and will not fare well.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, as we talk about the fact that it is open season on the poor and on our children, and in fact those who sent many of us here to Washington to protect them, we must understand that this welfare is not about long-term bilking the system, it is not about people who do not want to work.

In fact, another important point, setting the record straight about welfare, and as is the case so often with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they have a tendency to bring up and to proffer these race-baiting wedge issues. Welfare is not a black issue. It is not just a woman's issue. It is not a black issue. It is not just a white issue. It is an issue that relates to Americans in need.

Let us set the record straight on this. The racial composition of AFDC recipients: 18 percent are Hispanic, 37 percent are African-American, and 39 percent are non-Hispanic white Americans. It is interesting, though, that every time you see the images and you see the "stereotypical welfare recipient," it is somebody black, it is somebody brown.

Therefore, this issue is not a black issue. This issue is not a welfare fraud mother issue. This issue is 70 percent, once again, the recipients are children, the recipients are poor, the recipients are needy. The recipients are not lazy.

The recipients are people who want to work.

Unless we are going to take the kind of responsibility that we should take as leaders of this country, to be honest with the American people, to be truthful with the American people, and then to be responsible for America's children, then we should not be serving here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time to give America what I feel is an honest assessment and an honest appraisal of what the welfare system is and what kind of reform we need in this system. I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado, for joining me, because certainly I will wear that tie and I will wear it proudly.

I hope that before it is all over, we can tie some responsibility, some real responsibility onto Republicans who stand on this floor and tell us that the best way to solve our problems in this country is to punish and to cut off. No, the best way to solve our problems in this country is to reach out.

Mr. Speaker, it is not so much that these people need a handout. What they need is a hand, and not just in money. They need us to reach out to them and to let them know that this America is for them, too. That is why they need health care, that is why they need child care, that is why they need job training, and that is why they need jobs, so they can realize their dreams, just like everybody else in America wants to realize theirs. Then we will not have to worry about wasting so much time talking about who is ripping off the system.

It is interesting how my colleagues always talk about eradicating or bringing down the deficit or the national debt. Maybe if we did more to empower some of our welfare recipients, they would become working, empowered American citizens who would be putting more into the government till, and thereby raising our revenues and bringing down the deficit and bringing down the national debt.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say what a privilege it is to yield to the gentleman from California, because there is some good news today. I think we are going to have to keep doing these kinds of things. The good news is that I think we had a meltdown on meanness. When we voted on the rescissions, although we did not win, we had 200 votes. We got six Republican votes with us.

Often I wondered if they had an MRI and could not have a heart bigger than a swollen pea, but apparently they do not have an MRI machine. Apparently that is not part of the membership. I think people are waking up and finding out what these issues are that are coming at us very fast. I think that is part of the strategy, send them so fast they cannot find out.

The gentleman staying here late in the afternoon to talk about this I think is very important, and I think by having gotten 200 votes more than we

have gotten all this time on day 72 says that people are beginning to wake up and say "Not our children. Hands off our children," and we will wear these scarves, even though we thought they were for other countries, but we now find out they are for ours. Maybe we can make a change.

Mr. TUCKER. If the gentlewoman will yield, I want to applaud her for her consistent and long-standing fight, not only to protect our children, but to protect the interests of those who are in need. Certainly, your point is well taken, that when America wakes up to the reality of what these rescissions have done, the people will start to understand that it is not just your neighbor that was cut, it is not just your friend or it is not just the person in the other State that had a devastating impact from these cuts, but that indeed, these cuts are across the board.

When we look at things like the School Lunch Program, this goes all over the Nation. It is across the board. When we look at things like welfare, they are people that you know that will be affected. When you look at the job training programs, people you know will be affected.

When America wakes up from its wild night partying and having a good time, it will find out that the hangover was not worth it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH wants to move America back, back to the fifties—back to the 1850's.

Earlier this week, the Speaker announced that America needs to be more like Victorian England, whose heyday was in the mid-1800's.

I have a difficult time believing that the Speaker wants to take us back to another age, much less another country—the one we waged our revolution against.

But it is more difficult for me to believe that the Speaker, who prides himself on being a futurist, who claims to be a surfer of the third wave of information, who by his own admission was a free thinker of the sixties, and continues to use the tactics and language of the sixties, actually prefers to reinvent Victorian England here in America.

As Dickens spoke of that age in his opening paragraph of "A Tale of Two Cities" in 1859:

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epic of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us. * * *

The Victorian Age was great for the privileged few and awful for just as many. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, "There was always a Victorian underworld." Belief in the family was accompanied by a high incidence of prostitution, and in every large city there were districts where every Victorian virtue was ignored or flouted.

But I do not think Speaker GINGRICH literally wants to go back to Victorian England. He just wants to get back to the good old days of America.

The good old days. What were the good old days of the late 1800's like in America?

Otto Bettman in his book, "The Good Old Days," points out:

The good old days were good, but for the privileged few. For the farmer, the laborer, the average breadwinner, life was an unremitting hardship. This segment of the populace was exploited or lived in the shadow of total neglect, and youth had no voice.

And that is why I took this time today, to remind people that we don't want to go back to the days of orphanages, chronic diseases, polluted air, unsafe food, and unremitting hardships.

The 1990's more than any other decade of our history has to be one of hope, opportunity for all, and prosperity.

But as soon as Speaker GINGRICH began this new means season of politics by throwing out the first orphan when he floated his idea of Federal orphanages for children of the poor, I know that this was going to be rocky years for those of us who have put into place in America an infrastructure for America's kids.

Over the past 20 years, our Federal Government has made a commitment to our young children that they have a right to be safe, a right to be fed, and a right to dignity.

We have been able to put teeth into those promises. We put into place a school lunch program. We made child abuse treatment and prevention a national priority and committed resources to that end. We put in money and standards for children in childcare programs whose mother must work.

We made great strides for kids. And still, the amount of Federal dollars and resources we dedicate to them in paltry. In the 1980's budget commitments for kids were dwarfed by our investments in defense, highways, you name it.

But now the Republican rescissions threaten these modest gains as well as other progress our country has made for kids.

The majority of these rescissions are aimed at children and the elderly. The Republicans slash the women, infants, and children program that provides basic food and nutrition to pregnant women and children—even though this program saves more than three times its cost by eliminating the need for crisis health and prenatal care.

This move becomes even more unfair when you compare it to the risk-assessment legislation Republicans have passed so that their wealthy supporters can get out from regulations they don't want. If the principle of cost-effectiveness is good enough for their rich friends, why isn't it good enough for America's children?

The Republicans also cut programs to increase safety and reduce drug abuse in our schools. The Republicans eliminate more than 100,000 college scholarships and more than 600,000 summer jobs for young people.

The cuts against the elderly are just as bizarre, to use the Speaker's terminology. They cut housing for the elderly. They totally eliminate a heat assistance program for the elderly.

But batten down the hatches, folks. Just wait to you see next week's grotesquery. Under the Republican Welfare Reform Act, we are going to block grant our kid's lives away. We are folding programs that help battered, beaten, and neglected children into one grant, cutting that money, and shipping it off to the States. America is telling our kids: you are not

our problem. Our Federal guarantee to you is null and void, superseded by the Republicans' Contract for America.

If the Welfare Reform and Consolidation Act is enacted, funding will be cut by an estimated \$2.5 billion over 5 years. At that rate, in the year 2000, families of over 350,000 children will be without Federal child care assistance.

The Republican welfare bill is tough on kids and poor on work.

The Democrat proposal is great on kids and tough on work. It's a program where people work and one that honors children.

Welfare reform cannot happen without parents ability to work. The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, which I cochaired last year and this Republican Congress has since killed, released a GAO study last year that demonstrates the importance of child care subsidies in determining whether or not low-income mothers will participate in the labor force.

The GAO found that given a 100 percent child care allowance, low-income mothers' work participation could increase by 158 percent. These results show that if we expect mothers to successfully leave welfare, we must be prepared to guarantee adequate child care subsidies. The best catalyst for getting women off welfare is good child care.

But this Republican bill goes the direct opposite way. It decimates child care. It removes requirements for minimum health and safety standards for child care assistance. This at a time when all the research and polls show that safe child care is a top priority for American working parents.

Not only are they hurting children's safety by doing away with such standards, but as a taxpayer, I don't want to spend precious Federal dollars on unsafe child care.

In addition, there are no funds for States to use to improve quality and no funds for school age child care.

The bill ends the guarantee that children in child care centers, family child care homes, Head Start, and before and after school programs will receive nutritious meals. The new Family Base Nutrition Block Grant cuts funds by close to \$5 billion over the next 5 years.

The result will be: More children suffering from poor nutrition; costs for parents and providers will soar; and less incentives for family child care providers to become license or registered.

So now, Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to understand why you would like to go back to Victorian England where shame ruled the day. Because under your Contract With America, shame will rule the day. But the shame will be Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say that I found the comments by the gentleman from California also very interesting. I think an important part of this debate as we move toward welfare reform, I certainly learned a lot just from listening to him the last few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Clean Water Act, which I would like to discuss at this point, has brought us very far since its inception in 1972. It is particularly important in my district, because many of the municipalities that I represent

are on the ocean or on the rivers or on the bay, in my case, the Raritan Bay.

Yet if we look at the Clean Water Act and we look at an overall report card about its effectiveness, we would still have to say that it is incomplete; that it would achieve a grade of incomplete, over the course of its inception in 1972. We still have a long way to go.

Today I have introduced the Clean Water Enforcement and Compliance Improvement Act Amendments of 1995. This is an act or a bill that I am reintroducing from the last session. It targets what I call bad actors, those corporations or municipal authorities that have consistently violated their water quality permits. The bill rights the Clean Water Act enforcement wrong in the States that allows permit violators and the States that overlook these violations to reap economic benefits through their misbehavior.

Basically, we are trying to send a message with this bill that it does not pay to pollute. The problem is that too often, because of noncompliance or because of insufficient penalties, it is easier to pollute and to violate your water quality permits and pay the fines, rather than try to achieve compliance with the Clean Water Act.

□ 1615

The key to the penalty structure that is introduced in my bill is that civil penalties will be required to recover, at a minimum, the economic benefits of Clean Water Act violations. Regulations for calculating this economic benefit would be established by the EPA. It should be noted that both the Government Accounts Office and the EPA Inspector General have reported that current penalties do not reflect or recover the economic benefits of Clean Water Act noncompliance. My bill will correct this crucial flaw in present enforcement procedures.

I should also point out that we have introduced and passed in New Jersey an enforcement act that was very similar on a State level to what I am trying to do with the Clean Water Act on the Federal level, and those enforcement amendments have been very effective in upgrading water quality and bringing about better compliance in the State of New Jersey.

The bill sets up a mandatory penalty for serious violators that exceeds pollution effluent limitations by a specific percentage. If the frequency of these violations increase, the penalty also increases.

Finally, penalties collected are placed in a clean water trust fund to be established within the U.S. Treasury. These moneys would be available for use by the EPA administrator for better inspection and enforcement.

We have found that inspection also is something that we need to do a better job of. My bill deters Clean Water Act noncompliance not only by penalizing violators but by helping to stop violations before they occur through more rigorous inspection and reporting pro-

cedures. Frequent self-monitoring and reporting have been shown to help facilities achieve and maintain compliance with the Clean Water Act.

Again, if we look at the State of New Jersey we can see that the increased enforcement and inspection have had an effect on compliance and has increased this goal within my home State. As the bill provides, the worst violators are the ones subject to the most stringent inspection. Minimum inspection standards to be established by EPA and random inspections would be required.

Finally, the bill promotes more rigorous enforcement by empowering citizens to enforce the Clean Water Act. Many of my colleagues I am sure know that much of the enforcement of the Clean Water Act is done by private citizens, or grass roots citizen organizations. Since 1988 citizens have recovered for the U.S. Treasury over \$1 million in penalties and interest from environmental law violations. This bill gives citizens access to permanent compliance information. It also establishes posting provisions which increase citizens' awareness of water quality standard noncompliance as well as the resulting environmental and health effects and any fishing or shellfishing bans, advisories, or consumption restrictions.

Most importantly, the bill expands citizens' abilities to bring actions for violations, including past violations.

As a result of the bill I am introducing today, Clean Water Act violations would not longer be allowed to sabotage our efforts to achieve water quality goals, especially not at the expense of those States and facilities that act responsibly. We cannot continue to turn a blind eye to bad actors. To do so is to essentially turn our backs on years of effort and hundreds of billions of dollars spent to improve the quality of the Nation's water resources.

Again, we have made great strides with the Clean Water Act but there is no question we need better enforcement and better inspections.

The bill ensures efficacy in enforcement and equality in compliance. Moreover, it would bring us that much closer to achieving our water quality goals.

I know in this Congress there have been a lot of efforts to make some changes in our environmental laws. Some of the legislation we have passed in the first 100 days in my opinion has actually sent us far back, if it is ultimately enacted into law, in terms of dealing with environmental quality and environmental enforcement. We hope that in the next 100 days of the Congress that we would seek to turn that around and achieve better enforcement not only with the Clean Water Act but with many of our other environmental laws, and I think this bill will go far toward improving water quality and improving the Clean Water Act.

I again thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I must say as I wind down this hour that I think on day 72 we have had a very interesting discussion here about some of the things that happened in those first 72 days. The gentleman's attempt to try and get things back on course as we attain clean water, and the attempt that we have been talking about here to try and get things back on course in our commitment to children I think is very, very critical.

This is going to be a very exciting weekend. I think that going home on day 72 with the fact that we finally got up to 200 votes because enough members said no, those rescissions went much too far, you should not take from the poorest to give tax cuts to the richest; that is wrong, it gets us in a much better frame of mind to work on all of the issues that will be in front of this Congress next week when we will be dealing with very tough issues on welfare and nutrition issues that we have been discussing.

I think more and more people around the country are talking about it. As I said, this Sunday there will be many Members serving a lunch here on Capitol Hill, thousands of children are coming in, we are going to try to encircle the Capitol, we are going to be talking about these are our future, these children are our future, and if we do not care about them we are in real trouble. We often talk about natural resources being timber and coal and oil; well, yes, they are, but there is no natural resource as important to the sustenance of this country and the future as our children. They are our greatest natural resource.

So there will be that great event going on here this Sunday. And as I say, the Members serving will be wearing these and wearing ties and we are hoping to also go back to our districts, as I will be. We will be talking to the local people there and we hope to only keep building that number. If we can get it from 200 to 219 we can say stop, stop this war on children, let us go back and let us look at where we ought to be cutting.

Yes, we should have cut the super collider a long time ago. We put a lot of money in that hole in the ground and they found the quark without it.

Yes, we can cut an awful lot of programs in America's space program. We put a 400-percent increase in some of the things. Nobody in the world can spend a 400-percent increase efficiently.

Come on; get a clue. No, we do not need to do star wars and some of the other commitments that people have made, not when the Berlin Wall has come down and we are living in an entirely different generation.

The issues in defense are what is the threat out there, and if we are spending more than almost the whole rest of the world combined is on defense and we cannot find a way to defend ourselves

spending that much money we are in real trouble.

Those are the kind of debates we should have rather than this meanness and this attitude of picking on those who are least able to fight back.

I think there is a lot of anxiety in this society right now, anxiety about where they are going to go in the future, what kind of job are they going to have, will their lives be better. I understand that and I think every single American has some degree of that anxiety.

But being mean to kids is certainly not going to lessen America's anxiety. We ought to be looking at what we can do here to make people's lives better.

I introduced a bill I think would help, and that is to allow Americans to be able to bid off the same health care program we have. Why should they not be able to bid off of that same menu that every Member of Congress, every Federal employee, Federal retiree, the President, every one else bids off of? That says to them you can have our choices. It allows them to stop.

We have been reading this week about Members putting folks on their payroll for 1 month out of the year for \$100 so that person gets the option to bid off our health care benefits. Well hey, we cannot do that for everybody in America, we cannot put them all on our payroll. That does not make sense. This ought to be available.

Think of what creative energy that would free up for Americans and some of the tensions it would take off Americans who feel locked in their job because if they quit their job they are afraid they will lose their health care insurance, or locked in their job because they have health care now but if they went somewhere else they would have what is now called a preexisting condition, or someone who cannot quit and become self-employed because they know that if they are self-employed they will not have health care.

Think of that harness that absolutely stymies the creative energy in this country. It does not allow people to go where they think they could make the best contribution to society or make the most money for their family. Health care is a real anchor around their necks.

We did not deal with it last year. This is a way we could deal with it. It would alleviate only some of the anxiety families have. But it is that kind of anxiety we ought to be analyzing and trying to address, because when we allow it to build and build and build, then what we end up doing as a society is becoming Bosnia, where we are looking around trying to find who we can blame, who we can yell at, who we can throw radio epithets at over talk show hosts, how we can energize people to go hate. And I tell you, if we keep doing that this society comes apart.

But those who attack a child are shameless. Attacking a child and attacking a child who has no way to fight back is absolutely wrong.

When you look at every other part of the Western world, they do so much more for their children, it is embarrassing. I only hope we begin to look at that, we look at the mirror, we talk about what we are doing, and we also take our mind off our ingrown toenail and start looking at the horizon ahead of us and saying what are these programs to do as we march this country toward the future.

So I thank all of you for tolerating us in this interesting discussion we have had about children, the future, where we are going. I also must say I do end on a more positive note than I thought I would because I think the votes came out a lot better, and it says educating and talking is beginning to work.

Let us only do more of it.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from Thursday, March 16, 1995, to Tuesday, March 21, 1995.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TUCKER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

APPOINTMENT OF EMPLOYEES TO REVIEW PANEL FOR THE OFFICE OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KIM) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, March 15, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with House Rule LI, Clause 7(a) (2), in my capacity as Democratic Leader, I appoint the following House employees to the review panel for the Office of Fair Employment Practices: Karen Nelson, Office of Congressman Waxman, and Marda Robillard, Office of Congressman Dingell.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of illness.