



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 1995

No. 52

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BONILLA]

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 21, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable HENRY BONILLA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leaders limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for 5 minutes.

RESOLUTION BARRING ELIMINATION OR CUT OF COMMISSARY AND EXCHANGE SERVICES

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, next month the Contract With America will reach its 100-day conclusion. At a time when Congress is acting on this contract, I rise to discuss another more enduring and longstanding contract with our active and retired members of the Armed Forces. Under this contract, the Government has agreed to provide commissary and exchange services to active and retired uniformed men and women as a form of indirect pay for

their service and sacrifice. This contract has lasted more than 100 days. In fact, the commissary system dates back to 1825 when it was provided to service military personnel at remote posts where provisions were very expensive. Recent proposals to reduce or eliminate commissary and exchange services would jeopardize this contract.

Today I am introducing a concurrent resolution that will send a message that any elimination or cut in the commissary and exchange systems would be a breach of faith with our active and retired men and women in uniform and that if any reduction is enacted, then other forms of compensation should be paid to offset this loss.

The Department of Defense commissary and exchange system are proven parts of the military compensation package and contribute significantly to the morale and well-being of our men and women in uniform and their families. It is critical in retaining experienced members, it is valuable in recruiting new members, and reduces expenditures by the Federal Government for training and recruiting or for direct compensation which would have to be increased in order to maintain the same retention rate.

Commissaries and exchanges are critical in recruiting and retaining quality personnel and continue to be highlighted as a valuable aspect of military service. Among Armed Forces personnel, commissary privileges consistently rank among the top three benefits of military service, particularly among married personnel, and is one of the major factors in a service member's decision to remain in the armed services. The patron base includes 12 million individuals including active duty military, military retirees, selected and ready reserves, Medal of Honor recipients, 100-percent-disabled veterans, overseas civil service, and all their dependents.

For many of my constituents on Guam and for service men and women throughout the Nation, commissaries and exchanges translate into indirect pay for military families. A reduction would also translate into an erosion for many of quality-of-life facilities available to these individuals and their families. Profits from the exchange system are used to support many quality-of-life improvements such as the operation of youth centers, arts and crafts centers, recreational areas, and child development centers. Eliminating this exchange dividend would result in reductions in the quality-of-life facilities available to our armed services at a time when there have been many concerns raised about these issues.

The resolution that I am introducing today expresses the sense of Congress that first, if the commissary and exchange systems of the DOD are reduced or eliminated, the funds derived from the reduction or elimination should be used to increase other forms of compensation for current and retired members of the Armed Forces.

Second, the resolution states that if exchange stores are reduced or eliminated, funds should be provided by the Department of Defense to upgrade and avoid the erosion of morale, welfare and recreation activities, and other quality-of-life facilities provided to military personnel. The resolution ensures that the indirect pay on which service men and women rely will not be reduced and that the quality-of-life improvements on which the current system relies will not be eroded.

Most importantly, this resolution sends the message that a reduction in commissary and exchange systems would be a breach of faith in current and retired members who have earned this indirect pay through years of faithful service.

Let's make sure that we don't breach the more longstanding contract that

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H3329

all of us have with active and retired members of the Armed Forces. I invite and urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important resolution and to join me in support of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. VOLKMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I would be glad to join with the gentleman in his resolution. I know that probably one of the reasons that we see this type of resolution coming forward is concern with what is going on as far as budgetary cuts that are occurring here in the Congress at this time by the majority party; is that correct?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. We have seen a proposal that we saw in the defense rescissions bill that will cut back severely on veterans who have served this country in the past, to cut back medical care facilities for veterans that was proposed by the majority party; correct?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That was correct, in last week's rescission bill. I urge all Members to cosponsor this resolution.

AMENDMENT PROHIBITING DESECRATION OF OLD GLORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would love to respond to the last statement, but I will wait.

Mr. Speaker, today I will be introducing a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment prohibiting the physical desecration of the American flag. I am happy to say that this effort has received wide support from my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress, including my good friend SONNY MONTGOMERY standing over here, Senator ORRIN HATCH over in the Senate, as well as Senator HOWELL HEFLIN on a bipartisan basis. In fact, over 240 Representatives and 40 Senators have already answered the call to protect this our greatest national symbol, Old Glory.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, the surge of support to extend this needed protection for the flag comes not in response to changes which have occurred inside the beltway but in response to a massive grassroots movement from across this Nation, all as well it should have been. In fact, 46 State legislatures have already passed resolutions asking Congress to allow them the chance to ratify this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, at 3 o'clock this afternoon, I will drop that constitutional amendment in the hopper over here and there will be a press conference out in the grassy triangle on the Senate side of the Capitol, where those of us who support this badly needed con-

stitutional amendment will answer questions from the press.

At this time, I would like to yield to a truly great American. He is a Democrat on that side of the aisle, but he stands up for America's veterans and for the armed services.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank very much the gentleman yielding to me. I certainly support very much the American flag amendment that the gentleman from New York will drop in the hopper at 3 o'clock. As the chairman of the Committee on Rules mentioned, we have 242 members who have signed up on the House side to sponsor this. We need 48 more Members to get the 290 when we do get the opportunity to bring this constitutional amendment resolution up that it will have a chance to pass.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, a Member of Congress, who has been getting Democrats on this side of the aisle to sign that resolution. As the gentleman from New York said, it is nonpartisan. It comes about that we did pass a simple law in the Congress and signed by President Bush that said you cannot hurt this great American flag. This was turned down by the U.S. Supreme Court who said Congress does not have that authority.

So it becomes now to protect the flag. We have all the veterans organizations totally supporting this amendment. I stand right with the gentleman, side by side. We need to get this constitutional amendment. We need to get more signees on this side of the Capitol to be darned sure. We lost some of them last time as the gentleman remembers. We had over 290 signatures on the House side. When we brought the amendment up, we lost some and we did not pass it. We do not want that to happen this time.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is so right. He always does stand up for America. It is a crime today to destroy this dollar bill, it is a crime today to desecrate the Washington Monument. It is not a crime to desecrate Old Glory. That is a crime in itself. We are going to change that. I thank the gentleman and urge everyone to sponsor this constitutional amendment. We will have 290 votes in the very near future and Members ought to be an original cosponsor of the legislation.

You can be so if you sign on before 3 o'clock this afternoon.

WELFARE REFORM IS ASSAULT ON POOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I too hope that the Members today and this week will stand up for America, that they will stand up for an America that has a sense of respon-

sibility and compassion and the wisdom not to panic.

We have got some economic problems brought about by the changing nature of work which puts people without technological skills at something of a disadvantage, exacerbated by the increasing integration of the international economy. Those are things that we ought to be addressing.

But what the public is being offered by the Republican Party is an alternative explanation for that. It is a form of scapegoating. Working Americans who have found their economic futures insecure are being told it is the fault of those poor people and those immigrants and those women who keep having children so they can make the few bucks you get on AFDC.

In pursuit of that, what we will have this week brought forward by the Republican Party is an assault on people who are poor, who lack education, who lack skills, and most of all we will have an assault on children.

What we get in American politics today is a very selective quoting of the Bible. The part that says you shall not visit the sins of the parents on the children apparently has been written out of the editions of many people, because we are being told that children who make the terrible mistake of being born in the wrong circumstance, children who make the bad judgment to have a mother who was not married, will pay for that. Those children will see basic sustenance denied to them. The answer of our Republican friends is, "Oh, no, no, we're not going to cut that," although in fact they are cutting it "What we are doing is returning it to the States."

Well, understand one very important point. When there is a program which is important to the Republican Party, they federalize it. When we are talking about issues that the Republican Party or its major constituencies in the corporate community feel strongly about, they bring them to the Federal level. Where we have an issue which is not one that they favor, it gets sent back to the States with less money and in circumstances that invite the States to reduce things further. There will be no safeguards, there will be no requirements.

Today if you are a child born in those kind of circumstances, your lot is not going to be a happy one. The young child born to a single mother is those kind of circumstances will live a life that no child in America ought to live. And what is the response of the people on the other side? Let's make it worse. Let's penalize that family in the hopes that there will not be so many families like that in the future.

That is why a very wide range of organizations, religious groups, advocacy groups of various sorts are so unhappy with this.

Let's again be clear. The Republican Party says "Oh, no, we're just returning it to the States." When it came to prisons and how to sentence criminals,

matters that have been State law since the beginning of this Constitution, they took it away from the States and gave them orders. When it came to lawsuits of any kind, not just manufactured products but automobile accidents, people slipping and falling on the stairs, the Republican Party put through an amendment that makes those matters of national concern. We are going to be debating term limits. I said to a couple of the Republicans, well, are we going to have uniform national standards?

They said, "Of course," some of the Republicans have said, "We can't leave that up to the States. That's too important." The fate of poor children, that is not too important. And we know that the States are subjected to a competition among themselves for industry, industry which can decide whether it is from overseas or here where to move. They will tell a State, "We don't think your taxes are low enough. We think your benefits are too high." So what we have is a deliberate dismantling of this safety net, sketchy as it now is, sent back to the States, and the absolute predictable conclusion is that poor 2- and 3- and 4-year-olds will be poorer and worse off in the future.

The same is true with the school lunch program and with other programs. The military budget will go up. The space budget will be protected. The House gym will stay open. We will be OK, but poor children will be the victims of an assault unlike any we have seen in a long time.

I hope that the House will indeed stand up for America by saying that is not the kind of country we want to live in.

A DISTURBING DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to try and respond to the previous speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I will just simply say we will be debating welfare this week and if the gentleman represented a welfare program that was working, I do not think there would be the need for change and change is what we are trying to do to make it work better. I want to talk about a niche of the welfare problem.

In the 1980's, approximately one-half of the hemophilia community in the United States, that is between 8,000 and 10,000 people, became infected with the virus that causes AIDS through the use of contaminated blood clotting products, products which U.S. Government agencies have direct regulation and oversight over. More than 30 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have joined me already in offering H.R. 1023. It is a bill to establish a government compensation program for the victims of this tragedy. This bill is

known as the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act, named for the 15-year-old Florida boy who died of hemophilia-associated AIDS in 1992, that I knew.

Its premise is that the Federal Government which has taken on the unique obligation to safeguard the blood supply and regulate the sale of blood products failed to respond to clear warning signs in time to prevent the tragedy. Records indicate that there were serious red flags about the dangers of blood-borne diseases even in the early 1980's although our understanding of course of the implications of AIDS has evolved in the years somewhat after that.

Hemophilia sufferers are often described as the canaries in the coal mine because when something goes wrong with the blood supply they usually succumb first because they use a blood clotting factors known as Factor. A single dose of Factor is often manufactured from the pooled blood of thousands of people, placing hemophiliacs at an extraordinary risk for blood-borne diseases.

According to industry estimates from the early 1980's, the blood of one infected donor could end up contaminating between half a million to 5 million units of Factor, potentially infecting as many as 125 hemophiliacs in a given year. The risks for hemophiliacs were enormous during that crucial period of time and we are seeing the results today. Nearly 2,000 hemophiliacs died of AIDS between 1981 and 1993 from contaminated blood and many more including members of their families are now suffering from its debilitating effects. My view has been that the Federal Government must share their part of the responsibility for what happened with the industry that manufacturers blood products because we have responsibility for oversight.

The hemophilia community is currently seeking redress from four major pharmaceutical companies through the courts. They have always known that this would be an uphill fight. Manufacturers of blood products have special protection from liability under most State laws which grant them status as providers of services, not products, when they make blood products. As a result, seeking judicial redress for harm caused by these products is a very difficult undertaking. Still, hemophiliacs believed in their case and have pursued their legal options as is their right in a free society. However, over this weekend, something very disturbing happened. The Seventh U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Illinois issued an unsettling ruling in a pending negligence class action lawsuit.

Writing for the court in overturning an earlier ruling regarding certification of the class, Judge Richard Posner appears to have concluded that this group of victims may not constitute a class because doing so could "hurl the industry into bankruptcy."

The judge seemed highly concerned that despite the protections that al-

ready exist for blood product manufacturers under State law, a jury in a class action case could provide awards that would ruin the industry.

I am troubled by what appears to be a greater concern on the part of the judge for the solvency of a multibillion-dollar industry than the rights of victims to join together in seeking justice here in America.

As a member of this House, I have no intention of becoming involved in a pending matter before the judiciary obviously, especially since reports suggest that the claimants will appeal the ruling. Still as we seek to do our part in meeting Government's obligation to victims of hemophilia-associated AIDS, we have got to recognize that the judicial option may be closing for these victims, perhaps providing even greater impetus for relief coming from the U.S. Congress.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to look closely at H.R. 1023, the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act. It is the right thing to do and may be the only way out for these folks. It is the right thing to do now, this week especially, because this is the week we are discussing meaningful ways to deliver relief to truly needy Americans. Believe me, these 8,000 to 10,000 victims are people who are in desperate need.

WELFARE REFORM OR CUTS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a little of my time at first to talk about what I call the very mean-spirited, very radical welfare reform proposal that is being proposed by the majority Republican Party that would take money away from school lunches, from school breakfast programs, and take it away from needy kids.

I have spent some time in the last couple of weeks visiting with some of those programs. It is not just me saying this, but the State of Missouri, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, has analyzed their proposal and points out that there will be about 10 percent reduction in some of the programs for our school lunch kids. Then I look at the part that has to do with the food stamps and AFDC and I see further just cuts, not reform.

I thought we were here for welfare reform. This is not reform, these are just cuts. How do I say that? Not just me again, but again the State of Missouri saying the same thing, not HAROLD VOLKMER saying that. We know that they are cutting a total of well over 30, \$40 billion from these programs, just cuts, to take things away, along with, just like last Thursday, we did the cuts from the elderly for the heating assistance in the winter, we cut back on the

Job Training Partnership Act funds, and I will talk about those a little more and show how important they are, they cut that back.

Why did they do all of that? Why did they make all these big cuts? Well, here is why. They want to give later on, not next week, not this week, a big tax cut. Who gets the big tax cut? Well, if you make over \$100,000, and members of Congress do that, folks, and they are doing it maybe a little bit for themselves, if you make over \$100,000, you are going to get 51½ percent of the total cuts. People making that money get over half of it.

How did the people on the low end of the scale, say, zero to \$30,000? They get 4.8 percent of the cuts. I guess they do not need anything. It is the wealthy that needs the money. How about people between the wages of \$30,000 to \$50,000? I have got a lot of those in my district. They are middle income. They should get some money. Well, they get 11.6 percent of the cut.

People with wages of \$50,000 to \$75,000, they get 16.4 percent of the cuts. And \$75,000 to \$100,000, now we are getting in the upper brackets again, 15.2 percent of the cuts. So we know what they are doing. They are taking the money from the poor, the needy, and kids, and they are going to give it to the wealthy.

The other thing I would like to talk about are three young ladies, and I met with these three young ladies this last weekend, Ms. Keneetha Jackson, Ms. Shauntel Freelon, and Ms. Reba Brown. Who are they? They have not made national news or anything, but who are they? They are three young ladies who have children who used to be on welfare. They are no longer on welfare. Nor do they ever want to be on welfare again. They have been through the welfare cycle. They are no longer on the welfare cycle because they used some training programs, including principally the Job Training Partnership Act which the Republicans just cut last Thursday in the rescission bill, just last week cut it. Yet that program was primarily responsible so these people did not have to continue to stay on welfare.

They did not want to be on welfare. They did not like being on welfare. But one of them specifically pointed out to me in going through their life's history, each one of them did, that she had no alternative, she tried working after she had her first baby, she tried working at McDonald's and fast food places and she could not make it, she could not provide for her children and do it. So she found out about training programs. She entered into it.

All three of these are very proud of the fact that they are no longer on welfare. We have a lot more people out there that same way that want to get off welfare. Under the Deal bill, which will be a substitute for the Republican proposal, they will have a lot better chance of getting off welfare, of being able to be trained to get off welfare.

I agree we need to get and help people off welfare. We do not need to just give people a handout which we have done in the past. But we need to give them a hand up. We need to help them get up out of there. It can be done.

Here are three success cases. I am going to ask all of you, I know there are a few people out there who know the answer to this but there are not very many. Which one of these 3 that I mentioned this coming May will get a bachelor's degree in business administration from my alma mater, the University of Missouri in Columbia. That is right, folks. They are all determined to continue on this road to success, out of welfare.

I can tell you, it is Ms. Keneetha Jackson. She will be proud to be up there in May getting her degree. Then she tells you, that is not the end. She wants to go further and she wants her children to go further.

I dare say that none of these former welfare mothers' children will ever be on welfare because they too know what their mother has done.

DISTORTION OF TRUTH AND PARTISAN BICKERING IN WELFARE REFORM DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, we have heard here this morning quite a bit of comment and suggestion about the debate that is going to take place on this House floor later today about welfare reform. Unfortunately, I would have to characterize it as partisan bickering. It is distortion of the truth and partisan bickering.

I really believe this Nation deserves better than partisan rhetoric, half truths, mistruths and bickering. We have a serious problem because of our welfare system. Yet the other side of the aisle, who controlled this body for so many years, did nothing to reform that system. Now that we have a reform plan before us, we have partisan rhetoric, bickering, and half truths.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is time to put America first. Cut out the rhetoric, the partisan bickering, the half truths.

If you have a better proposal, we will be glad to hear it. But it is time that we address that system. It is time that we put partisan bickering behind us. The American people want and should expect a welfare system that works.

We have a system now that does not ever encourage you to get off. We just keep paying. And, yes, some of the reforms are difficult. But why were those reforms not brought forth before? The majority of the experts on this in this country will tell you it is going to take tough reforms to change our welfare system.

What are we going to be debating here today? Yes, we have to talk about what is wrong with our system. Why we have so many people who get on

AFDC and stay there for years. Why we have families that are on that program for generations and do not get off.

I think if anybody would look at the way the program is set up and would see how we dole out the money, they would realize psychologically it is a trap for people. It is not something that gives you the helping hand up and out.

That is what we will be debating here today. How do we get the people that are on AFDC into paying jobs? How do we give them the self-respect so that they can raise themselves and their families up in our society?

Funding for welfare programs is out of control. It fits right in with the need to balance the budget. Of course on the other side, all we get when we propose a cut is rhetoric and partisan bickering. They do not bring forward cuts to balance the budget. Goodness no, only give the Republicans a hard time because they are trying to balance the budget.

But the welfare costs are going to increase from \$325 billion to almost \$500 billion by 1998. How do we ever balance the budget with runaway welfare programs like that?

We have spent \$5 trillion on welfare. The system has not worked. We still have people mired in this system. There are some very important provisions to the bill that we are going to talk about in the next few days, things that are supported by the great number of working American taxpayers. When we hear the partisan bickering and the rhetoric from the other side, we need to focus on the working American taxpayers who are not being represented in that type of debate.

We want to make a tough work requirement in our welfare system. We want to eliminate awards for having children out of wedlock to get more welfare. We will have many important elements to debate, those are just a few, in the days ahead. But what we do here today is for our children, for the next generation, for the long term, for the survival of our country.

DSG SPECIAL REPORT ON REPUBLICAN CONTRACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to advise Members of the publication today of the first special report being issued by the newly reorganized Democratic Study Group. It is a special report entitled "Cheating Children: The Real Meaning of the Republican Contract." It really is a catalog of the contract's attacks on the kids of America. It goes through in a very systematic fashion the various bills that we have already acted upon, particularly the welfare bill that will be in front of the House this week, and lays out exactly

what each of them will do to the children of America.

First off, taking food from children. The welfare bill that we will have before us later this week when all is said and done with the various block grants on nutrition programs will mean a loss over the next 5 years of \$6.5 billion compared to what would have been provided to hungry and needy kids. Where all does this take place? Well, in the very, very successful program for women, infants and children, early childhood care, we will have a cut that will deprive over 400,000 needy families that were otherwise entitled to help under the WIC Program.

School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs under the new block grant, even if fully funded at the authorized level, will be almost \$2.5 billion below what would otherwise have been required under existing law, a really penny-wise and pound-foolish strategy given all of the data we have about how effective these school feeding programs have been in improving learning in this country.

Food stamps will be cut by over \$14 billion over the next 5 years under the welfare bill that will be coming up under Republican sponsorship, changes that would take food stamps away from over 2 million Americans over the next 5 years and reduce the level of support to the participants that remain.

At the level estimated by the Congressional Budget Office to be necessary to carry out the revised program if unemployment remains low, we would have those kinds of deficits in coverage, but just think what happens if the economy slows down and more families with children become eligible for assistance? And also keep in mind, and it is a sad statistic but one that puts this in perspective. One in five children in America today depends upon food on the table from the food stamp program.

Passing on from nutrition, which is certainly a central issue, to day care. Under the welfare bill that will be coming up from the Republican side, we will be cutting funding for child care programs by almost \$2.5 billion over the next 5 years, or a 20-percent drop compared to where we would be under current law. Sadly, for all the talk about how important it is to move welfare families on to work, to free them from dependency, unlike the current law, the bill that the majority party would bring to the House will have no requirement that in States that have work requirements for welfare, no requirement that these families also get child care. Again parents will be put to the Hobson's choice of no good child care but requirements for work in order to remain eligible for any kind of assistance to their children.

This bill will also greatly unravel the general safety net for kids in this country that is represented by aid to dependent children. Again, even if fully funded at authorized levels, which is a

big question given the resort to annual appropriations rather than entitlement status, nearly \$12 billion is to be cut compared with levels projected under current law. As the gentleman from Massachusetts commented a few minutes ago, it is truly a sad commentary that this bill will require that we deprive kids who happen to be born into the wrong kinds of family of any prospect for assistance when they are in need. The changes in the AFDC Program are estimated to leave something like 1.3 million needy children without assistance by the end of the century.

It is even worse when we look at disabled kids now entitled to some help under the Supplemental Security Income, where changes proposed in this legislation would cut nearly \$11 billion over the next 5 years. Within 6 months, over a quarter of the 900,000 kids that now depend on SSI would lose assistance.

This is not good for America. It represents a perverse desire that in order to relax the capital gains tax formula for people over \$100,000 a year, we are going to water down the baby formula for poor kids on WIC. Instead of putting money into the lock box for deficit reduction, we are going to have a tax cut that puts it into the safety deposit boxes of the wealthy.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Personal Responsibility Act. With this act, we will make tremendous strides in changing the incentive structure to make people more responsible for their actions. We will bring an end to the failed welfare system that has done so much more harm than good over the past 30 years. And we will do so over the objections of those who refuse to see the disaster that the system has become.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone seriously argue that the welfare system has been a success? The welfare system was supposed to be a safety net. Instead it has become quicksand that few people ever return from. Of familiar now on AFDC, 65 percent will remain on welfare for at least 8 years. The average length of stay for people on the rolls at any given time is 13 years, 13 years. And what do we as a nation expect in return for supporting people for years and years? Nothing. We have no real work requirement, job-training requirement, or education requirement for people receiving welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the welfare system has caused the disintegration of the family. Fathers have become irrelevant, replaced by a welfare check as the family provider. In 1965, 7 percent of children in this Nation were born out of wedlock. In 1990, 32 percent of children in this Nation were born out of wedlock.

Could welfare have possibly been more destructive to the family? Mr. Speaker, as we study the welfare system, I am absolutely certain of one thing—we could do nothing worse than to preserve the current welfare system.

Mr. Speaker, the Personal Responsibility Act is about changing incentives. It is about forcing people to take responsibility for their actions. Unlike the current system, after 2 years on welfare, you will go to work. Unlike the current system, if you are under 18, you will not automatically receive a check for having a child. Unlike the current system, if you are on welfare, having an additional child will not automatically mean another check. Unlike the current system, if you father a child, we will find you, and you will take financial responsibility for your child.

The Personal Responsibility Act will give the States the ability to deal with these issues, and it will remove power from the hands of Federal bureaucrats. Contrary to the Democratic myth, in the area of child nutrition, we are increasing funding by eliminating the costly ransom taken by Federal bureaucrats. We will give the States the opportunity to make real change, as in Wisconsin where welfare payments were reduced for those who left school, and high school drop-outs returned to school to finish their degrees. We will give the States opportunity to get tough as in Michigan, where a serious work requirement for welfare recipients met with harsh criticism from liberals, and now the welfare rolls have fallen to their lowest level in 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the other side to join us in an honest debate about the failed welfare system. I ask you to join the debate about changing incentives and forcing people to take responsibility for their actions. But I realize some of you cannot accept my challenge; I know that some of you are too dependent on the protecting the role of Government; to you I say this: If you can do nothing more than defend this morally bankrupt system, if you can do nothing more than obscure the facts in a desperate attempt to protect the status quo, well then I would have to say I feel sorry for you. Because the American people are calling out for change, and they expect more than weak and spurious defenses of a failed welfare system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, to defeat the forces of the failed status quo, to confront those who will distort the truth, and to do what is right and long overdue for America.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS POSE THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised by yesterday's nerve agent incident in Tokyo. Now I am concerned about what might happen here in the United States.

Let me read, Mr. Speaker, from a special inquiry which I chaired in 1993 dealing with the growing threat of chemical and biological weapons. One of our conclusions was,

The prospects for chemical and biological terrorism have probably increased as terrorists and sponsors of terrorism acquire chemical and biological warfare agents and weapons. As a consequence, the possibility of terrorist use of such agents against the United States or one of its allies cannot be discounted and should not be ignored. The United States should strengthen emergency planning to respond to a potential terrorist use of chemical or biological weapons.

Well-trained and equipped military personnel can survive and fight a chemical war, but civilians cannot deal with chemical attack. Chemical weapons have been called the poor man's atom bomb because they are cheap and easy to make and because civilians are thoroughly panicked by chemical weapons.

Look at today's headlines.

The Washington Post, "Nations Unready To Thwart Mass Poisoning."

The Washington Times, "Subway Gassing Called a Preview of Terrorist Future."

USA Today, "Transit System Alert Urged. Officials Fear Copycat of Japanese Gas Attack."

The New York Daily News says, "New York's Subway Riders' Nightmare. We Have No Plan."

Mr. Speaker, it is only a matter of time before terrorists, extortionists or deranged individuals and groups targeted Americans. That is why I am asking American defense intelligence and emergency preparedness officials to tell me and the American people just what our Government is doing to prepare for chemical and biological terrorism here in the United States.

TAX RELIEF AND REDUCED SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman that just spoke is quite right, and I think looking at old George Washington over there, he would have agreed that defending the country is primary in our interest. I think old George would also have agreed that we don't need welfare, and we don't need high taxes. In his day, there wasn't any income tax.

I stand here to tell you that a promise we made to the seniors that we would give them tax relief by eliminating the 85-percent tax on Social Security is in jeopardy. A promise we made to married couples that they would get relief from the marriage penalty is in jeopardy. A promise we made to give

the people the option of using their IRA's to buy their first home, send their kids to college or help pay their medical bills is in jeopardy. And a promise to families to provide them with a \$500 per child tax credit is in jeopardy.

Why? Because some of your Congressmen on both sides of the aisle want to lower the income level from \$200,000 down to \$95,000. It disappoints me that we have to have an income gap, but it irritates me that some Members want to lower it. Every single American deserves tax relief and it is preposterous that even the Members who signed the Contract With America are now reneging on the promise they made to the American people.

Believe me, I have heard the arguments. "Tax cuts are for the rich. They will increase the Federal deficit." Those are false statements. They really are. Those arguments are shortsighted and they have no concern for our current tax burden that is placed on every American taxpayer.

Did you know that in 1950, the typical American family with two children sent \$1 out of every \$50 it earned to Washington, DC? Last year, just 25 years later, that same family sent \$1 out of every 4\$ it earned to Washington, DC.

A family with five children making \$200,000 a year is not rich. Besides, whose money is it, anyway? We are not taking it back from the Federal Government. We are giving it back to the people who earned it, you the voters, the constituency, the people of America.

The Government did not work to earn the money but I will bet you for sure the Government sure knows how to waste it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose these questions to the American people. Are you taxed too heavily? Do you deserve tax relief? Do you believe the Government spends too much? Finally, do you believe that Republicans should keep our promises?

I urge each of you to call your representatives and let me know you support this bill. Pick up the phone right now and make your Congressman accountable. Tax relief combined with spending reductions will revive America's strength.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we had a member from the majority side a few minutes ago talking about joining the debate on welfare reform. I would be more than happy to join the debate with him, talking about the fallacies of both the original H.R. 4 that was introduced but also the H.R. 1214 that we are considering today and this week and which reminds me, since

last year I heard from so many talk show folks about, I wonder how many of those people have read H.R. 1214 who are now talking about it as the greatest thing since sliced bread?

It is not as big as some of the bills we have considered but it is almost 400 pages and I hope that some of the proponents who talk about how great it is have had a chance to read it, like some of us have who were on the committees who dealt with it.

The school nutrition program will be hurt if we pass the, what is now H.R. 1214. The Republicans' shell game continues with our children hanging in the balance. As this flier states, "When It's Budget Cutting Time, You Always Shoot at the Easiest Target." You can see how the impact of that will be when you talk about the WIC program, or you talk about the children's nutrition program.

Your argument should be that we do need to reform welfare, and I agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but this bill that came out of both the Committee on Ways and Means and out of the committee I serve on was not a debate, it was just, "We have a plan and we are going to run over you as Democrats. We're not going to agree with you that we need to address children's nutrition through the School Lunch Program. We're just going to block-grant it. We're going to do what we want to do."

So there was not a debate. It was the majority saying we are going to do it the way that we want instead of really making it a bipartisan effort.

When I came to Congress in January, I thought that welfare reform would be a bipartisan effort, but I do not think we are going to see it today or this week because it has not been.

I agree we need to reform welfare. We need to take away the incentive of someone or the tragedy of a person being on welfare. But we do not need to cut the programs that provide the most effective safety net that we have for our children. We should require people to work. We should require a time limit about how long they are on there. We should require them to go to job training. We should require them to do all sorts of things. But when you take the school nutrition program and you say we are going to increase the authorization, whereas now a child shows up in school, they have a guarantee of that lunch if they are qualified and say we are going to authorize 4 percent more but next year in the Committee on Appropriations it may be cut and then we are going to let the State take 20 percent and spend it on something else because of the block granting. That is why this poster is so relevant: "When it's budget cutting time, the easiest target is a child."

Last week a colleague of mine from Texas talked about some of the highway demonstration projects in the rescission bill that were untouched. Yet we cut AmeriCorps, we cut job training, and most of these projects were

not even requested by our local highway departments or transportation department.

How is it equitable that we cut school lunches but not highway projects? The chief financial officer for the State of Texas has estimated that if this welfare bill passed today, this H.R. 1214 passes, it will cost the State of Texas over \$1 billion in our next biennial, 1996-97. The Department of Human Services estimates that if this bill passes, it would cost the State of Texas \$5.2 billion. The CBO has said that with growth in population and inflation, this reduction would be \$2.3 billion.

I know I am throwing out lots of numbers and some of them may disagree, but no matter how you cut it, the people who are going to pass this bill this week really do not know what it is going to do because all they are doing is running that train and saying we are going to pass a welfare reform bill, even if it does cut WIC or school nutrition, or it cuts a lot of other programs that are really important and have a great deal of support.

If any of these are reduced fundings, particularly the one from the Congressional Budget Office estimates for savings and administrative costs, we are talking about stopping children from having a hot lunch. Yesterday I was in my district at J.P. Henderson Elementary School in Houston trying to show that the claim of the welfare reform is missing the point. Those children are eating that hot lunch and that is at a school that has easily 80 percent of the children have a reduced and free lunch.

We should not continue to be playing games with our children's future. We need to do welfare reform. We can take school nutrition programs out of the welfare reform just like the majority took the senior citizens nutrition out of welfare reform 3 weeks ago. It is just that again it is too often popular to hit the easiest target and not the senior citizens.

We do not consider buying text books, computers, or desks as welfare. We should not consider school nutrition welfare.

PICK ON SOMEONE YOUR OWN SIZE: KID'S VOICES HEARD AT CAPITOL RALLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, Sunday was a beautiful day at the Capitol because 2,000 children from all over this area from West Virginia to Pennsylvania came to oppose cuts in the school lunch programs proposed by the Republican majority. It was reported as the children's crusade against Republican budget cuts. Despite bus rides for as long as 5 hours, the children were very eloquent indeed.

A 10-year-old with the distinguished name of Touissant L'Ouvertuo Tingling-Clemmons said, "Children have to say no to a lot of things. Food should not be one of them."

Chastity Crites from West Virginia, a daughter of a construction worker, said she does not eat if he, her father, does not work except for school lunches.

A sixth grader from southeast Washington said, Marche was her name, "The food tastes so good and sometimes when we get to school we are hungry. Why would they cut school lunches?"

Why would they indeed? The issue of hunger in our country has never been a debatable one and indeed feeding the hungry has always enjoyed bipartisan support. In 1946 President Truman signed the Federal School Lunch Program into law. President Richard Nixon later said a child ill-fed is dulled in curiosity, lower in stamina and distracted in learning.

Why then is the Republican majority putting on the House table a proposal which will take food off the cafeteria table for America's children?

The extreme Republican proposal will cut, I repeat, it will cut the number of poor children who benefit from the program. It will cut the School Lunch Program benefits because it says that States must spend only 80 percent of the Federal school lunch funds on school lunches because it removes nutritional standards and removes eligibility requirements.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal will hurt our children, weaken our future and dim the prospects for our future. I urge our colleagues to think again about the Republican proposal to cut the School Lunch Program.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, O gracious God, that the words we use will foster truth and be delivered with understanding. May our expressions promote knowledge and our statements advance a clearer realization of our concerns. Help us, O God, to keep our vision on the ideals of equity and justice so that all we do, in

thought, word and deed, be reflections of Your will for us and our desire to be faithful to that to which we have been called. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DELAURO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 16, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 4 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, in addition to Ms. Linda Nave, Deputy Clerk, I herewith designate Mr. Jeffrey Trandahl, Assistant Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 104th Congress or until modified by me.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk.

FAIRWELL TO MARIAN VAN DEN BERG

(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 want to say that today the official reporters of debates, the reporters who chronicle all

the proceedings on this floor, say farewell, farewell to a valued member of their staff, and of ours.

For the past 17 years, Marian Van Den Berg has been a transcriber with the official reporters. As we all know, working with the official reporters is not a 9-to-5 job. It often entails long hours, demands devotion far beyond that called for with ordinary jobs, and requires a high degree of competence. Marian has met all these criteria and more. She has been an outstanding, hard-working, always cheerful, always devoted member of our staff.

She is now leaving to pursue a new career.

Marian is a native of Annapolis, MD, I tell my friend, Mr. GILCREST, one of his constituents. The daughter of champion swimmers, her mother was a swimmer of Olympic caliber. Marian herself lives near the bay in Annapolis and has had a lifelong love of the water and water activities.

She attended the University of Maryland, and then Strayer Business College and Strayer School of Court Reporting. While living in California, she worked at IBM. At home in Annapolis, she worked at the Naval Academy.

In addition to her work with the reporters, Marian worked 2 years with Representative Clark Thompson of Texas.

Her children are Susan and Rick, son-in-law, Tom, and she is the loving and proud grandmother of young Patrick—whose picture she shows at every opportunity.

Marian loves music of all kinds, is a jazz aficionado, is especially devoted to rock and roll, and plays a mean piano, I am told.

This exemplary employee of the House of Representatives will be greatly missed by her colleagues and by each and every Member of the House of Representatives and the American public whom she serves. Marian has touched the hearts of everyone who has had the good fortune to meet her and to work with her.

Marian, there are just a few of us on the floor, but if you would please rise we would like to give you a hand and thank you so much for all you have done for all of us.

Marian, God bless you and Godspeed.

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states the following: On the first day of Congress, a Republican House will require Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else; cut committee staffs by one-third; and cut the congressional budget. We kept our promise.

The contract continues and in the first 100 days, we promised to vote on the following items: A balanced budget

amendment—we kept our promise; unfunded mandates legislation—we kept our promise; line-item veto—we kept our promise; a new crime package to stop violent criminals—we kept our promise; national security restoration to protect our freedoms—we kept our promise; government regulatory reform—we kept our promise; common-sense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits—we kept our promise; welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence—we're starting this today; family reinforcement to crack down on deadbeat dads and protect our children; tax cuts for middle-income families; Senior Citizens' Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty; and congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature.

This is our Contract With America.

WELFARE REFORM

(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, today we take up the welfare reform bill sponsored by our Republican colleagues. This would end cash assistance for mothers, children, and legal immigrants.

Last week my own cardinal for the archdiocese of Detroit said this: "The measure of any such reforms will be whether or not they enhance the lives and dignity of poor children and their families."

The truth is that these welfare reform proposals fail the cardinal's test and they fail the test which was set forth by the Catholic archbishops and bishops last week. Almost \$70 billion will be removed from welfare programs; \$2.2 million legal immigrants will lose eligibility; 6 million needy children will lose their cash support; 65,000 children in my own State will lose their lunch money.

The Republicans cut money but they do nothing to improve the way the welfare reform programs operate. That is not reform. It is wrong. It is mean-spirited.

These programs have flaws. They should be corrected. Protect the children. Be fair. Respect the dignity of human beings.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce to all of my colleagues that I intend to support our term limits section of our Contract With America. This is a decision that did not come easily nor have I taken it lightly.

Many of my colleagues know I have long believed that term limits were not necessary, that the voters of our districts every 2 years could make that

decision about whether they should send us back here or not.

But the fact is that some 22 States now have enacted term limits, not by polls, not by letters, but by actually going to the ballot box and casting their votes in favor of it. In 1992 my district voted overwhelmingly by 70 percent to support term limits. I believe that I have to respect the judgment of those in my district.

But when all of this became crystal clear to me was watching the Senate debate over the balanced budget amendment and watching the arrogance of six Democrat Senators who have voted for a balanced budget amendment 1 year ago, the identical language, thumb their nose at the American people.

We, ladies and gentlemen, do not have the right to thumb our nose at our constituents. We have a responsibility to respect their opinions, and I am proud to stand here as a new supporter of the term limit movement in this country.

WELFARE WEEK

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is welfare week. For me it started not in the abstractions of bill language. It started on Sunday when I picked up my mentee, a 13-year-old who lives in a D.C. housing project, to bring to Sunday's school lunch rally at the Capitol. She gets her breakfast and lunch at school.

Welfare week continued for me at noon today when I went to the elementary school I attended as a child. Then we brought our lunch or went home to eat it. Today 95 percent of the children in my elementary school each lunch at school.

You can talk until you are red, white, and blue in the face about only cutting the growth in school meals. The truth is the School Nutrition Programs will lose \$2.3 billion over 5 years under the contract. A cut in kids' lunches is a foul. Let us stop playing kids' games. Pick on somebody your own size.

REPUBLICANS CLEANING UP OUT-OF-CONTROL WELFARE SYSTEM

(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 Liberals continue to exploit the hard work and innovative ideas of the Republican Party. The latest assault is our welfare proposal. They claim it is unfair to children, mothers, and other recipients. Wrong. What we are doing, is cleaning up a system, which has spun out-of-control for years. Spending for this bureaucratic-laden system has

reached \$325 billion; if this continues, it will cost the country approximately \$500 billion in 1998.

Instead, our proposal moves in the opposite direction. It saves the taxpayer approximately \$60 billion over 5 years. Under the plan, people who honestly need a helping hand will be given job training and education to rejoin the work force.

The current welfare state has been the families downfall. Our plan will remedy this, we will offer incentives adding up to 10 percent to States which successfully reduce illegitimacy rates.

Let us work together, to create a system, which restores pride and opportunity for the American people.

STOP THE WAR ON KIDS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, thousands of children and their parents staged a "Lunch-In" on the steps of the Capitol to protest Republican plans to cut the School Lunch Program. The message that these families sent to the Republican majority is simple: Stop the war on kids.

We all agree that there is waste in Government and that there are programs that do not work and should be eliminated, but the School Lunch Program is not one of them. The School Lunch Program works. It works to help our kids stay healthy, alert, and ready to learn each day.

If we are going to cut spending and reform Government, why not start by cutting corporate welfare. We could save \$5 billion if we eliminate the tax breaks given to pharmaceutical companies to manufacture offshore. Why not start there, instead of starting by cutting programs for our children.

□ 1415

IT IS TIME TO OVERHAUL THE WELFARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, we begin today to discuss the debate the Republican welfare reform plan.

Now, our Democrat colleagues have tried to put their own negative spin on our plan. However, they still have not got it quite right.

Let me explain the entire bill in a few simple words: Work, family, personal responsibility, and hope for the future. Now, how hard is that to understand?

Republicans are going to replace a failed system of despair with a more compassionate solution that will work to get people off the public dole. Through the dignity of work and the strength of families, we will offer hope for the future of millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come finally to completely overhaul the welfare system.

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, we begin the debate today on a proposal that would transform welfare eligibility, affect Federal spending, and shift social services responsibility from the Federal Government to the States.

This is major reform, without a doubt, welfare reform, they say. I support welfare reform.

Proponents of the Personal Responsibility Act say that the bill will result in saving over \$60 billion. We say the bill cuts almost \$70 billion from women, infants, children, and the elderly. Proponents say the bill will streamline bureaucracy. We say the bill creates 50 other bureaucracies. They say the bill will reduce deficits. We say the bill fuels the deficit by adding to health costs. It is penny wise and pound foolish. They say the bill puts people to work. We ask where and how will they work?

It has been said that one person's profanity is another person's lyrics. This debate is not whether we are cursing. This debate is about whether we are cursing or cheering America.

The people will decide who we are benefiting and who we are hurting. This bill should be helping America and not dividing us.

THE ONE-PENNY BUDGET CUT

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

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, last week I sent every Member of the House one penny.

One penny that is what we were talking about in the budget rescission passed last week.

The rescissions package the House passed represents approximately one one-hundredth of the Federal budget for fiscal year 1995.

If we cannot cut that from the budget, what are we doing here in Congress?

Mr. Speaker, my home State of New Jersey went through this same process years before Congress did.

Then, as now, the doomsayers said the difference of a penny would ruin the Garden State.

Well, the doomsayers were wrong then and they are wrong now.

We will show the American people that cutting one penny on the dollar off the budget will not ruin our Nation. Rather as Congress decides to make the difficult decisions to turn our fiscal situation around, our Nation will only get stronger, not weaker.

Mr. Speaker, for 40 years, the other party has shown that they do not have the resolve to cut even one penny. For

America's sake, we do, and we did last week.

WASHINGTON POST POLL SHOWS MORE PEOPLE TRUST REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post poll that my colleague just cited had other interesting numbers in it that he failed to mention:

More people trust Republicans in Congress to cut taxes rather than President Clinton.

More people trust Republicans in Congress to reform the welfare system than President Clinton.

More people trust Republicans in Congress to reduce the deficit than President Clinton.

More people trust Republicans in Congress to reduce crime than President Clinton.

More people trust Republicans in Congress to handle the Nation's economy than President Clinton.

And finally, more people trust Republicans in Congress to handle the main problems facing our Nation today, more so than the liberals and President Clinton. The poll is very clear, Mr. Speaker. They trust the Republicans. We are on track with welfare reform this week. We hope success will be here by the end of the week.

OSHA CUT WOULD DELAY PROTECTION FOR WORKERS

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House last week in passing the DeLay amendment, which cut an additional \$3.5 million from the current year budget for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, was reckless, counterproductive, and just plain stupid. In the name of stopping the ergonomics standard, the House made cuts that cannot and will not stop work on the standard, but will hurt health and safety by cutting workplace inspections and consultation visits. Thousands of workers will be hurt, and some may die if these cuts are allowed to stop the effort to make our workplaces less dangerous.

Mr. DELAY says we have to send a signal to OSHA not to ignore the moratorium bill. But that bill is not law; we do not have a one-House veto. Mr. DELAY cannot singlehandedly delay progress. And the Senate probably is not going to pass the silly moratorium bill in any event.

OSHA is following the law and doing the right thing—precisely what we all tell them we want—working with the business community, checking out their ideas in the field, consulting with

workers and managers. At this point there is no ergonomics proposal, just ideas in draft form for tackling the single biggest source of injuries to American workers. Why in the world would we tell the agency not to try to figure out a cost-effective way to protect workers from carpal tunnel syndrome and back injuries?

Mr. Speaker, the DeLay amendment to delay protection for workers was reckless, counterproductive, and just plain stupid.

THE IMPORTANCE OF BIODIVERSITY

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to your attention two little known animals that are very important to the pharmaceutical industry in the United States. The existence of these animals brings new hope to high blood pressure sufferers and heart attack victims in this country.

First, high blood pressure sufferers look to the pit viper to provide an entirely new generation of extremely effective antihypertensives. Compounds found in the venom of these snakes have led to greater understanding of the human mechanism for maintaining blood pressure. However, number of pit viper species are threatened with extinction.

Second, the Houston toad, on the brink of extinction due to habitat loss, produces alkaloids which scientists believe may prevent heart attacks. These alkaloids also appear to have analgesic properties more powerful than morphine. The Houston toad is native to the United States.

At least 500 species and subspecies of plants and animals in the United States have become extinct since the 1500's. Could one of those long-gone species have held the cure to AIDS, cancer, or the common cold?

Let us reauthorize a workable Endangered Species Act.

STOP PICKING ON KIDS

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I come to deliver a message from our luncheon on Sunday: Stop picking on kids.

Little 10-year-old Touissant Clemmens probably said it best, "Children have to say no to a lot of things. Food should not be one of them."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot for the life of me understand why we are cutting \$6 billion out of the School Lunch Program to provide tax breaks for the wealthy. I cannot understand why we are trying to replace a Federal bureaucracy with 50 State bureaucracies, and why that is a better idea. I cannot

understand why we are eliminating national nutrition standards.

Does someone want to go back to calling catsup a vegetable?

I am concerned, because these cuts are going to finance tax breaks for the wealthy. Fifty percent of the tax breaks go to families making over \$100,000, like Congressmen. I do not think we need a tax break.

Five hundred dollars per child for people making up to \$200,000? I do not understand why. Twenty percent of the tax cuts go to the wealthiest 2 percent of the people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, you like to talk about the average American. Well, I will tell you, when the average American citizen figures out we are taking money out of the mouths of children to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy, I think they are going to resent it. I think they are going to resent it all the way to the 1996 elections.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

WELFARE REFORM BILL: NEW METHODS FOR COLLECTING FROM DEADBEAT PARENTS

(Ms. DUNN of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today we begin the process of overhauling a welfare system that traps millions of Americans, especially women and children, in an endless cycle of poverty and hopelessness.

One of the most crucial provisions of the Republican welfare reform bill provides new methods for collecting money from deadbeat dads and mothers. Right now these irresponsible parents in my home State of Washington owe over \$423 million, and \$34 billion is owed nationally to the children and the families.

This is money that, in many cases, could be used to keep children off welfare. These uncaring parents provide neither hope nor a bright future for their children. What these deadbeat parents do instead is three things: They evade their most basic responsibility by failing to support their own flesh-and-blood children, they force their own children into welfare, and they force you, the American taxpayer, to pick up the tab for their irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, they force the Government to become the parent.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the status quo welfare system provides little relief to the families trapped by delinquency of the deadbeat parents. The child-support provision of our bill,

which I am pleased to say has great bipartisan support, will begin the process of ending welfare as we now know it and putting our children first by requiring both parents to support their own children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to support this bill and the children.

INCREASE, NOT REDUCE, THE FOOD PROGRAM

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I went to the Henry Suder School in my district on last Friday for the School Nutrition Program, and while I was there, they gave me these paper dolls. They have been coming into the office over the last month or so. They are from various children who are at the school.

One little girl says, and this is to CARDISS COLLINS from Pearl Haye. It says,

Children need quality, nutritious foods to help them grow. If there is no balanced food, they won't be healthy. They will not become healthy citizens. I like to eat well, and I like to learn a lot of skills. Please, increase, not reduce, the food program so that all kids can benefit from it.

You know, it is really amazing to me when people talk about cutting \$60 billion out of the mouths of children. To snatch food right out of children's mouths is absolutely not comprehensible at all to me.

You know, I went to the school, and for lunch they had a little tray with a few little chicken fingers, french fries, a few carrots, an orange, and a carton of milk.

Why take that away from little kids? It does not make sense to do so.

MAKING GOVERNMENT LESS COSTLY AND LESS INTRUSIVE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, straight from the Democratic Party propaganda room, I give you the Washington Post's latest poll that says the momentum of the Republican Contract With America is slowing down.

Mr. Speaker, it is polls like this and scare mongering by our opponents that has given America 40 years of one party rule, bloated budgets, arrogance, and a country on the verge of bankruptcy.

Are the Republicans cutting wasteful spending? Are we working toward a balanced budget? Have we begun to end the arrogance of Washington knows best? And are we working hard to keep our word to the American people? The answer is yes.

Our journey is a difficult one. Fighting the scare tactics of the "let's party on" crown has not and will not be easy. But the American people know better.

They may have been fooled when they voted for change in the 1992 election and ended up with the "let's party on" crowd's higher taxes, more Government spending, and a proposal for Government run health care.

But the 1994 election was different. And despite the naysayers who will fight our efforts every day preserving the status quo, we will succeed in cutting the waste and making Government less costly and less intrusive.

□ 1430

LET US KEEP THE FREE LUNCH PROGRAM

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I went to Hawthorne School in Seattle and talked to the whole student body, 650 squirming kids, all of whom had taken a paper dinner plate and written a note to me about the school lunch program. The kids actually know what is happening. In Seattle, 47 percent of the students take part in the reduced or free lunch program. There were almost 430,000 lunches served last year.

In the next school year, with the cuts in this bill we are going to deal with over the next couple of days, Seattle will lose \$654,000. Now, that means the State legislature has got to pick up that amount. Some of my colleagues in my delegation pushed through an amendment that says it takes 60 percent to raise the taxes in the State of Washington. So how are you going to get that through?

But even more amazing, I picked up the Seattle paper, and one of my colleagues says we are going to save money by cutting regulations like that useless regulation that requires the schools to monitor the temperature of the milk. It is as though the Members on the other side never heard of the germ theory.

The reason you have cool milk being is to keep kids from getting sick.

Vote against this bill.

TITLE VII OF H.R. 4, CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the chief sponsors of the Family Reinforcement Act, I rise in strong support of the goals of the child support enforcement provisions in the Personal Responsibility Act.—Our welfare reform initiative.

The strength of America's families is of utmost importance to the future of this country. We must act quickly and decisively to restore, encourage and protect our most fundamental unit of American society.

I am here today to voice my support for the commonsense goals of H.R. 4:

reducing welfare dependency by ensuring that parents support their children; strengthening and streamlining the State-based child support system; and giving the States the tools they need to get the job done.

Too many single-parent families have had no where else to turn but to resort to Government support programs—and too many children go to bed hungry or do without—all because their dead-beat parents outrun the current bureaucratic and time-consuming child support collection system. This has got to stop. Republicans are working to change our child support collection system.

I applaud the child support enforcement goals of H.R. 4, and support its efforts.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing problems facing our society today is domestic violence. Violence against women exists in big cities, and it also exists in small, rural communities, like those in my district in northern Michigan. For many years domestic violence was not discussed in public, because people thought it was a problem that should be dealt with from within the home.

Statistics show that crimes against women are rising at a faster rate than total crime. Even more disturbing is the fact that more than two-thirds of violent crimes against women are committed by husbands, boyfriends, or acquaintances. In fact, thirty-three percent of American women who are killed, are killed by a boy friend or husband.

Recently, we have had reason for hope, because President Clinton took on the fight against domestic violence. Because of his leadership and support, the Violence Against Women Act was passed into law.

President Clinton is the first President to attack this problem head-on. He has created a special Violence Against Women Office at the Department of Justice to spearhead the effort to fight violence against women. Today, the President announced approximately \$26 million in STOP Grants to the States to fight violence against women.

I salute President Clinton's leadership in this fight, a fight which we all must join, to stop domestic violence.

TELL IT LIKE IT IS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked groups of people back home if the news media have explained to them that the Republican School Lunch Program is increasing by over 4

percent per year for 5 years or that we are increasing funding for WIC, Women Infants, and Children's Program, by over \$1 billion over 5 years? Their answer is they have not heard.

The Democrats started the lie about the cuts and the news media have compounded that lie. We are increasing funding for school lunch programs and also for WIC. I wish the other side would tell the truth, and likewise for the news media. It seems only Rush Limbaugh is telling the truth.

WELFARE REFORM IS NEEDED

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, welfare reform is needed. Let us have a real debate on welfare reform. We can require work. Let us set time limits on assistance for the non-disabled. Let us require job training. Let us do a better job on collecting child support. I think that needs to be done.

But this bill today is more than that. This bill is about cuts in assistance to children. And whether you call it cuts or, under the newspeak, we call it limitations on increases, the American people want welfare reform, but they do not want cuts in our school lunches.

Yesterday I had lunch at the J.P. Henderson Elementary School in Houston, TX. Those children enjoyed their lunch. We had a burrito, and I will have to admit it was harder for me to eat than it was for them to eat. But their lunch is important to them, as important as their school work, their room or their teachers, because a child who is hungry cannot learn. The American people understand that, and I hope people would understand in this Congress that they need to read their lips; they want welfare reform but they do not want cuts in school lunch programs, as this bill, H.R. 1214, will do.

WESTERN COMMERCIAL SPACE CENTER LEASE SIGNING

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the 25-year lease agreement between the Department of the Air Force and the Western Commercial Space Center was finally signed. Although the agreement had been agreed upon in principle for months, it was nearly derailed by an overzealous civilian bureaucracy. In essence, what would have taken less than 30 days in the private sector took several months because of the arcane manner in which government tends to operate.

This lease agreement paves the way for construction to begin on the first polar orbit commercial spaceport in

America. Moreover, this agreement will usher in a new era of commercial launches from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California and will be a catalyst for greater private industry investment in commercial space activity across America.

Mr. Speaker, many people deserve thanks and credit for going the extra mile to work out this lease agreement. As we have discovered once again, when the national interest is involved—in this case the U.S. commitment to commercial space—both sides of the aisle can come together to do what is best for America.

REPUBLICAN RADICAL APPROACH TO CUTTING SCHOOL LUNCHES

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as I traveled around my district over the weekend, I met with school administrators who are concerned about what is going to happen to the School Lunch Program under the Republican radical approach to cutting school lunches.

One of the biggest things that became apparent to me as I traveled around and talked to people, and I asked people what they knew about the Contract With America, I found very few that ever heard of it and about two or three of all the people I talked to even knew anything about it.

It seems all these speeches that are being given here every day about this contract are not soaking in back home.

One thing they did ask me about invariably, wherever I went, what has happened to the NEWT GINGRICH investigation? What happened to the book deal? What happened to the COPAC investigation? Why is not something being done about that?

That is what I hear about all over my district. That is what the people want to know: Why is not this House investigating the Speaker's actions and what he has done on the book deal and other things?

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing wetlands legislation intended to replace section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Section 404 governs wetlands regulation and has long been in need of review and reform.

The new section would classify wetlands by their function and value, and balance the farmers' and landowners' property rights with the need to protect our Nation's functionally important wetlands.

I strongly disagree with the current wetlands regulation process. The

congressional section 404 is a bureaucratic quagmire that fails economically, constitutionally, and environmentally: Local development is constrained to spare the destruction of marginal wetlands, private property rights are ignored as Government declares citizens' property unusable, and State programs offer little to no incentive for local land owners to preserve and enhance vital wetlands.

The new legislation surpasses the current 404 program in many ways. Most importantly, the legislation recognizes that not all wetlands are the same. Wetlands would be classified into three types with the most valuable class being more strictly regulated than under current law. The middle class would be treated similarly to current law, but benefiting from the injection of a new balancing approach to the system. The third class, which provides no wetland functions and values, would be virtually unregulated.

The legislation also makes important strides in recognizing the rights of private property owners. For farmers, prior converted cropland would not be included within the scope of the wetlands regulation. Furthermore, land owners, who have lost the right to use a portion of their land due to a Government taking, would have the option to seek compensation at fair market value and transfer that the title to the Government, or to retain the title to the property land abide by the prohibition established for type A wetlands.

In addition, the legislation also provides for the protection and growth of our Nation's most functionally important wetlands. First, States are required to develop mitigation programs to enhance wetlands growth. Second, this legislation expands the list of activities that require permits in type A wetlands.

For all of these important reasons, I am pleased to offer this bill to the House.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the authors of the Violence Against Women Act, I was proud to join President Clinton at the White House earlier today to announce the appointment of former Iowa Attorney General Bonnie Campbell to direct the Violence Against Women Office at the Department of Justice.

The Violence Against Women Act, which passed with strong bipartisan support, is the first comprehensive Federal effort to fight violence against women. Long before Nicole Simpson was a household name, violence against women was one of America's most serious crime problems and most hidden secrets. Unfortunately, our local agencies were often inadequately trained, or hindered by scarce resources, and unable to tackle the problem.

Today, we say, "no more." Funding will begin to flow to the States to bolster their law enforcement, prosecution, and victim services that address violence against women. A national family violence hotline will be established. As a result of the rape victim shield law, which prevents abusive inquiries into one's past, victims will no longer be the ones put on trial. And individuals convicted of certain Federal sex abuse laws will be ordered to pay restitution to their victims.

Crimes against women are rising much faster than total crime.

Today we say, "no more."

REPAIRING A BROKEN WELFARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, our welfare system is broken. It encourages dependency, destroys initiative, and robs the poor of hope. As Ronald Reagan said,

You cannot create a desert, hand a person a cup of water, and call that compassion. And you cannot build up years of dependence on government and dare call that hope.

We need to break the cycle of dependency created by four decades and several trillion dollars of Federal payments. We need a welfare system that encourages personal responsibility, that requires work, and that gives States more flexibility to solve their own unique problems. This is not just a matter of fiscal responsibility, Mr. Speaker. For the sake of the people this Government has locked into a dehumanizing welfare system, we need to begin offering a hand up, not a hand-out. This is what the Republican welfare reform plan is all about—caring for the truly needy, while empowering people to help themselves. That is the American spirit, Mr. Speaker, and it is time we restore it to our welfare system.

WELFARE REFORM: REJECT THE REPUBLICAN PLAN

(Mr. WATT of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the rich are getting richer, and the poor are getting poorer. Over the last 15 years the top 5 percent, the richest people in our country, have seen their income and assets grow tremendously. The bottom 20 percent, the poorest people, have seen their incomes drop. The middle has been frozen in the same place for that entire period of time.

What does that have to do with welfare reform which we are discussing today? The Republicans' block grant approach freezes welfare at the 1994 level for the next 5 years. At the same time, they propose a \$190 billion tax

cut, 70 percent of which will go to the rich. Well, their philosophy is take from the poor and give it to the rich. That is what they are proposing to do.

We should reject this welfare reform proposal and reject this reverse Robin Hood approach that the Republicans are advocating.

REPUBLICAN WELFARE REFORM ENCOURAGES RESPONSIBILITIES

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Personal Responsibility Act, because the current welfare system has been an utter and complete failure. The welfare system encourages people toward three extremely harmful actions. First: Don't get a job. Second: Don't get married. Third: Have children out of wedlock—repeatedly. The current system subsidizes each of these behaviors with a check from the Federal Government. Only the Federal Government could have designed such a destructive system.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will make real change in the system. It will change the incentives to encourage people to get a job, get married, and be responsible in having children. All the while, we will hear the cries from Democrats who are so wrapped up in defending the morally bankrupt welfare system that they fail to see its destructive nature.

□ 1445

DEMOCRATS SEEK WELFARE REFORM THAT MOVES PEOPLE INTO THE WORKFORCE

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to my Republican colleagues by saying that there is nothing in this welfare reform package of a Personal Responsibility Act that says that we are going to send people to work. What the Democrats have said all along in our debate in the subcommittee and full committee is that we want to link welfare to work. We want people to be able to work, and we want to have a program that will assist them and move them into the workforce. I say to my colleagues, "You punish children, and you are just plain mean to children in this country, just for one purpose, and that is to say to the wealthiest of this Nation that we're going to pass you on a tax cut." It is wrong in the Personal Responsibility Act, for the Republicans to bring it to this floor, to be so cruel and to penalize children in this Nation at a time that we ought to be trying to protect our children because they will be the next generation that will carry this Nation forward.

REPUBLICAN WELFARE BILL PROMOTES FREEDOM AND REWARDS DETERMINATION

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, that is exactly what is wrong here, the Federal Government in control. They want to control our lives and every aspect of it. As my colleagues know, George Washington over there did not want welfare, he did not want taxes.

This week another historic debate is going to begin; another 40-year-old broken welfare program will end. Today the Republicans are going to bring forward a welfare bill that promotes freedom, rewards determination, and establishes self-esteem. Today mean-spirited Democrats, uncaring Democrats, will try to stop reform, cruel Democrats now defending a system that promoted dependency, rewarded complacency, and established self-defeat. They are the ones defending big government.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we believe in our Constitution. We believe that States, not the Federal Government, should be given the flexibility to design a program that will fix the problems that are unique to their communities.

Mr. Speaker, let us not just talk about ending welfare as we know it. Let us do it. Vote "yes" for America. Vote "yes" for welfare reform.

WELFARE SLOWLY DESTROYS THE WILL TO PERSEVERE

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the welfare system has been called a waste, it has been called inefficient, it has been called a destroyer of families, and it has even been compared with slavery. I would argue that these criticisms are largely accurate.

To those who would defend the current welfare system, I challenge them to go outside the Capitol Building and walk around the streets of the District of Columbia or almost any major city in America. Here one can see the results of the welfare culture. Crime, corruption, teenage pregnancy, children without fathers, poverty, unemployment, and on and on it goes. In other words, an almost complete breakdown of community.

The problems that the District and other communities face are not because too little money is being spent on welfare. They exist because welfare creates a perverse set of incentives that suffocate the dignity of work and slowly destroy the will to persevere.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have promised to not only reform welfare, but to replace welfare. We are committed to the belief that people are more important than government and that strong

children are better than strong bureaucracies.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its Clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 889. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 889) "An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes to the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. GORTON, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. REID to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelop received from the White House on Friday, March 17, 1995 at 4:35 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he notifies the Congress of his intention to designate the West Bank and Gaza Strip as a beneficiary for the purposes of the Generalized System of Preferences.

With great respect, I am
Sincerely yours,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES' BENEFITS TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA STRIP—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-47)

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 Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am writing to inform you of my intent to designate the West Bank and Gaza Strip as a beneficiary of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). The GSP program, which offers duty-free access to the U.S. market, was originally authorized by the Trade Act of 1974.

I have carefully considered the criteria identified in sections 501 and 502 of the Trade Act of 1974. In light of these criteria, I have determined that it is appropriate to extend GSP benefits to the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

This notice is submitted in accordance with section 502(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1995.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993—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 Science:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 3(f) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1862(f)), I am pleased to transmit to you the Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for Fiscal Year 1993.

The Foundation supports research and education in every State of the Union. Its programs provide an international science and technology link to sustain cooperation and advance this Nation's leadership role.

This report shows how the Foundation puts science and technology to work for a sustainable future—for our economic, environmental, and national security.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 21, 1995.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENTS RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-48)

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:

1. On August 19, 1994, in Executive Order No. 12924, I declared a national emergency under the International

Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*) and the system of controls maintained under that Act. In that order, I continued in effect, to the extent permitted by law, the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, the Export Administration Regulations (15 C.F.R. 768 *et seq.*), and the delegations of authority set forth in Executive Order No. 12002 of July 7, 1977 (as amended by Executive Order No. 12755 of March 12, 1991), Executive Order No. 12214 of May 2, 1980, Executive Order No. 12735 of November 16, 1990 (subsequently revoked by Executive Order No. 12938 of November 14, 1994), and Executive Order No. 12851 of June 11, 1993.

2. I issued Executive Order No. 12924 pursuant to the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including, but not limited to, IEEPA. At that time, I also submitted a report to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). Section 204 of IEEPA requires follow-up reports, with respect to actions or changes, to be submitted every 6 months. Additionally, section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (NEA) (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*) requires that the President, within 90 days after the end of each 6-month period following a declaration of a national emergency, report to the Congress on the total expenditures directly attributable to that declaration. This report, covering the 6-month period from August 19, 1994, to February 19, 1995, is submitted in compliance with these requirements.

3. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12924, the Department of Commerce has continued to administer and enforce the system of export controls, including antiboycott provisions, contained in the Export Administration Regulations. In administering these controls, the Department has acted under a policy of conforming actions under Executive Order No. 12924 to those required under the Export Administration Act, insofar as appropriate.

4. Since my last report to the Congress, there have been several significant developments in the area of export controls:

BILATERAL COOPERATION/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

—As part of the Administration's continuing effort to encourage other countries to implement effective export controls to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as certain sensitive technologies, the Department of Commerce and other agencies conducted a range of discussions with a number of foreign countries, including governments in the Baltics, Central and Eastern

Europe, the Newly Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union, the Pacific Rim, and China. Licensing requirements were liberalized for exports to Argentina, South Korea, and Taiwan, responding in part to their adoption of improved export control procedures.

AUSTRALIA GROUP

—The Department of Commerce issued regulations to remove controls on certain chemical weapon stabilizers that are not controlled by the Australia Group, a multilateral regime dedicated to stemming the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. This change became effective October 19, 1994. In that same regulatory action, the Department also published a regulatory revision that reflects an Australia Group decision to adopt a multi-tiered approach to control of certain mixtures containing chemical precursors. The new regulations extend General License G-DEST treatment to certain categories of such mixtures.

NUCLEAR SUPPLIERS GROUP (NSG)

—NSG members are examining the present dual-use nuclear control list to both remove controls no longer warranted and to rewrite control language to better reflect nuclear proliferation concerns. A major item for revision involves machine tools, as the current language was accepted on an interim basis until agreement on more specific language could be reached.

—The Department of Commerce has implemented license denials for NSG-controlled items as part of the "no-undercut" provision. Under this provision, denial notifications received from NSG member countries obligate other member nations not to approve similar transactions until they have consulted with the notifying party, thus reducing the possibilities for undercutting such denials.

MISSILE TECHNOLOGY CONTROL REGIME (MTCR)

—Effective September 30, 1994, the Department of Commerce revised the control language for MTCR items on the Commerce Control List, based on the results of the last MTCR plenary. The revisions reflect advances in technology and clarifications agreed to multilaterally.

—On October 4, 1994, negotiations to resolve the 1993 sanctions imposed on China for MTCR violations involving missile-related trade with Pakistan were successfully concluded. The United States lifted the Category II sanctions effective November 1, in exchange for a Chinese commitment not to export ground-to-ground Category I missiles to any destination.

—At the October 1994 Stockholm plenary, the MTCR made public the fact of its "no-undercut" policy on

license denials. Under this multilateral arrangement, denial notifications received from MTCR members are honored by other members for similar export license applications. Such a coordinated approach enhances U.S. missile nonproliferation goals and precludes other member nations from approving similar transactions without prior consultation.

MODIFICATIONS IN CONTROLS ON EMBARGOED DESTINATIONS

- Effective August 30, 1994, the Department of Commerce restricted the types of commodities eligible for shipment to Cuba under the provisions of General License GIFT. Only food, medicine, clothing, and other human needs items are eligible for this general license.
- The embargo against Haiti was lifted on October 16, 1994. That embargo had been under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Treasury. Export license authority reverted to the Department of Commerce upon the termination of the embargo.

REGULATORY REFORM

- In February 1994, the Department of Commerce issued a Federal Register notice that invited public comment on ways to improve the Export Administration Regulations. The project's objective is "to make the rules and procedures for the control of exports simpler and easier to understand and apply." This project is not intended to be a vehicle to implement substantive change in the policies or procedures of export administration, but rather to make those policies and procedures simpler and clearer to the exporting community. Reformulating and simplifying the Export Administration Regulations is an important priority, and significant progress has been made over the last 6 months in working toward completion of this comprehensive undertaking.

EXPORT ENFORCEMENT

- Over the last 6 months, the Department of Commerce continued its vigorous enforcement of the Export Administration Act and the Export Administration Regulations through educational outreach, license application screening, spot checks, investigations, and enforcement actions. In the last 6 months, these efforts resulted in civil penalties, denials of export privileges, criminal fines, and imprisonment. Total fines amounted to over \$12,289,000 in export control and antiboycott compliance cases, including criminal fines of nearly \$9,500,000 while 11 parties were denied export privileges.
- Teledyne Fined \$12.9 Million and a Teledyne Division Denied Export Privileges for Export Control Violations: On January 26 and January 27, Teledyne Industries, Inc. of Los

Angeles, agreed to a settlement of criminal and administrative charges arising from illegal export activity in the mid-1980's by its Teledyne Wah Chang division, located in Albany, Oregon. The settlement levied criminal fines and civil penalties on the firm totaling \$12.9 million and imposed a denial of export privileges on Teledyne Wah Chang.

The settlement is the result of a 4-year investigation by the Office of Export Enforcement and the U.S. Customs Service. United States Attorneys offices in Miami and Washington, D.C., coordinated the investigation. The investigation determined that during the mid-1980's, Teledyne illegally exported nearly 270 tons of zirconium that was used to manufacture cluster bombs for Iraq.

As part of the settlement, the Department restricted the export privileges of Teledyne's Wah Chang division; the division will have all export privileges denied for 3 months, with the remaining portion of the 3-year denial period suspended.

- Storm Kheem Pleads Guilty to Nonproliferation and Sanctions Violations: On January 27, Storm Kheem pled guilty in Brooklyn, New York, to charges that he violated export control regulations barring U.S. persons from contributing to Iraq's missile program. Kheem arranged for the shipment of foreign-source ammonium perchlorate, a highly explosive chemical used in manufacturing rocket fuel, from the People's Republic of China to Iraq via Amman, Jordan, without obtaining the required validated license from the Department of Commerce for arranging the shipment. Kheem's case represents the first conviction of a person for violating section 778.9 of the Export Administration Regulations, which restricts proliferation-related activities of "U.S. persons." Kheem also pled guilty to charges of violating the Iraqi Sanctions Regulations.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from August 19, 1994, to February 19, 1995, that are directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to export controls were largely centered in the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Export Administration. Expenditures by the Department of Commerce are anticipated to be \$19,681,000 most of which represents program operating costs, wage and salary costs for Federal personnel and overhead expenses.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 21, 1995.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF REVIEW PANEL PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 7, RULE LI OF HOUSE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable VIC FAZIO, ranking minority member of the Committee on House Oversight:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT,
Washington, DC, March 10, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to House rule 51, clause 7, I have appointed the Honorable William J. Jefferson, and the Honorable Ed Pastor, to serve on the review panel established by the Rule for the 104th Congress.

Best Regards,

VIC FAZIO,
Ranking Minority Member,
Committee on House Oversight.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 117 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 117

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the text of the bill (H.R. 1214) to help children by reforming the Nation's welfare system to promote work, marriage, and personal responsibility, and shall not exceed five hours, with two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and three hours equally divided among and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 117 is a rule providing for general debate on H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995.

The rule provides 5 hours of general debate, with 2 hours allocated to the Committee on Ways and Means and 1½ hours each to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Committee on Agriculture.

Debate must be confined to the bill and the text of H.R. 1214, which the Committee on Rules intends to make in order as original text for amendment purposes in a subsequent rule—which we will put out of the Committee on Rules at about 5 p.m. this afternoon. After general debate, the rule provides for the Committee of the Whole to rise without motion.

No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except by subsequent order of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Personal Responsibility Act that the full House will begin debating today is an extremely complex and important piece of legislation.

The House has considered this bill to date in a detailed and thorough manner.

House Republicans promised a comprehensive reform of our Nation's abysmal welfare system, and we have delivered.

H.R. 4 was introduced on January 4, 1995, the opening day of this session.

Three House committees—Ways and Means, Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Agriculture—held extensive hearings on welfare reform. All three committees conducted grueling marathon markups, often deliberating late into the night.

Chairmen ARCHER, GOODLING, and ROBERTS then merged their versions of the package into one new bill, H.R. 1214 before us now. The Committee on Rules intends to make this new bill in order as original text for amendment purposes on the floor.

The committee is scheduled to meet at 5 p.m. this evening to report a rule providing for the amendment process for the bill.

The Committee on Rules held a 7½-hour hearing on Thursday, March 16, and took testimony from no less than 60 witnesses.

Members on both sides of the aisle suggested constructive amendments and there was an excellent debate about the many issues the bill addresses head-on.

Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate the importance of this legislation to the American public, the Republican leadership has set aside an entire week on the House floor for consideration of this bill.

If anyone should claim that this welfare reform legislation has been hasty or ill-conceived, I would ask—"Where was the welfare reform legislation when the Democrats held both Houses of Congress and the White House?"

Mr. Speaker, we certainly do not have the time to recount the President's many broken campaign promises, but the Clinton administration's failure to make good on its pledge to

reform the welfare system has been outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 tackles some of the most difficult issues of our day directly and head-on.

The bill makes fiscal sense by consolidating numerous major programs into block grants directly to the States, and that's the way it should be. Layers of bureaucracy in Washington will be made unnecessary.

The savings will be phenomenal—and the States will maintain maximum flexibility to help the poor in their areas, and they know how best to do it, not us inside the beltway.

The bill requires welfare recipients to work within 2 years, and bars receipt of benefits for more than 5 years.

Reasonable restrictions are applied to recipients on AFDC to encourage self-sufficiency; in other words, to stop them from being second, and third and fourth generation beneficiaries of welfare.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 makes badly needed reforms to the Federal food stamp program, to the Supplemental Security Income program and family nutrition and child nutrition programs.

Mr. Speaker, as the House debates welfare reform this week, the public should take note of which of these proposals honestly addresses the problems of poverty in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, the American people will be asking, and Members had better be asking ourselves, which alternative defends the status quo. That is the question right here tonight, which alternative defends the status quo that has failed so miserably, and which alternative wrestles with the issues of illegitimate births, welfare dependency, child support enforcement, and putting low-income people back to work.

Mr. Speaker, the Personal Responsibility Act will prevail when scrutinized in this manner. I ask my colleagues to do this. During the recent debate on cutting spending I asked this House what is compassionate about adding another trillion dollars to the debt on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. Is that compassionate? The answer was no then. I ask my colleagues today now what is compassionate about continuing failed welfare programs that encourage a second, and third and fourth generation of welfare dependency? I say to my colleagues, "You know, and I know, the answer is 'nothing.'"

Mr. Speaker, that is why we must not defend the status quo. We must make the changes that are so necessary today. We can do it by voting for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule was voted unanimously out of the Committee on Rules on Thursday afternoon on a bipartisan basis. The House is eager to begin this debate. We should do it now and get on with it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we support this first part of the rule providing for consideration of the Personal Responsibility Act. The 5 hours of general debate times it provides are essential for the thorough deliberation that is required for legislation as comprehensive and as drastic as this.

□ 1500

As has been true of most of the elements of the Contract With America, this legislation was hastily drafted and has been sent to the House without the benefit of thorough and public discussion or debate. We hope these 5 hours of debate will help clarify the controversies surrounding this overhaul not only of AFDC, the program most of us think of when we talk about welfare, but also of the entire child welfare system, of disability benefits for children, and of all the major nutrition programs our Nation has provided for many years.

The Committee on Rules heard a full day of testimony from Members of the House, Democrats and Republicans alike, about the need for substantive changes in the legislation before us. There was bipartisan support for changes in several parts of the bill, including the paternity establishment section, which is so restrictive in nature that even if a mother fully cooperates, she and her child could be punished by the denial of cash aid, if a State dragged its feet on establishing paternity.

There was also bipartisan support for amendments to strengthen the child support enforcement section, and for amendments to provide more funding for child care for welfare recipients so the mother is able to work or to get job training.

Unfortunately, the Personal Responsibility Act fails to deliver what the American people want: A welfare system that expects parents to work to support their families, but that also protects vulnerable children.

We need to pass legislation that ensures parental responsibility while also protecting children, encourages State flexibility without totally abdicating Federal oversight, and protects taxpayer resources by applying fairness and common sense.

Not only is the Personal Responsibility Act weak on work requirements, but it contains no requirement for education, training, and support services. If we want poor parents to work, they will need these services. They will need child care and transportation, for example.

The goals of the bill include preventing teen pregnancy and out-of-wedlock births. Unfortunately and incredibly, family planning services, the key to reducing out-of-wedlock births, the vast majority of which are unintended, are not even mentioned in this bill, which

does away with the 30-year-old requirement that States offer family planning services to all AFDC recipients.

Meanwhile, in just the past decade the percentage of all children born in the United States out of wedlock has doubled, more than doubled, to 32 percent. Thirty-two percent of all the babies born in this country are born out of wedlock, and there is nothing in this so-called reform bill that even tries to deal with this enormous problem.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons and many others, the Personal Responsibility Act requires the lengthy debate that this rule provides. We support the rule and urge our colleagues to approve it so that we may proceed with consideration of this important and controversial legislation today.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the fine gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

This is probably the most important debate and perhaps the most important issue that we will face, perhaps during my lifetime, certainly the most important since I have been in the Congress of the United States.

What is at stake? Well, basically, what is at stake is this: What do we do to free millions of Americans from the shackles that the Federal Government has placed them in? All of the programs were well meaning. Over the years I sat behind several chairmen, one who used to say, "Bill, these programs just aren't working the way we had intended them." And that is true. So year after year, generation after generation, we have enslaved these people, so, unless we make a change, they will never have an opportunity to get part of that American dream. That is destructive to them. That is destructive to our society and to our country.

Making changes is very, very difficult. Change is something that people fear, and that is true in no place worse than in the Congress of the United States. But if we do not change, then, of course, we are going to continue to enslave the very people we have sent over \$5 trillion to try to help. Year after year we will be doing this, and it is totally unfair to those people in our society.

So it would be my hope that we get away from the rhetoric and pay a little attention to the facts and see whether we can do better than we have done in the past. I think those people that we have tried to help are depending on us to make that change.

The first thing we have to do is admit that we failed. That should not be so difficult. It does not matter which side of the aisle we sit on. Just passing more programs and more programs and adding more money and more money has not worked. It has disadvantaged the disadvantaged. So it is time to make that change. An alco-

holic has to admit that he has that problem before we can ever do anything to help him or for him to help himself to a recovery. It is true of any other drug addict. It is equally as true with the legislation we are dealing with today.

So I would call on my colleagues to listen carefully and participate intelligently. Let us not get up and give a lot rhetoric that has nothing to do with the facts. We know the facts. We know the facts of how we failed, and we know the facts of what it is we are trying to do to see whether we can help the most vulnerable in this country receive a portion of the American dream that we on the Federal level have denied them from receiving all of these years.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN].

Mr. Speaker, the first thing we should do in starting the debate on as serious a subject as this is to puncture the myths that surround this debate. The first myth I would like to puncture is that the Democrats support the status quo. That is absolutely not true.

As recently as last year, I introduced and held hearings on a very substantial welfare reform program. Unfortunately, it ran into a hurricane of Republican filibuster, and it got nowhere. But it was not that we did not try.

Second, the myth is that the Democrats have held control of this since 1935 and we have done nothing except perpetuate poverty and the miseries of welfare.

That is not so. In the Johnson and Kennedy eras, we made substantial reforms in the welfare program, and we created such programs as Head Start and Upward Bound and the Follow Through Program and programs for aid to college-bound students and for those who should be bound for college but unfortunately could not go.

As recently as in the 1970's, a Republican President, President Nixon, sent us a comprehensive welfare reform bill that unfortunately we rejected. It came to us at a time when President Nixon was encumbered by the Watergate scandal, and the bill got polluted in that environment. At that time, it is important to note, the President suggested that we federalize welfare, that we not dump it on the States as our Republican colleagues would do today, and that we take the entire responsibility because he thought, and I think, that every child is a citizen of the United States and every child should have a government that cares for him in a humane way. That was the thought of President Nixon, and we unfortunately did not adopt it.

Well, as we all know, Reagan was elected in 1980, and so we did nothing

for 8 years. We could not even get a squeak out of him about making any changes in that program. But during the Bush administration, in 1988 we made substantial reforms to the welfare program and crafted in it the requirement of work. But it was put in there in a workable manner so that if the woman needed a job and was able to work and had to have child care because she just could not leave her child or her infant at home unattended, she could get that, or if she needed training, she could get that. So the myth that we in the Congress have done nothing except perpetuate this is, I hope, punctured.

Let us look at the bill before us. This is a cruel piece of legislation. It punishes the children, the innocent children, because of the errors of their parent or parents. It punishes them not just at birth but it punishes some for a lifetime, and certainly it punishes others through all of their childhood era. It will deprive them of the basic necessities for food, of clothing, of housing, of education, of love. That is what this bill does.

There is a better way, a far better way, and we have put that forward. We will have alternatives for this program on the floor here, but they will receive scant notice. They will have perhaps an hour or so of debate time, and then it will all be over. But this bill will never become law. There is hope out there that something sensible will become law.

Mr. Speaker, let us get on with the debate.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, of course, I take strong exception to the comments about the Republican filibuster in the last year. There is no filibuster in the House of Representatives. Rather, it is the Republicans who are taking the bull by the horns.

Furthermore, as to the bill, the punishment to our children is, if we do nothing, if we maintain the status quo, that is where the real punishment to our children comes from. Frankly, I think it is somewhat baloney when they say this bill takes away love from children and will leave children out there hungry, and so on, and so forth. I think that is political rhetoric, and we need to get beyond that to the meat of the bill.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. GOSS].

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], a new and hard-working member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are today indeed launching a very historic debate on welfare reform, as Chairman GOODLING has outlined. We are going to be struggling with some of the most vexing and

challenging issues of our time that confront our country and, more importantly, confront the people of our country.

One thing is very, very clear: In this most important comprehensive reform on welfare programs that we have ever attempted in the House, there is no ultimate wisdom. There are going to be disagreements.

No one has all the answers, and it is likely that we will not get it exactly right on all fronts the first time we go through this, but we have got to start because we owe it to our children and others in need to make the best possible attempt to fix what is broken. And what is broken is the system that we have now. It is clearly broken, and it is failing. Doing nothing is not the right answer.

As the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] said and as many others are going to say, doing nothing only leads to more grief for more Americans, because we can see that we are running out of money and we can see that we are not succeeding in what we are trying to do.

This rule allows 5 hours of general debate to get the process started, and I look forward to a truly deliberative and productive process, bringing together the best judgments of every Member of this institution.

But first, let us review the facts. Mr. Speaker, in the early 1970's the United States declared war on poverty. That was the cry, and despite the best intentions and \$5 trillion of taxpayer funds, we just about have to say that we lost the war, that it is time to surrender and do something different. Illegitimacy rates and welfare rolls continue to soar and as everybody knows, more people live in poverty today than when we started the war and before we spent the \$5 trillion.

□ 1515

Worse still, the current system hurt some of the very people it was intended to help. The Republican welfare reform bill focus on three important things. First, it consolidates programs to minimize bureaucracy, fraud, and hopefully gets rid of some of the waste we have got, in order to ensure that our finite resources, and they are increasingly finite, reach those who truly need the help. In other words, we are not going to deal with the marginal cases. We are going to deal with the needy.

Second, the Republican plan is legislation that allows States the flexibility to enact programs that are best suited to their individual needs while at the same time providing accountability at the local level. It is not exactly the same in New York City as it is in Alaska, Florida, or someplace in the Midwest. We need that flexibility.

Finally, the bill does away with many of the destructive disincentives that have helped to perpetuate generations of dependency, and we all know that.

Although this bill is estimated to save taxpayers tens of billions of dol-

lars over the next 5 years, we have managed to increase spending for important programs like WIC and school lunches, despite the rhetoric to the contrary we keep hearing, and we have changed the carrots and sticks to move people off welfare roles and on to pay-rolls.

Mr. Speaker, I spent a good deal of time this weekend meeting with people in southwest Florida in my district who are right on the front lines, people working within the current system who know the issues, who have the expertise to redflag possible problems with this reform. And there are some serious and legitimate concerns, especially about the block grant approach and the potential for abuse and unfair distribution of funds within States.

We have to make sure we build this into the block grant approach, some kind of safeguard to make sure dollars flow to the areas where they are most needed. And I support that. That is just one area that we need to explore through this process.

But we have so many opportunities to make improvements and do things better. I sat at a Headstart luncheon yesterday with youngsters in the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten program. This is a program that works. We are keeping it. We make sure it is funded.

The things that work, we are trying to save. It is the things that do not work we are trying to excise and replace with something better. I think the authors of our proposal have done yeoman's work in bringing us to this point. Obviously, it is not a finished product, but it is a place worthy of beginning debate. Let the debate begin and support the rule.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule for the 5 hours of general debate on the Personal Responsibility Act of the welfare bill, but I must rise in strong opposition once again to the Personal Responsibility Act because when we see how cruel this particular bill would be to children in this country, and Republicans are saying that Democrats really do not want a welfare bill, that they have had all of these years in order to pass one. But I have chaired this subcommittee for many, many years, and we have tried to work with the Republicans in the past to structure a welfare reform system that would respond to the human needs of people in this country.

I think when we see the Family Support Act of 1988, which was brought on by the Democrats, or we have seen certain things put in place, and even under the Clinton administration, when he was elected President and he campaigned on the fact that we wanted to end welfare as we know it, and I

think we tried to fashion legislation and we tried to get Republicans to come around.

But even if you think not, I would say to the Republicans that it is a time that what we all want to accomplish in this is to try to make sure that we move people off welfare into the private sector workplace, if possible. That is what we all want to accomplish in this welfare reform bill, and the Personal Responsibility Act, it does not address that.

The work requirements are such that people can just roll off of welfare, move into no jobs at all, and therefore, under your work requirements, that will be counted. We have not placed people in the workplace. We have not identified a link between welfare to work at all. I think Democrats have said all along that we want work first.

If Republicans, we could sit down with Chairman SHAW and others and do that. But just look at one thing. When we reported this bill, the formula has changed four times on the allocation of the \$15.4 billion. We see now that under the changes that have been made from what we reported from the subcommittee, we see Speaker GINGRICH'S State of Georgia gained \$45 million in the back rooms of the Committee on Rules. His State is picking up an additional \$45 million. We see that those same private deals reduced California's block grant funding over a 5 year period by \$670 million. In every public discussion on this subcommittee, it was very clear that California's share was higher.

Look at the other ways under the Committee on Rules, in the back room of the Committee on Rules, we see New York will take a hit of \$275 million. But we see the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] took care of himself. He added an additional \$20 million in the back room of the Committee on Rules. Not the subcommittee, not the full committee, but in the back room of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that we are in the protecting the children of this country. We see the first State allocation of allocation formula being changed, just in back room dealings by the Republicans. You too are ashamed of this bill you are bringing to the House floor today.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while I am a little baffled by the gentleman from Tennessee's allegations about the back room drafts on this, the rule has not even been reported. The Committee on Rules meets at 5 o'clock. I invite you to come up and see about the back room thing. There is going to be media there. There is no back room drafting.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss this bill. I am in support of the rule which we have before us. I do disagree with those who would say that this bill is cruel, and I would hope that our debate through the general debate and through the amendment process which we are going to undertake will be one which is constructive. Because maybe this is not the final bill, and I think there are some very good ideas. Lord only knows there are a lot of people here who have worked in this particular area, and we need to work with them as well.

But welfare as we know it today has basically continued people in poverty. There has been a sense of hopelessness attached to it. No real opportunity to leave or really to improve your life unless you are so self-motivated you can do so. Frankly, it has been generational to some degree.

In Delaware, we put together a program in 1987 under a blueprint for change and it became one of the model States for the Family Support Act of 1988. We developed an employment and training program to target the needs of hard-to-employ long-term welfare client. We developed a case management approach to service delivery. We raised the case assistance standard of need to bring benefits in line with neighboring States or the national average, and we developed indigent medical care programs and other programs to help people off of welfare.

The statistics are interesting on that. Since 1986, over 5,600 clients have benefited, with 2,779, and that is about one-half, of course, working full-time and 2,075 leaving welfare all together. Additionally, child care for families and work education and training has been increased substantially. We dealt with the problem in the State of Delaware, and I was pleased to be able to be the Governor during that period of time, and I think we dealt with it successfully.

Now we look at this program and we look at what we have. We are going to have a lot of rhetoric about it. The truth of the matter is the President of the United States of America, a good proposal by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], which we are going to hear about, and this bill are not as different from each other as we are probably going to hear about.

They essentially call for an end of welfare at some period of time for all families. They all call for work after a couple of years so people would have to go to work. It is a big-bang solution to solving the problems of welfare.

The Republican bill does call for block grants and gives more State flexibility. But today the House does begin consideration of some very important changes in our Personal Responsibility Act and a dialogue with the American people and our welfare recipients on replacing that failed welfare system with one based on work, individual responsibility, family, hope, and opportunity.

This bill does represent fundamental and dramatic change. We are going to have to talk about it. In its best light this bill could provide opportunity for those who have none. Democrats and Republicans, all agree by removing welfare recipients into work we can help place welfare recipients on the road to self-sufficiency, opportunity, and hope for their future, where currently frankly there is none. And this is not mean-spirited Republican philosophy, but American values.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention to the gentleman, you have not only been a tremendous and a very valuable member of the team which has been working over the last year to craft the bill and to get us where we are today, but your model, the Delaware model, which is continuing now under the present Governor, but from the seeds that you planted in Delaware, you have set the pattern, as a few other Governors have in this country, in what welfare should be, and taking it from a program of dependence to a program promoting independence. I would just like to compliment the gentleman in the well for the great work he has done as a Governor and a Member of this House in reforming this very difficult task of reforming welfare as we know it today.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for his compliments, unsolicited, I might add. I might just say with respect to that, I think we as Republicans have a responsibility to make sure as we monitor this bill to make absolutely positive that the kinds of programs we want are being put into place in the States, with the child care, the training, the education which is necessary; that we make sure there is no hardship, and we are trying to do something about rainy day funds. But that we give people that opportunity.

I think that is what this is all about. I think there has been some misrepresentation, all the way from the food nutrition programs, which has been I think misrepresented as to its potential growth, through a lot of other things that are happening.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, as this day wears on and as the next few days wear on, that that story comes out. If there are amendments we should adopt, so be it, we should adopt them. But when it is all said and done, I hope we will have a welfare system in place in this country that will allow people to look at it and know this is giving us hope, it is giving us sustenance, it is going to carry us through, we are going to be able to take care of our families, but at some point we are going to have the hope to be able to grow through it, to be able to be employed, if one is employable, and take care of those who are not employable, and be able to ac-

tually make progress for many people in America.

I look upon this in an optimistic sense, not in the pessimistic sense that this is a bill to suppress people. I realize there is a different point of view on that. But I hope we listen to each other and balance this and carry it out before the week has ended and we actually can adopt a piece of legislation that all of us can be very proud of.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague who is in the well now, one who has worked on the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means and one who has been in the forefront of the work component of the Democratic piece for welfare recipients in this country. I thank our colleague from Michigan, who has worked so hard with the full committee ranking member and the ranking member of the subcommittee. So I just wanted to first commend the gentleman.

I want to refer to my colleague from Colorado by saying what I am really afraid of in all of this is if the formula allocation was changed four times from the subcommittee, what bothers me is what the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] talked about earlier.

Surely, I want to say we Democrats want to work with the Republicans, talk this out, work it out, craft a welfare reform package that will put people to work and put work first. But what we do not want to do is to see when we go back to the Committee on Rules that we are going to continue to bring a bill to this floor that will constantly change in the allocation formula, and other things that will change in this bill, that we did not report out of the full Committee on Ways and Means. It was a bad bill that we reported out. It is tough on kids, it is cruel to kids in America, and I think we have to continue to discuss this. The Personal Responsibility Act is a bad bill for kids in America.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, let me just talk about welfare reform for a few minutes.

Look, the status quo is dead. The only issue is what is going to replace the present welfare system, and here is the quandary before the Committee on rules. We have only a partial rule, but they are faced with a bill that is extreme. It is extreme.

The school lunch program was just the tip of the iceberg. Then over the weekend we heard complaints about the provisions on mothers under 18, kids being punished if they are mothers under 18, or if they are the second kid

in the family, forever. Well, now there seems to be kind of a retreat from that extreme provision.

Then we also heard over the weekend about day-care. The troops are a little restless over there on the Republican side with the extreme provision. We had urged in committee and subcommittee, make welfare reform work, have day-care. Now maybe you are beginning to get the message.

The trouble is that you have many other extreme provisions in your bill. For example, there is no linkage of welfare to work. States can meet the participation requirements simply by knocking people off the rolls. Period. There is not one more dollar, in fact there are dollars less, for work to give States the ability to link welfare with work.

SSI, there is a potential of knocking 700,000 kids off the SSI rolls. There is some abuse in the program, but do not punish truly handicapped children because of the abuse of some families.

□ 1530

That is harsh. Foster care, we put a provision in the bill so you could not divert moneys from foster care to some other program and you delete that.

Legal immigrants, this bill takes billions and billions, about \$15 billion under some estimates, in terms of benefits from legal immigrants. There needs to be reform, but there does not need to be a drastic, drastic kind of measure here.

The bill that was presented by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], unlike the GOP bill, in my judgment has attempted to face these issues fairly and squarely. When it was urged that they fell short, their sponsors had an open mind, rather than a deaf ear. The Republicans, in contrast, have it backwards. Weak on work and tough on kids.

The only hope for a bipartisan response now is to set aside this bill and see if we can put together one that will truly put into effect workable welfare reform. We owe it to our constituents to do that. The bill before us miserably fails.

We Democrats stand ready to work with you. The problem is, you have been totally unwilling to work with us.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to commend my colleagues for working so hard to develop a welfare reform proposal which takes great steps in reforming the welfare system. I support H.R. 4 for many reasons.

One of the main reasons is that H.R. 4 reforms the welfare system by providing incentives that move people off welfare into work. Many States have already developed welfare to work programs that have experienced high success rates, my State of Illinois included.

In the 16th district of Illinois, which I represent, Project Prosper is enjoying fantastic success and job training and placement of their welfare recipients, and Project Prosper uses no Federal funds. Why? Because the developers of that project work day to day with the welfare recipients and are able to concentrate on individual needs of particular circumstances.

I stand firm with my colleagues here in Washington, my constituents back home and many people across the nation in my conviction that the States are in a much better position to create and operate welfare programs that best suit their constituencies. These local programs provide the necessary incentives that move the welfare recipients in the direction of financial independence.

The welfare reform debate continues, and it is important to keep in mind that since 1965, when it first began, the Federal program has spent a total of \$5 trillion. For cash welfare programs alone, the Federal Government has spent \$1.3 trillion; for medical programs, \$1.8 trillion; for food programs, \$545 billion; and for housing assistance, nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ trillion dollars. With all the money plowed into the programs, what do we have? The same poverty rate in 1966 as we do today, 14 percent.

We want to change the system, give children of this country an opportunity and incentive to enjoy the American dream, to get off the welfare system, to know what the free enterprise system is about. That is the purpose of H.R. 4, to imbue that sense of personal responsibility back into the welfare system.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], the ranking minority member on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and 5 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, if Attila the Hun were alive today and elected to Congress, he would be delighted with this bill that is before us today and proud to cast his vote for it. H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act is the most callous, coldhearted, and mean-spirited attack on this country's children that I have ever seen in my life.

You know, I cannot help but wonder how that could be? How people could be so insensitive to the needs of kids. Now, this bill is touted as welfare reform. It is intended to move Americans out of the welfare system. Well, if throwing children and low-income people in the streets is reforming the system, then I guess this bill succeeds at what it purports to do.

What the bill really succeeds in doing is something that is not discussed. It creates \$69.4 billion in savings to pay for tax cuts for the rich folk of this

country. That is what the Republicans are eager to do.

The first fundamental flaw of this bill is that H.R. 4 ignores the very basic reason that most Americans become welfare recipients and stay on welfare. They cannot find jobs. There are very few low-skill, entry-level jobs nowadays that pay a living wage, but instead of improving our job training program or increasing the minimum wage, or providing affordable child care or creating jobs or offering a possible alternative to poverty, this bill, which is a hatchet act, punishes Americans for being poor. This bill fails to create a single job and still creates a whole list of reasons to cut Americans and their kids off the welfare rolls.

This cut and slash bill guts our current system of a safety net for the needy by carrying a bad idea to the far extreme. It just wipes out the critical entitlement status of most of our current systems and replaces them with State block grants and Federal funds with no strings attached. Anybody in the State could do whatever they wanted to with these things. There are major problems with completely abolishing the Federal Government's most successful programs, such as the School Lunch Program, the Breakfast Program, the WIC Program and so forth, and putting them into State funds that are already inadequate or will be inadequate because they are already going to be cut and monitoring or establishing no kind of quality standards or no kind of monitoring standards by which the States can be held accountable.

Let us take the School Lunch Program. I mentioned earlier today that I had gone to the Henry Suder School in my district. In that school, 488 kids out of 501 are on the School Nutrition Program. I see some of my Members on the other side of the aisle laughing.

I ask this question, how many of them have ever been hungry? How many of them have ever known what it was not to have a meal? How many of them have ever known what it was not to have decent shoes, decent clothing, a nice place to live? I will bet most of them have had a nice room of their own, not shared with any brothers or sisters, maybe five or six, have always been able to get their shoes if they wanted, the clothing that they wanted, food that they needed, et cetera. They do not know about poverty.

So I challenge them to come to the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, in my district, and walk in the path of these children that they are cutting off on welfare. Walk in the path of the truly needy people who live by welfare because they have no other means by which to live. Not everybody stays on welfare eternally. We all know that. Some people do get off. Occasionally people get off of welfare because they do find a job, because they are able to get a GED, because they are

able to get their education. And it happens more than once. It happens time and time again.

There are some people, of course, who have been on welfare for a long period of time, but that is not the norm. And we all know it is not the norm, and why we stand here and say that it is does not make any sense at all to me.

Let me tell you, I have to wonder when I see young bright kids who have every opportunity to learn in this country but who are not able to do so because they live in hunger, because they live in poverty, because they have no real life, no real life, if you will, that we are accustomed to denied the opportunity to live to be full Americans because of their lifestyle, because of what they do not have, because of the things that are not given to them, because of the enrichment programs that we send our kids to but that they do not happen to have because they are poor and because they are on welfare. I dread to think of the time when a child of mine or yours, in fact, would be denied an opportunity to feed your grandchild or my grandchild or anybody else's because they have not been able to find a job, because they have been laid off from their job for a small period of time, a short time.

These are the things that we are talking about today. We are not talking about welfare forever. We are talking about welfare as a gap, a bridge, a bridge over troubled waters.

If you have never been there, do not knock it. You might drown.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, as to the gentlewoman's comments from the State of Florida, I take strong exception to her comments that there is laughter on this side of the aisle. While we may disagree with her point, her comments are taken with respect.

I rather suspect that her comment about laughter was probably written into her speech.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

(Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Republican welfare reform bill.

Our welfare system has failed us. Everybody agrees on that. Since President Johnson launched the War on Poverty in the 1960's, America has spend over \$5 trillion on welfare programs.

But, over the last 30 years, the poverty level has actually increased, and America's poor are no better off now than they were then.

When you spend \$5 trillion on anything, you are bound to get something back. And there have been some cases where people on welfare managed to climb out of poverty.

But, as a whole, the welfare system that we have now deserves nothing less

than a complete overhaul. It traps recipients in poverty, it denies them opportunity and it has directly contributed to the moral breakdown of the family.

It is time to end welfare as we know it.

Recent Federal attempts to reform welfare have gone absolutely nowhere. So the Republican welfare bill takes the logical step of giving more authority to the States so that they can shape effective programs that really work.

Everyone acknowledges that the States have taken the lead in proposing bold changes to welfare. The real innovation in welfare has been going on in the State capitals, not in Washington.

The Republican bill acknowledges this by taking away power from Washington bureaucrats and giving it to local officials who actually have to make assistance programs work on a day-to-day basis.

This is a practical solution to a practical problem.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress had their chance to reform welfare and did nothing. Talk about cruelty to children. In 1992, the President campaigned hard on a promise to end welfare as we know it. But it was not until last June that we finally saw his proposal, and then the Democratic Congress sat on it and every other welfare reform bill. It did nothing to change the status quo.

Now the Democrats are still talking a pretty good game, and in the next couple of days they are going to complain a lot about the Republican proposal.

But the fact is that it is the Republicans who are moving ahead and reforming welfare. If it was not for the Contract With America and the November 8th electoral earthquake, I am sure that we wouldn't be having this debate today.

The Members on the other side of the aisle had their chance on this issue and they dropped the ball. And now that they are behind the curve, they are resorting to distortions and false attacks like the bogus charge that the Republican welfare bill cuts funding to the Student Lunch Program.

By now, everyone on Capitol Hill should know that this bill *increases* funding for child nutrition programs by 4.5 percent per year for the next 5 years, and increases WIC spending by 3.8 percent per year over the same period.

But the cold, hard fact is that since Republicans have stepped up to the plate on welfare reform, the Democratic leadership's only response has been to respond with misleading, partisan attacks like the school lunch issue since they were unable to pass welfare reform when they had the chance.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to move past all of this and face the fact that the time for real welfare reform has come,

and that the Republican welfare bill is going to pass.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4 and to help end welfare as we know it.

□ 1545

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL].

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

First of all, I would like to thank the Committee on Rules on both sides of the aisle and their staff for allowing a substitute that I have proposed to be considered and hopefully we will have the opportunity to debate that and proceed with determining where we stand on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is somewhat ironic that we come here to discuss a system that we call well-fair. Recognizing that my comments are a play on the phonetic pronunciation of that word rather than its literal spelling, nevertheless I would suggest that it is a system which is neither well nor fair. It is not well in that it has placed actually a plague on our society that has condemned many generations to repeat and to fall into its prey. It is certainly not fair, in that it does not reward work. In many cases it does exactly the opposite. But I would concur with the comments of our colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], earlier today in which he said that we do not need to spend our time with rhetoric discussing the failures of the current system. I do not come here to justify the status quo. I come here to change it. Our efforts in this debate should be focused on how do we best change the current system to secure for ourselves and for our constituency the kind of system that is humane, the kind of system that rewards work, and a system that moves people out of this cycle of welfare.

I have offered as I indicated a substitute that is the work of many of my colleagues that has grown out over a 2-year period. We will propose this substitute and I would briefly like to address some of the areas that I think its strengths are embodied in it.

First of all is that we emphasize work. We think that work should pay. That the only true way to break welfare is to put people into work. But we recognize that for many mothers with dependent children that there are two critical ingredients that are presently disincentives that we need to change into incentives. First of all, they need child care. Second, they need to make sure that by going to work, most of which will be at low-paying jobs, that they do not lose health care coverage for their children. Our bill significantly addresses both of these.

First of all, CBO has estimated that if we truly wish to move people out of welfare and into work, that the cost for child care alone will be increased by

approximately \$6.2 billion. We provide the funding in our proposal for doing that. We also consolidate our child care programs into one particular and single program.

Second, we recognize that we need an additional year of transitional Medicaid so that these mothers will not lose all health care benefits for their children. We likewise recognize that if you are going to move into the work force, you must have training. We have a 2-year time period for a work first program. We make those programs truly tailored to the needs of citizens who are going to be trained to go into the work force. At the end of that 2-year period if an individual has not found a job in the private sector, States will have two options. One is a private voucher that can be taken to a private employer to be used if they hire a welfare recipient. Second is to place them in a community service program where they can likewise learn job skills and later move into the private sector market.

Another important distinction is that we think we can pay for a change of the welfare system within the welfare system itself and we do not need to reach outside into nutrition programs, and we do not.

We also in the process of doing this cut the programs by about \$25 billion within the welfare system. We spend \$15 billion of that making the changes for additional child care and additional training, with a net of approximately \$10 billion which will be used for deficit reduction, and our proposal will be the only plan that will apply the savings to deficit reduction.

As I said, we do not tamper with the children and elderly and WIC food programs. We think that they are working and that they are working well and do not need to be brought into this net. We do strengthen child support enforcement provisions. Currently it is estimated there are about \$48 billion in child support payments out there, only \$14 billion of which are actually collected. We have a very tough provision for a registry for enforcing child support. We likewise recognize that teen pregnancy is a big problem. We devote much of our attention to that. We think it is an issue that we should not mandate but give States the flexibility.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are demanding dramatic change in their welfare system. They know it is broken and they are calling upon us in the House of Representatives now and later in the Senate to fix it. Unfortunately, I do not think we are doing it in exactly the right way. I do not think it is dramatic enough and I do not

think there are enough changes in certain areas that we all know need changes.

The American people want people who are on welfare and can work to work. They want more responsibility for the individual. They definitely want to strengthen the family, and they want to protect children.

When I look at this bill that we are going to have in front of us by the majority, some of these things are being done, but some are very definitely not. I listened to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] asking us to listen to each other. We have a rule in front of us today that is only partial. There was something like 130 amendments upstairs at the Committee on Rules. I am convinced we can make some good changes. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], the chairman of the subcommittee that did welfare, accepted child support enforcement as part of welfare reform, and that was a very good move. So I would hope that before we finish we could accept amendments, that could make this a better bill. We need to improve the work section so that it helps people really go from welfare to work. We should accept amendments so we really protect children. To take away the minimum standards for safety, Federal standards for children is absolutely wrong. We know in our own States, every State, these systems are overburdened, we need this last safety net for abused children, Federal oversight. So I would hope that as we look at this bill now, as we talk about the rule, that as the day goes on, we have improvements we can all agree on.

When I say they are not dramatic, let me tell you block grants are not dramatic. What they do is take everything together, send it back to the States and say, "Now it's your problem." I think we can do better and I hope as the process goes on in the next couple of days we will.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very tired of hearing the Democrats talk about cruelty to children. I think we have got to get squared away on just where this debate is going.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that what I consider cruelty to children is that \$34 billion owed to these children by deadbeat parents, who have not paid up and who have not been checked in recent years. In this Republican welfare approach, we have taken a long, hard look at deadbeat dads and moms and how to get those \$34 billion back into the system because that is \$34 billion that could be used to keep these children out of the welfare cycle, out of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, of that amount, \$11 billion leaves the system as deadbeat parents leave the State to evade their re-

sponsibility. What they end up doing not only is not supporting their children but also with their irresponsibility requiring that these kids stay on welfare. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but they also end up requiring that the Government take responsibility as the parent for these children.

I support this rule because I think we need to have open debate on this issue. Title VII is the child support enforcement part of this bill. The plan that we have put before the Congress and will be debating in the next few weeks requires a Federal parent locator service to be set up at the Federal level that will allow the States to access information and locate where those parents are to make them pay up. I think it is very responsible, Mr. Speaker. A lot of the information in this title VII has come from work between the parties. So this can be our bipartisan core of this bill that we all agree on to force these parents who have given up all responsibility for their supporting their flesh and blood children to get back in the system and keep these kids off welfare. That to me, the ultimate cruelty is something we can take care of in supporting this bill this week.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN].

(Mrs. LINCOLN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, today we will prove to Arkansans and to all Americans that we have heard their frustrations and are finally prepared to take action on welfare reform. Since I came to Congress in 1993, I have talked almost daily with constituents who are tired of sending their tax dollars to Washington to give people something for nothing. I join the people of the First District of Arkansas today in enthusiastically saying, "It's about time for welfare reform."

It has all been said, just everyone has not said it, but I will say it again here today. Welfare was intended to be a safety net for widows and children, but it has become a hammock that has encouraged laziness and idleness. Less than 12 percent of the people who receive welfare benefits today are actually working and that is why we focus our intentions on work.

We have been paying the other 88 percent to sit at home and watch their mailboxes. The Federal Government has been making bigger promises than Publishers Clearinghouse. But after this debate ends and the votes are counted, I am confident that the House of Representatives will have sent a message to their home districts, "No more something for nothing."

Over the next few days, we will talk about several proposals for changing our welfare system. I challenge all of my colleagues to look beyond their party identification and listen closely to the merits of each plan, to check their party affiliations at the door and

look to program reform that is both realistic and puts principles and values back into our families.

The Deal substitute, which I helped to write and cosponsor, puts more people to work than the current system, while making it possible for people to find a job and stay in it. We offer more job training and more child care than the status quo, and for the first time we set a lifetime limit of 2 years on welfare.

Your choices are simple, if you look beyond party lines. Put more people to work in less time, or put fewer people to work over more years. Put these options with another favorite theme, greater State flexibility, and you have an even easier choice.

The substitute that will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], myself, and other conservative Democrats allows States to tailor welfare to fit their needs. We give States the option of denying benefits to teenage mothers, we let the States decide whether to continue giving more money to mothers who have more children while on welfare. We also let States decide whether they want to keep people in welfare programs for a additional 2 years under community service. And we give them the option of recycling a few needy people back into the welfare rolls after their time limit has expired.

We are also the only plan that dedicates the moneys that we save to deficit reduction. You will hear more about our plan and the differences between the Deal substitute and the other welfare reform plans that are offered. I encourage you to think of your constituents before your party identification and to look at the reality of our plan and what it does for the future not only for us, for this country but for our children and our children's children.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time remaining to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. DOOLITTLE). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debate from this side of the aisle, you would think that one of the words that really sticks in my head was one of the speakers, the gentlewoman from Illinois, for whom I have a great deal of respect, referred to our idea as something having to do with Attila the Hun. I hear the gentleman from Tennessee refer to us as mean. And I hear the other speakers refer to us as being tough on children and weak on work.

I would notice, however, a resounding silence in this Hall when it comes to anybody defending the system that we have today, defending the system that we were unable and unwilling to change while the Democrats controlled this body.

You look back at some of the good welfare proposals that have come down the pike, some that really helped. Take the earned income tax credit. That was a Republican proposal. Take the child care that has been put in place. And remember the great fight that we had with the committee, and we worked together on that particular bill. That was bipartisan in nature, and it was signed into law by a Republican President.

Now the time has come to change the balance of the program, to change, truly change welfare as we know it today. For the Republicans to carry forward, to fulfill the 1992 platform pledge of the Democrat Party.

□ 1600

This is the Republicans carrying through on the pledge of the Democrats because of the Democrats' failure to do this. We are going to, I hope and pray that we do pass a welfare bill, that we get rid of the cruelest system that has ever been known.

The cruelest system that is out here on the floor is existing law and we must change it, we must work together, we must move this process forward.

We have worked long and hard on the Republican side in order to change welfare. The bill of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], which will I understand be offered as a substitute sometime later this week, that bill itself comes a long way from where the Democrat party was just a few short months ago when we could not get a bill to the floor, when we could not reform welfare.

A few short months ago in the last years when the Democrats were in charge, we would have been glad to come forward and work on a bill such as that. But I tell all of my colleagues to read it carefully; come in with specifics. The Republican bill is weak on work? Read the Deal bill. The Republican bill is the bill that stands for work. It stands for real reform and it stands for the empowerment of people.

Let us break the chains of slavery that we have created with welfare in this country and let us work together for a better America.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, does the rule we have just adopted make in order general debate on H.R. 4 or H.R. 1214?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule makes in order debate on H.R. 4.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the committees of jurisdiction reported out three other bills, none of which is before the House today. Am I correct that H.R. 4 has not been reported out by any committee of jurisdiction?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, continuing that inquiry, is it true that the Budget Act points of order which are designed to assure that the budget rules we established for ourselves are adhered to apply only to measures that have been reported by the committee of jurisdiction?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair observes that sections 302, 303, 311, 401, and 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 all establish points of order against the consideration of bills or joint resolutions as reported. That is, in each case the point of order against consideration operates with respect to the bill or joint resolution in its reported state. Thus, in the case of an unreported bill or joint resolution, such a point of order against consideration is inoperative.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we had followed the regular order and reported either H.R. 4 or H.R. 1214 from the committees of jurisdiction, several points of order would have applied. To get around those rules, the majority has instead put before the House an unreported bill making it impossible for those of us who believe the House should be bound by the rules it sets for itself to exercise those rights.

Mr. MCINNIS. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House has just adopted House Resolution 117.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. It is my understanding that we went around the rules because we did not follow the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCINNIS. A point of order, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was a parliamentary inquiry, not a speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT
OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 117 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4.

□ 1604

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will each be recognized for 1 hour; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] will each be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican welfare revolution is at hand. Today begins the demise of the failed welfare state that has entrapped the Nation's needy for too long. Today we begin to replace that disaster in social engineering with a reform plan that brings hope to the poor of this Nation and relief to the Nation's taxpayers. Working Americans who carry the load will get relief.

Government has spent \$5.3 trillion on welfare since the war on poverty began, the most expensive war in the history of this country, and the Census Bureau tells us we have lost the war. The bill we bring to the floor today constitutes the broadest overhaul of welfare ever proposed. The status quo welfare state is unacceptable.

Today we have the chance to move beyond the rhetoric of previous years of endless campaign promises to end welfare as we know it. Today there must be no doubt. The rhetoric is stopping, the solution is beginning.

Our bill is constructed on three principles which strike at the very foundations of the Nation's failed welfare state. The three principles are personal responsibility, work, and returning power over welfare to our States and communities where the needy can be helped the most in the most efficient way.

The first and most fundamental principle captured by the title of our bill is

personal responsibility, the character trait that build this country.

The current welfare system destroys families and undermines the work ethic. It traps people in a hopeless cycle of dependency. Our bill replaces this destructive welfare system with a new system based on work and strong families.

Virtually every section of the bill requires more personal responsibility. Recipients are required to work for their benefits. Drug addicts and alcoholics are no longer rewarded with cash payments that are often spent on their habit. Aliens who were allowed into the country because they promised to be self-supporting are held to their promise; fathers who do not live with their children are expected to pay child support or suffer severe consequences; and welfare can no longer be a way of life. After 5 years no more cash benefits will be provided.

This bill will reverse the decades-long Federal policy of rewarding unacceptable and self-destructive behavior. We will no longer reward for doing the wrong thing.

The second underlying principle of our bill flows naturally from the first. Able-bodied adults on welfare must work for their benefits. Here it appears that the Democrats have surrendered completely to Republican philosophy. On work we are all Republicans now, but it was not always so.

During the welfare debate of 1987 and 1988, Democrats perpetuated a system in which able-bodied adults could stay on welfare year after year after year without doing anything. Now the Clinton administration and Democrats in the House are finally claiming they want mandatory work too, but the substitutes they will offer later do not require serious work.

That is not surprising. Conflict among Democrats on the basic issue of work was one of the reasons they did nothing on welfare reform in the last Congress. Another was the fact that it took the President almost 2 years to write a welfare bill, which he then let die without so much as a minute of debate in the House or the Senate.

If the Democrats were serious about welfare reform, they would have taken action last year when they had the chance. To the Democrats, welfare reform is not a policy objective, it is a political platform. It is an empty promise, it is a campaign device that is put on hold once they get elected.

House Republicans signed a Contract With America that promised we would provide a vote on the House floor on true welfare reform, and we are now fulfilling that promise within less than 80 days. We are proud to move forward to change America's failed welfare system.

The third principle which forms the foundation of our bill is our commitment to shrink the Federal Government by returning power and flexibility to the States and communities where the needy can be helped the

most. My own mayor in Houston, TX, a Democrat, talked to me several weeks ago and said you can cut the amount of Federal money coming to Houston by 25 percent, but give me the flexibility without the Federal regulations and I will do more with 25 percent less.

Some say, however, that only those in their ivory towers in Washington care enough to help the needy and aid the poor; the only caring people in all of government throughout the United States are only here right in Washington. That is what they say. They say you cannot trust the States. These people seem to think that the Governors are still standing in the schoolhouse doors not letting people in. But rather it is the Democrats in Washington who are standing in the doors of our Nation's ghettos and not letting people out.

The current regulatory morass is shown on the chart standing next to me. It shows that the welfare system Republicans inherited consists of at least 336 programs in 8 domains of welfare policy. The Federal Government expects to spend \$125 billion on these programs this year. Here it is, proof of the ridiculous tangle of overlapping bureaucratic programs that have been thrust upon the Nation since the beginning of the war on poverty, and the worst part is that the American taxpayers, working Americans are paying the bill.

But these 336 programs are only the tip of the iceberg. Imagine how many regulations had to be written to implement these 336 programs. Just let me show you. These are the regulations from just 2 of the 336 programs. They are standing right next to me here on the desk. They weigh 62.4 pounds. I guess I could probably lift them, but it would be easier with a fork truck.

I can think of no more fitting symbol of the failed welfare state than these pounds of Federal regulations. It is time to remove the Federal middleman from the welfare system. We can cut these unnecessary regulations, eliminate Federal bureaucrats and give our States and communities the freedom they need to help their fellow citizens. Our bill will end 40 of the biggest and fastest growing programs and replace them with 5 block grants. By ending counterproductive overlapping and redundant programs, we will win half of the battle. We are proud, though, that we have hit upon a much better approach to helping the poor than this top-heavy Federal system.

Our new approach recognizes that the action on welfare reform today is in the States already. While Washington twiddled its thumbs for the last several years, States all over the country were engaging in actual welfare reform.

The laboratories of democracy are in the States, not Washington, DC. Block grants will bring the decisions closer to the people affected by them, they will give Governors more responsibility and

resources to design and run their own programs.

□ 1615

And once we have given the State this flexibility and eliminated the need for them to beg Washington for permission to operate outside the stack of rules in that pile on the desk, the reforms they have implemented thus far will be dramatically expanded and spread to every State.

Mr. Chairman, welfare today has left a sad mark on the American success story. It has created a world in which children have no dreams for tomorrow and grownups have abandoned their hopes for today.

The time has come to replace this failed system with a new system that uplifts our Nation's poor, a new system that turns the social safety net from a trap into a trampoline, a new system that rewards work, personal responsibility in families, a new system that lifts a load off of working, tax-paying Americans. It represents a historic shift long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following correspondence for the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM F. GOODLING,
Chairman, Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Rayburn House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLING: I am writing to congratulate you for your leadership in bringing H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act, to the floor for a historic vote this week. This achievement could not have occurred without the close working relationships developed between the Members and staffs of our two committees. Thank you for the outstanding cooperation we have enjoyed in developing this landmark legislation.

I would also like to clarify certain jurisdictional issues surrounding this unprecedented effort, and to acknowledge your recent correspondence. On March 8, the Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported H.R. 1157 as its portion of welfare reform legislation. The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities favorably reported H.R. 999 on February 23. A leadership working group then combined these provisions, along with those of the Committee on Agriculture and others interested in welfare reform, into H.R. 1214. The text of H.R. 1214 will be considered as the base text for floor consideration of H.R. 4.

As you know, Republicans have been working diligently to combine social programs with similar or identical purposes into block grants. The procedure has been to identify all the programs with a similar purpose, end the spending authority for all but one of the programs with a similar purpose, and fund the resulting block grant at roughly the level of funding for all the constituent programs combined. Unfortunately, this common sense approach is not easily accomplished within the existing committee structure.

I want to thank you for agreeing to have the Committee on Ways and Means consolidate certain child protection provisions into a Child Protection Block Grant in Title II of H.R. 1157. In addition, H.R. 1157 contains provisions authorizing the transfer of funds from the temporary assistance block grant to food and nutrition programs and the child care block grant. It also contains a technical correction to ERISA Title I, concerning

child support enforcement. Thank you for not objecting to the inclusion of this provision, and for bringing an additional technical correction to my attention. I understand that in order to expedite Floor consideration of this legislation, your Committee will not be marking up H.R. 1157.

Similarly, H.R. 999, as reported by the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Specifically, H.R. 999 ends the at-risk child care and the AFDC and Transitional child care programs for consolidation into a Child Care Block Grant. H.R. 999 includes mandatory work requirements relating to the JOBS program. These provisions were later harmonized with similar provisions from H.R. 1157 in the leadership bill, H.R. 1214. H.R. 999 also includes provisions authorizing the transfer of child care and family and school nutrition block grant funds to the temporary assistance, child protection, and Title XX block grants.

Because of our prior consultations and to expedite consideration of this legislation on the Floor, the Committee on Ways and Means will not mark up H.R. 999. However, the forbearance in this case should not be considered as a permanent waiver of this Committee's jurisdiction over these provisions, and it should not preclude the Committee from legislating in this area in the future should the need arise.

Thank you again for your leadership and cooperation on this landmark legislation. With warm regards,

Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC
AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 1995.

Hon. BILL ARCHER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to alert you to a provision in H.R. 1214, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means which is in need of correction and involves an amendment to Title I of ERISA.

As contained in section 711 of the bill, subtitle H—Medical Support, the provision in question amends section 609 of Title I of ERISA to add a judgement, decree, or order issued by an "administrative adjudication" to the criteria required for such an order to be considered a "qualified medical child support order."

The term "administrative adjudication" is not defined in the bill or under current law. However, the intent appears to be to expand the definition to encompass orders issued through an administrative process established under state law.

Although our committee has no objection at this time to the inclusion in H.R. 1214 of this amendment to ERISA Title I, over which the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities has exclusive jurisdiction, it is our opinion that the technical flaw should be corrected before the bill is considered in the House. In this regard, I have referred the following technical correction to the House Legislative Counsel for inclusion in the final bill—ERISA section 609 (a)(2)(B)(ii)(II), as added by section 771(q)(3) of H.R. 1214, should be amended to read "(II) is issued through an administrative process established under state law and has the force and effect of law under applicable state law."

This is also to inform you that the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities will request that its members be appointed as the exclusive conferees on section 771, inasmuch as there are other technical

changes to ERISA section 609 that will be necessary to remove current ambiguities to this section of ERISA Title I over which our Committee's exclusive jurisdiction has never been disputed.

Sincerely,

BILL GOODLING,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

Hon. FLOYD D. SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, Rayburn House Office Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPENCE: Thank you for writing me regarding committee consideration of H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act. In response to your letter, I would like to clarify certain jurisdictional issues surrounding this unprecedented effort.

On March 8, the Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported H.R. 1157 as its portion of welfare reform legislation. The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities favorably reported H.R. 999 on February 23. A leadership working group then combined these provisions, along with those of the Committee on Agriculture and others interested in welfare reform, into H.R. 1214. The text of H.R. 1214 will be considered as the base text for floor consideration of H.R. 4.

As you noted, during its consideration of the child support enforcement title of H.R. 1157, the Committee on Ways and Means included a provision dealing with enforcement of the child support obligations of members of the Armed Forces falling within the jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security. I want to thank you for waiving your committee's jurisdictional prerogatives in this instance to expedite Floor consideration of this legislation, and I understand that you are reserving your Committee's jurisdictional prerogatives for future consideration of this provision.

Thank you again for your leadership and cooperation on this landmark legislation. With warm regards,

Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY,
Washington, DC, March 13, 1995.

Hon. BILL ARCHER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Ways and Means has recently ordered reported H.R. 4, a bill that would reform the welfare system. During markup of the legislation, the committee adopted a provision dealing with the enforcement of child support obligations of members of the armed forces. This provision falls within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security pursuant to House Rule X(k).

In recognition of your committee's desire to bring this legislation expeditiously before the House of Representatives, and with the understanding that a clause in the above described provision to which this committee objects has been removed from the bill, the Committee on National Security will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 4. This forbearance should not, of course, be construed as a waiver of this committee's jurisdiction over the provision in question. This committee will seek the appointment of conferees with respect to this provision during any House-Senate conference.

I would appreciate your including this letter as a part of the report on H.R. 4 and as part of the record during consideration of the bill by the House.

With warm personal regards, I am
Sincerely,

FLOYD D. SPENCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

Hon. THOMAS J. BLILEY, Jr.,
*Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Rayburn
House Office Building, U.S. House of Rep-
resentatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN BLILEY: Thank you for sharing with me your recent correspondence with the Speaker regarding committee consideration of H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act. In response to your letter, I would like to clarify certain jurisdictional issues surrounding this unprecedented effort.

On March 8, the Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported H.R. 1157 as its portion of welfare reform legislation. The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities favorably reported H.R. 999 on February 23. A leadership working group then combined these provisions, along with those of the Committee on Agriculture and others interested in welfare reform, into H.R. 1214. The text of H.R. 1214 will be considered as the base text for floor consideration of H.R. 4.

As you noted, during its consideration of H.R. 1157, the Committee on Ways and Means included provisions dealing with the Medicaid program. I want to thank you for waiving your Committee's jurisdictional prerogatives in this instance to expedite Floor consideration of this legislation, and I understand you are reserving your Committee's jurisdictional prerogatives for future consideration of these provisions.

Thank you again for your leadership and cooperation on this landmark legislation. With warm regards,
Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, March 15, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
*Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, The
Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing for two purposes: first, to indicate that, in order to expedite Floor consideration, the Committee on Commerce will waive its right to mark up both H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act, and H.R. 1214, the Personal Responsibility Act; and second, to indicate the Committee's interest in preserving its jurisdictional prerogatives with respect to a House-Senate conference on either of these two bills and any Senate amendments thereto.

H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995, was introduced on January 4, 1995, and referred, by title, to the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Agriculture, and the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, as well as to other Committees. The Committee on Commerce received an additional referral on two of the eight titles: Title IV, Restricting Welfare to Aliens, and Title VIII, Effective Date. Within the Committee, the bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Health and Environment and the Subcommittee on Energy and Power for those provisions which fell within their respective jurisdictions.

H.R. 1214 was introduced in the House on March 13, 1995, and represents a consensus bill developed by the three Committees with primary jurisdiction for consideration on the House Floor in lieu of H.R. 4. In addition to the three primary Committees, H.R. 1214 was also referred to the Committees on Commerce, the Judiciary, National Security, and Government Reform and Oversight, in each case for consideration of those provisions as

fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee concerned.

Staff of the Commerce Committee has carefully reviewed both the text of H.R. 4 and H.R. 1214 and has worked with the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means in drafting language contained in H.R. 1214 as it relates to provisions within this Committee's jurisdiction. Specifically, the following provisions of H.R. 1214 have been identified as falling squarely within the Commerce Committee's jurisdiction:

TITLE I

Section 106: Continued Application of Current Standards under Medicaid Program

TITLE II

Section 203: Continued Application of Current Standards under Medicaid Program

TITLE IV

Section 401: Ineligibility of Illegal Aliens for Certain Public Benefits Programs

Section 401(a): In general: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any alien who is not lawfully present in the U.S. shall not be eligible for any Federal means-tested public benefits program.

Section 401(b): Exception for Emergency Assistance

Section 402: Ineligibility of Nonimmigrants for Certain Public Benefits Programs

Section 402(a): Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any alien who is lawfully present in the United States as a non-immigrant shall not be eligible for any Federal means-tested public benefits program.

Section 402(b): Emergency Assistance—emergency medical care

Section 403: Limited Eligibility of Immigrants of 5 Specified Federal Public Benefits Programs

Section 403(a)(4): Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any alien who is legally present in the U.S. shall not be eligible for Medicaid.

Section 403(b)(4): Exceptions (Emergency Assistance, including emergency medical care)

Section 403(b)(5): Transition for Current Beneficiaries

Section 431: Definitions

TITLE VI

Section 601(d): Funding of Certain Programs for Drug Addicts and Alcoholics

Section 602(b): Establishment of Program of Block Grants Regarding Children With Disabilities

Section 1645(b)(2): Medicaid Program: For purposes of title XIX, each qualifying child shall be considered to be a recipient of supplemental security income benefits under this title

Section 602(c): Provisions Relating to SSI Cash Benefits and SSI Service Benefits
"Treatment of Certain Assets and Trusts in Eligibility Determinations for Children"

Section 602(e): Temporary Eligibility For Cash Benefits For Poor Disabled Children Residing in States Applying Alternative Income Eligibility Standards Under Medicaid

TITLE VII

Section 701(a)(1): State Obligation to Provide Child Support Enforcement Services

Section 702(b): Definition of Federal Medical Assistance Percentage

H.R. 4 and H.R. 1214 are an essential component of the House Republican Contract with America. The Members of the Commerce Committee have no desire to delay the House's consideration of this important measure. Therefore, at this time, I am waiving this Committee's right to take up both H.R. 4 and H.R. 1214. I wish to make clear that by waiving its opportunity to mark up these bills, the Committee does not in any way prejudice the Commerce Committee's jurisdiction with respect to H.R. 4 or

H.R. 1214 or to any of the legislative issues addressed therein in the future. In addition, the Committee respectfully requests that if H.R. 4 or H.R. 1214 or any amendments thereto should be the subject of a House-Senate conference, the Commerce Committee shall receive an equal number of conferees as those appointed for any other House Committee with respect to the provisions contained in H.R. 4 or H.R. 1214, and any Senate amendments thereto, which fall within this Committee's jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HYDE: I am writing to congratulate you for your leadership in bringing H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act, to the floor for a historic vote this week. I would also like to clarify certain jurisdictional issues surrounding this unprecedented effort.

On March 8, the Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported H.R. 1157 as its portion of welfare reform legislation. The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities favorably reported H.R. 999 on February 23. A leadership working group then combined these provisions, along with those of the Committee on Agriculture and others interested in welfare reform, into H.R. 1214. The text of H.R. 1214 will be considered as the base text for floor consideration of H.R. 4.

As you know, Republicans have been working diligently to combine social programs with similar or identical purposes into block grants. The procedure has been to identify all the programs with a similar purpose, end the spending authority for all but one of the programs, and fund the resulting block grant at roughly the level of funding for all the constituent programs combined. Unfortunately, this common sense approach is not easily accomplished within the existing committee structure.

I want to thank you for agreeing to have the Committee on Ways and Means to consolidate certain child protection programs under your Committee's jurisdiction into the Child Protection Block Grant in Title III of H.R. 1157. I understand that in order to expedite Floor consideration of this legislation, your Committee will not be marking up this legislation. Specifically, H.R. 1157 consolidates the missing and exploited children program, grants to improve the investigation and prosecution of child abuse cases, and the children's advocacy centers program. In addition, you requested that the Committee include in H.R. 1157 provisions concerning welfare and immigration, and the treatment of aliens.

Thank you again for your leadership and cooperation on this landmark legislation. With warm regards,

Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

Hon. JAMES A. LEACH,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Rayburn House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEACH: I am writing to congratulate you for your leadership in bringing H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act, to the floor for a historic vote this

week. I would also like to clarify certain jurisdictional issues surrounding this unprecedented effort.

On March 8, the Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported H.R. 1157 as its portion of welfare reform legislation. The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities favorably reported H.R. 999 on February 23. A leadership working group then combined these provisions, along with those of the Agriculture Committee and others interested in welfare reform, into H.R. 1214. The text of H.R. 1214 will be considered as the base text for floor consideration of H.R. 4.

As you know, Republicans have been working diligently to combine social programs with similar or identical purposes into block grants. The procedure has been to identify all the programs with a similar purpose, end the spending authority for all but one of the programs, and fund the resulting block grant at roughly the level of funding for all the constituent programs combined. Unfortunately, this common sense approach is not easily accomplished within the existing committee structure.

I want to thank you for agreeing to have the Committee on Ways and Means consolidate the Family Unification Program under your Committee's jurisdiction into the Child Protection Block Grant in Title II of H.R. 1157. I understand that in order to expedite Floor consideration of this legislation, your Committee will not be marking up this legislation.

Thank you again for your leadership and cooperation on this landmark legislation. With warm regards,

Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Rayburn House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CLINGER: I am writing to thank you for your assistance in bringing H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act, to the floor for a historic vote this week. I would also like to clarify certain jurisdictional issues surrounding this unprecedented effort.

On March 8, the Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported H.R. 1157 as its portion of welfare reform legislation. The Committee on Economics and Educational Opportunities favorably reported H.R. 999 on February 23. A leadership working group then combined these provisions, along with those of the Committee on Agriculture and others interested in welfare reform, into H.R. 1214. The text of H.R. 1214 will be considered as the base text for floor consideration of H.R. 4.

During its consideration of the child support enforcement title of H.R. 1157, the Committee on Ways and Means included a provision dealing with enforcement of the child support obligations of members of federal employees falling within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. I understand that in order to expedite Floor consideration of this legislation, your Committee will not be marking up this legislation.

Thank you again for your leadership and cooperation on this landmark legislation. With warm regards,

Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD], the ranking Democrat on the Welfare Subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, we have now brought the welfare reform bill to the House floor, which is the Personal Responsibility Act.

Mr. Chairman, as we go through this bill over the next 5 hours tonight and as we take amendments on this bill tomorrow and maybe Thursday, we, as Democrats want to point out to the American people that what the Republicans have brought to this House floor is a bill that is weak on work requirements. The Republican bill does not put work first, and the Democrats, we have said all along, if we are going to reform the welfare system in this Nation, is that we must make sure that those who are able to work should go to work and that the State and the Federal Government should participate in making sure that we link welfare to work.

When we look at the Republican bill, there is no requirement that any AFDC recipient actually go to work. States can fulfill their work requirements by cutting people off the welfare rolls. They can meet that 50-percent requirement by the year 2003, yes, you just roll them off, no work requirements for the first 2 years.

Democrats are saying what we want is a self-sufficiency plan. The day that you enter the welfare office is that you will have to sign up in a self-sufficiency plan which means that the States would have a responsibility. We would also fund the States to make sure that they would have the moneys necessary to do just that. For the first 2 years, as I have said, under the Republican bill recipients need not work. There is no work requirement that would say to the States, "You must place someone in the work force," and after 2 years under the Republican plan, the State only has to obtain 4-percent work participation; after the 2 years, only a 4-percent work participation.

The Democrats think that Republicans ought to come together and let us pass a bill that would say to the able-bodied men and women on welfare that, "You must work, and we are going to assist you in placing you in the work force."

And when you look at the Republicans, they have no commitment to move people from welfare to work. They only move you off of welfare, and they will place the problem and the burden on the cities and counties and neighborhoods throughout America. No resources are provided under the Republican plan to help States provide education, training, and there is no child care under this bill.

Democrats offered amendments in the subcommittee and the full commit-

tee to say to those mothers who want to go to work that we guarantee a minimum child care component in the welfare reform package. Democrats, once again, we put people first through a self-sufficiency plan that will place them in the work force.

The self-sufficiency plan would put people to work immediately, and those recipients would be able to go to work, and if they needed education, training, and child care, the Democrats wanted to provide that. Democrats put work first, because we do not use caseload reduction to fulfill the work requirement.

And like I said earlier, Democrats want to include the private sector, to make sure that the private sector can help us create some of the jobs that will be needed in order to put people to work.

And let us go on a little further than that. Child support enforcement, it was the Democrats who insisted upon the Republicans bringing this provision of this title to the bill to the House floor. We are proud of the fact that you did included 90 percent of what the Democrats wanted, but the other 10 percent is what the children of this Nation are in need of.

Why not put the drivers's license, attach them to make it possible to hold up those licenses or to make sure that when you get a ticket, in one State and you do not pay it, is that your license will be revoked until that ticket is paid? We are saying the professional license, why not, in the child support enforcement bill.

I commend you, I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], for bringing the title to this bill that will address child support enforcement, but, you know, and we know as Democrats, that you did not go far enough.

Or when we look at how you want to punish children. I mean, why take infant kids, why should we take innocent kids, infant kids to say that because of the behavior of your parents you will be penalized? Why would we say to kids who are born to welfare families in America that we are going to penalize kids?

The rhetoric that the Republicans have given us in saying that we need to change welfare, we would agree with that, but there is no need of us saying that we will not link welfare to work and make work first in priority in a welfare package. Democrats want a welfare reform bill, but we want a bill that will send people to work, hopefully in the private sector.

We want to make sure that the day you enter into the welfare office that you sign up with a plan, and that will be a self-sufficiency plan that will put you to work, keep you in the work force, and for you to provide for your children and not be mean to children, I mean, just plain mean to children, like

this Personal Responsibility Act that is before this House today.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, today we begin taking the final steps to revolutionize welfare. We are keeping our pledge to the American people to replace the current failed system with one that encourages personal responsibility, family unity, and work.

Under our proposal dozens of programs are merged into block grants to provide States flexibility in meeting the cash welfare, child protection, child care, and nutrition needs of their residents. Overnight, States would have real incentives to get welfare recipients into work. States that are successful can save for recessions, expand child care, or invest in more job training. Individuals would have to work to keep cash welfare, food stamps and other benefits.

Working families will stop seeing Federal tax dollars subsidize behavior they know is destructive: Unmarried children will not receive welfare checks and an apartment if they have a baby; families already on welfare will not get added payments for having more children they cannot support; and aliens will no longer be eligible for several welfare benefits. Welfare will be transformed into temporary help, not a way of life.

Supplemental Security Income benefits are reformed to protect taxpayers and target help to the truly disabled. Drug addicts and alcoholics will no longer receive monthly disability checks because of their addiction. And by refocusing SSI children's benefits, we provide more help to severely disabled children while protecting taxpayers against fraud and abuse.

Child support enforcement is strengthened to achieve better coordination between States, surer tracking of delinquent parents, and more efficient collection of support. All agree that holding absent fathers accountable is critical to any real welfare reform, and our proposal does just that.

Under our proposal families on welfare are expected to work, just as tax-paying families must work to support themselves. So after a maximum of 2 years on welfare, and less if States choose, families must work or lose their welfare checks. After 5 years of cash welfare, families must become free of government dependence, period.

Despite these unprecedented changes, Democrats, who won the White House pledging to reform welfare and then did nothing for 2 years, are charging that Republicans are soft on work. This charge is simply incorrect, for numerous reasons.

Under the Democrat substitute offered by Congressman DEAL, States are required to provide 2 years of education and training, not work, for all recipients. So States like Massachusetts that want to get welfare recipients into work after 2 months, not 2 years, would

be barred from doing so. As a result, the Deal substitute would prolong, not shorten, families time on welfare.

Further, under the Deal substitute, simply searching for a job satisfies the supposed requirement that people on welfare work first.

Finally, because the Deal substitute allows States to count everyone who leaves welfare as meeting the work requirement, the number of people required to work by the bill is actually lowered by 500,000 per month. Even if a State somehow found a way to fail to meet this so-called requirement, no penalty would result.

Whether these and other flaws in the Deal substitute are due to drafting errors, oversights, or intentional omissions, the effect is the same: the Deal substitute offers too little, too late on requiring work for those on welfare. This debate will bring that into focus for many of my colleagues who I know want to support real welfare reforms. Unfortunately, especially on work, the Deal substitute is right on rhetoric but wrong on substance.

It's not hard to see which bill provides real welfare reform—the Personal Responsibility Act. Our plan is nothing short of a revolution in social policy that replaces the current failed welfare system with one that will better meet the needs of the poor and get millions into work and off welfare. That is the only way to solve the welfare mess, and we are here to deliver on our promise to do just that.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], a member of the welfare subcommittee, the Human Resources Subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, you know, as I listened to the majority, this is, I think, very clear, Americans, the American people, want firmness. They do not want harshness. And you come across as harsh, harshly partisan, and also harsh on people and soft on work.

And let me explain why you are soft on work. It is very simple. The structure of this bill and other bills requires States to meet participation rights. It is a certain percent the first year, a certain percent the second year, et cetera into the next century.

Under the Republican bill, the States do not have to put a single person to work to meet participation requirements, not a single person. That is just the truth.

On page 22 of the bill it says that in plain English. And why does it say that? Because the majority bill does not provide any money to the States to help them put people on welfare to work. It was in your bill of a year ago. What happened to it?

You want to save money, I guess, for tax cuts for a privileged few instead of helping people get off of welfare into

work. That is why you come across as soft on work, because you are, and that is why you come across as harsh, because you are. Firmness, yes; harshness, no.

And a rainy day fund? The Republican Governors themselves said \$1 billion over 5 years is not enough to provide in cases of recession, in cases of inflation, and you just look the other way.

Now, why tough on kids? Look, we have done a lot of work on SSI. There is abuse in this program for kids. Some families are gaming the system, but most of these families are handicapped kids, parents struggling to provide a decent life for their handicapped children, and SSI says what you do to them; 21 percent would still qualify under the present program.

□ 1630

And the rest of them would be at the mercy of a State bureaucracy or off the rolls altogether. Those are the facts. You are going to eliminate from the rolls 700,000 kids by the year 2000.

Now, look, there is abuse, let us make that clear; but you are abusive in getting at abuse, you are harsh. You use a meat ax against handicapped children and their parents. And they say they do not want a bureaucracy, State or Federal, telling them what to do. They will account for the money, but they know best for their kids.

You turn your back on kids, you are soft on work, and that is why your bill is not worthy of passage.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we stand here today at the threshold of righting a wrong. We have the opportunity to reverse an injustice that has plagued this country for decades. We can, and will, fix a broken welfare system that has literally trapped generations of Americans in a cycle of dependency from which there is little chance of escape.

We must not let this opportunity pass.

The Committee on Ways and Means took testimony from 170 witnesses. No one defended the status quo.

So we know the current system is broken, but what's wrong with it?

First, it discourages work. Second, it fosters out-of-wedlock births. Third, it is anti-family. And fourth, by the Federal Government deciding on a one size fits all welfare system for everyone from Los Angeles to Boston, it is anticommunity.

In our welfare reform package, we not only encourage work. We demand it from able-bodied people. Those who can work will work.

Unlike the Democrats whose answer to work is temporary subsidized employment we give people the dignity of work.

Our package fights illegitimacy by not giving cash benefits to children having children. And let me preempt those who try to paint us as cruel or mean: Noncash benefits such as Medicare, Food Stamps and child care will continue, to ensure the child is cared for. But giving 15-year-olds cash payments so they can move out of their parents' home and into Government apartments or trailers, is the cruelest thing you could do to that young parent and their baby.

By encouraging independence and concentrating on keeping families together, we provide recipients dignity, opportunity, and hope. Three characteristics missing from the current system.

The other side of the aisle hold tight to their belief that Federal bureaucrats based here in Washington are somehow more compassionate, and more capable of caring for the needy. To hear them tell it, our communities, local governments, and Governors will starve the children and give the money to the rich. Drop the heated and false rhetoric and let go of the status quo.

Let us bring Government closer to home. The welfare needs in the Fourth District of Michigan are different from those in Detroit. Just as the needs in New York are different from those in Dallas. Let us give these communities the freedom and flexibility to create innovative new programs based on their specific needs. By cutting out the Federal middle-man, we can save 10 to 15 percent of administrative costs right off the bat.

We're not cutting welfare benefits; and in some cases we are increasing them. What we are cutting is bureaucracy and that is driving the defenders of big Government and redtape crazy.

By giving hope and opportunity, we again make welfare a safety net and a helping hand, not a life sentence to poverty.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], a member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MATSUI. I thank the ranking member for this time.

You know, it is very interesting. I heard during the debate on the rule the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] say there is really not much difference between the different bills we have before us. Second, he also said that this is just the first step of the legislative process so that any imperfections or flaws could be changed as we move along.

I might just have to make a couple of observations. First of all, there is a big difference between what the Democrats are proposing and what the Republicans are proposing.

For example, on the issue of work, the Republican proposal, all they do is

provide the same amount of resources currently existing in the system, they block grant it, send it to the States with very few restrictions or very few standards.

Well, how are you going to get people to work? We all know that in order to create jobs, in order to create people in the work force, you have to provide job training, you have to provide education, you have to provide day care and even transportation, because most of these people on welfare do not have cars. So you have to provide them bus tokens.

The Republican bill does not provide any of that.

Nevertheless they expect within 7 years to get 50 percent of the American people on welfare off of welfare to jobs. We know that is not going to happen. In fact, the reason the Republicans are making that proposal without any additional resources is because in 2 or 3 weeks on the floor of the House of Representatives we are going to be debating a tax bill. That tax bill will cut taxes by \$188 billion over 5 years, or \$640 billion over 10 years.

Bear in mind this is not going to go to the middle class. In fact, the top 1 percent of the taxpayers in America will get 20 percent of that tax cut, and those that make over \$100,000 a year will get 58 percent of that \$640 billion tax cut.

So this is not a program to move people from dependency to independence, from welfare to work; this is a program basically to give tax cuts to the very wealthy. We knew they were going to do that when they took power on November 8, and they are doing it now. The American public should begin to realize that.

I might just conclude by making one final observation. We have a safety net in America. When a child is in an abused family, we put him either in foster care or provide adoption services to him. The Republicans are going to eliminate that program and block grant it. Those standards to the States—and you know the reason we had to do this in the first place was, in 1980, 1980, the States were doing such a terrible job with these children that we had to take over and set forth national standards. In fact, standards—little things, what they would call additional paperwork, things like providing medical records for the child when the child moves from one foster care family to another, or maybe the child's educational records.

That is what we are really talking about here. That is why this bill is mean-spirited and that is why this bill should not pass.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY], a member of the committee.

(Mr. MCCRERY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Personal Responsibility Act, H.R. 4, but I rise particularly, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the portion of the bill dealing with SSI disability for children.

This program has experienced explosive growth over the past few years. Since 1989, both the costs of the program and the number of children qualifying for the program have tripled. Why? Two things: First, this is the most sought after welfare program in America. The average monthly cash benefit of about \$450 per child per month is the most generous cash payment in our welfare system. Second, a Supreme Court decision in 1989, the Zebley decision, radically liberalized the criteria under which children qualify for the program.

Besides the wasteful drain of taxpayer dollars, consider the harm this Federal program does to too many children. In testimony before a Federal commission studying this program, Dr. Bill Payne, a physician who oversees disability decisions in Arkansas, said, "There is no doubt in my mind that there are a lot of children that receive disability checks who are not really disabled at all."

Willie Lee Bell, principal of an elementary school in Lake Providence, LA, said students were refusing to perform academically so that they could qualify for disability checks. Mr. Bell told of a Lake Providence child who, prompted by a mother seeking SSI checks, fabricated a story of bizarre behavior so convincing that doctors committed him to a mental hospital, fearing that he was a threat to his family. A psychologist in another Louisiana Parish, Ray Owens, also said that parents were coaching children to do poorly, saying "The children are being doomed to failure."

Mr. Chairman, this is an abused program which begs for reform. Thankfully, some Democrats have also recognized the need for reform. I want to thank Mr. KLECZKA and Mrs. LINCOLN, particularly, for their assistance in researching the problems in this program and in helping to craft a thoughtful response to those problems.

The solution to the explosion in the growth of this program, Mr. Chairman, and to the harm it is doing to otherwise healthy children, is to overturn the Zebley decision, and to offer cash payments to only the most severely disabled children who, absent the cash assistance, would have to be institutionalized. For other, less severely disabled children, we will provide medical and nonmedical services designed to cope with the child's disability. These changes in SSI disability for children will restore integrity to this out of control Federal program, while providing even more helpful resources to the most severely disabled children in need.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], a member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CARDIN. I thank the ranking member for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, both Democrats and Republicans want to end the welfare system as we know it today. Both Democrats and Republicans understand the need to enact new legislation.

But there is a major difference on how the Democrats and Republicans want to proceed on ending our current welfare system. The Democrats want to require work, to get people off of welfare, to work. The Republicans reward States for doing nothing.

The requirements on the States under the Republican bill states that they are successful if they get a person off welfare even if that person does not become employed, even if that person becomes a ward of local government. The Republican bill rewards the States.

The Republican bill is weak on work. The Democrat bill is tough on work.

Both Democrats and Republicans establish national standards the States must meet in order to participate. Make no mistake about it. It may be a block grant, but the States still have requirements they must meet. The Republican bill micromanages the plans of the States by requiring the States to meet certain tests as they relate to teenage moms, how the States handle family caps.

The Democrats establish national standards on work. It requires the individual able-bodied person to work. It requires the States to have programs so that people can work.

The Republican bill does not provide the resources to the local governments. Even though H.R. 5 did, there was a change made. The Republicans all of a sudden needed some money for a tax cut. So they cut the program even though they know it is needed. The Democratic bill provides the resources so the States can provide the programs to get people back to work. That is, day care, health care benefits so that welfare people can work. The Republican bill dumps the problems on local governments.

We have a clear choice. The Republican bill gets people off of welfare, the Democratic bill gets people off of welfare. The Republican bill gets the people off welfare to nowhere; the Democratic bill gets people off welfare to work.

We are going to have a chance to come together, Democrats and Republicans, during this debate. It is called the Deal substitute, sponsored by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL]. It is an opportunity for us all to come together on a bill that is tough on work, gets people off of welfare but gets them to work, rather than becoming a ward of our local governments. I urge my colleagues to support the bill that will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman DEAL.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], a member of the committee.

(Mr. ZIMMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZIMMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, as we debate the Personal Responsibility Act, I hope we do not lose sight, in all of the rhetoric, of why we are here in the first place. We are not here because restructuring welfare will save Federal dollars, even though a bankrupt Nation cannot feed its children or protect its needy. We are here because welfare as we know it is an unmitigated failure and, if we do not uproot it, we will condemn literally millions of children to a life without hope and without access to the American dream.

□ 1645

The Personal Responsibility Act is not a perfect document. But it reflects the determination and courage of a new majority to address a critical problem that, until now, has simply not been a priority for Congress.

What it proposes is very straightforward:

It asks that people assume ownership of their own lives and not always expect others to pay for their mistakes.

It asks that parents be parents and that both mothers and fathers take responsibility for the children they have brought into the world.

And it asks that we, as a society, reestablish certain values that we agree must guide us—including both compassion and individual responsibility.

What the Personal Responsibility Act does not do is perpetuate three mistakes that have made the current system such a disaster: First, it does not assume that simply pumping more money into a failed system will make it work.

Second, it does not assume that patchwork efforts such as demonstration projects and pilot programs, which have taken the place of reform in the past, will add up to real reform. It proposes systemic reform instead.

Third, it does not assume that Washington knows what is best for everyone. Rather it restores to the States the power to make decisions about the needs of their own people.

No one can guarantee that welfare programs run by States will outperform those run by Federal bureaucrats, and that unknown is what has caused much of the apprehension about this bill, I think. But one thing I do know is that no State can mess up welfare as badly as the Federal Government has done. It is time to let innovation by the States take hold and give it a chance, and it has begun to succeed in many States, including my own State of New Jersey.

There are millions of men, women, and children now receiving welfare in our country. Among them are countless families who are now trapped in a

system that was supposed to help free them and countless individuals who have been forced to trade self-reliance and self-respect for dependency as the price for receiving help.

Mr. Chairman, we can do better, a lot better. We must do better, and that is why the Personal Responsibility Act is before us today.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this mean-spirited Republican bill. It is cruel. It is wrong. It is down right low down.

The Republican welfare proposal destroys the safety net that protects our Nation's children, elderly, and disabled. It is an angry proposal, a proposal devoid of compassion, and feeling.

Hubert Humphrey once said that "the moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life—the children; those who are in twilight of life—the elderly, and those who are in the shadow of life—the sick, the needy, and the handicapped."

Mr. Chairman, this welfare proposal attacks each and every one of these groups. It takes money out of the pockets of the disabled. It takes heat from the homes of the poor. It takes food out of the mouths of the children.

I am reminded of a quote by the great theologian, Martin Niemoller, during World War II:

In Germany, they came first for the Communists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Communist. Then they came for the Jews, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Jew. Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak up because I was a Protestant. Then they came for me, and by that time no one was left to speak up.

Mr. Chairman, this Republican proposal certainly isn't the Holocaust. But I am concerned, and I must speak up.

I urge my colleagues, open your eyes. Read the proposal. Read the small print. Read the Republican contract.

They are coming for the children. They are coming for the poor. They are coming for the sick, the elderly, and the disabled. This is the Contract With America.

I say to my colleagues—you have the ability, the capacity, the power—to stop this onslaught. Your voice is your vote. Vote against this mean-spirited proposal; raise your voice for the children, the poor, and the disabled.

A famous rabbi, Rabbi Hillel, once asked, "If I am not for myself, who will be for me? But if I am only for myself, what am I?"

What am I, Mr. Chairman?

I am for those in the dawn of life, the children. I am for those in the twilight of life, the elderly. I am for those in the shadow of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped.

Yes, I am proud to be a liberal Democrat. I stand with the people and not for corporate interests.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman on the floor, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS]. There is no one in this House that I have had more respect for than you. But for you to come on this floor and compare the Republicans to the reign of the Nazis is an absolute outrage, and I'm surprised that anybody with your distinguished background would dare to do such a horrible thing.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would tell the visitors in the gallery that, while we welcome you to enjoy these proceedings, you are not supposed to be involved in them, and, any more applause, and we will have to empty the galleries.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I can only repeat the old truth: "Sometimes the truth hurts."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

(Mr. CLEMENT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I believe restoring American's trust in government is the single greatest challenge facing this Congress. The American people are perilously close to losing their faith in this institution and its Members' ability to effectively govern.

The American people feel we have been too consumed with preserving and promoting government rather than the will and liberties of the governed. Many have come to feel that the Washington Beltway which encircles this capital city has become a physical barrier to real change.

One need look no further than our welfare system to find an illustration of the disconnect between the people and their government. Reforming welfare is not a revolutionary idea. Reform has been kicked around for more than a decade.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that one would be hard pressed to find anyone who does not support the idea of welfare reform. In fact, one could almost be so bold as to assert that there is unanimous support for welfare reform.

Thus, the need for welfare reform is not in dispute. The issue which this House must resolve over the next few days is which direction do we head, how far do we go, and which is the best way to get there.

Some look at welfare and see a system which penalizes marriage and robs individuals of their initiative, motivation, and self-esteem. They contend that recipients are not opposed to work and would love to work but the current

system is too bureaucratic, too oppressive, and prevents recipients from working. They feel that welfare can be transformed and recipients can be given new life if the Federal, State, and local governments will only remove the obstacles to work, empower the people, and provide the means and tools by which recipients can become self-sufficient.

But, there are an equal number who feel that the current system is built on the notion of getting something for nothing, that the system is plagued with fraud and abuse, and leaves them wondering why their hard-earned dollars continue to support this bureaucratic nightmare. They support tough measures that require recipients to do something to get benefits. They feel that the solution lies in turning the welfare programs over to the States with little or no influence by the Federal Government.

The States, cities, localities, and counties which administer welfare programs argue that they are faced with the prospect of providing to a growing population while dealing with inflexible rules and regulations and a chronically insufficient supply of funds.

And what do I see?—I see all these things.

Government has failed! Something must be done.

I believe that neither argument is entirely right or wrong and that on the whole these arguments all have merit. That is why I joined five of my colleagues in drafting a bill of our own. We sought the middle ground, a truly centrist position, a compromise between these diverse schools of thought. I believe that we have achieved our goal.

We will bring a substitute, known as the Deal substitute, which will not simply reform the current system but replace it with a partnership of mutual responsibility.

Our proposal is based on three fundamental principles: Work, individual responsibility, and State flexibility.

The cornerstone of our plan is work. Our substitute places an emphasis on moving recipients into the private sector as soon as possible, includes real work requirements, and fulfills the pledge that recipients must be working. We require recipients to complete a minimum number of hours of work or work-related activity each week to receive benefits. We deny benefits to any recipient who refuses a job or refuses to look for a job. And in exchange, we remove all incentives which make welfare more attractive than work and remove the biggest barriers to work—health care and child care. In short, we guarantee recipients that if they will go to work we will provide the money and take all the necessary steps to ensure that recipients have a real opportunity to become self-sufficient.

Our second principle, individual responsibility, is based on the notion of tough love. I have two beautiful daughters. Elizabeth who is 13 and Rachel

who is 11. My wife and I love our daughters dearly and have tried to instill good values in them. We have taught them the difference between right and wrong and trust they will make the right decisions. And we make every effort to nurture them and see that each receives the attention and encouragement they need. But, as every parent knows, no matter what you do, there comes a time when your children must be disciplined. Elizabeth and Rachel know that we have rules which must be followed, and that my wife and I have certain expectations of them. They also know that they will be held accountable if these guidelines are not adhered to.

Our bill takes this same approach. We make every effort possible to ensure that each recipient has a real opportunity to return to the work force permanently. In return, we ensure that they are aware that there are specific expectations of them and that they will be held accountable for their actions and disciplined when necessary.

Specifically, every recipient must sign an individualized contract designed to move them into the work force. Each recipient must complete 30 hours of work and 5 hours in job search during the Work First Program and 35 hours of work and 5 hours of job search during Workfare. Minor parents will be denied public housing and must live at home with a parent or responsible guardian. And, States would have the option of implementing a family cap. If recipients fail to meet any of these requirements, they will have violated the agreement and the partnership will be terminated. We don't just stop with recipients—we also include strong child support enforcement provision which will require noncustodial parents to live up to their responsibilities.

Our third principle reaffirms our belief that it is not the Federal Government but the frontline administrators of these programs which best know the needs in their respective States and localities. For this reason we give the program back to the States. But, unlike other proposals, we do not simply shift the burden to the States and run away. We believe that as it is a federally mandated program, the Federal Government has a responsibility to ensure that the States have someone to turn to for support and assistance. Our bill includes general criteria to guide the States in developing their work programs; however, beyond the broad criteria, States are given a tremendous amount of flexibility.

For example, under our substitute, States would have the flexibility to develop programs to move individuals into work, flexibility in funding, the freedom to pursue innovative approaches and we consolidate and coordinate programs to give States more latitude.

But we do not stop there. In addition to work, responsibility and State flexibility, we also eliminate the fraud and abuse in the Food Stamps Program,

make work pay, consolidate and strengthen existing child care and health care, making these services available to more individuals. We streamline and reduce the bureaucracy by allowing States to circumvent the burdensome waiver process. We eliminate SSI for drug addicts and alcoholics. We reform and revise SSI for children in a fair and equitable manner which eliminates the fraud and abuse, controls growth, and ensures due process for each and every child currently on the rolls, ensuring that no qualifying child loses benefits.

We have a wonderful opportunity to make a real difference in the lives of thousands of individuals. The President, the Congress, and the person on the street all agree that the current system is not working.

Mr. Chairman, in short, our substitute is a responsible, workable approach which maintains the Federal responsibility without simply shifting the burden to the States. Recipients will be required to work for benefits, but there is an absolute time limit for receipt of these benefits. Our plan provides the best opportunity for welfare recipients to become productive members of the work force. We provide States with the resources necessary to provide this opportunity without incurring an additional fiscal burden.

I would remind my colleagues that the American people are watching. They are skeptical. Welfare reform provides a real opportunity to make meaningful changes and demonstrate to them that we can still govern effectively. We must not allow this golden opportunity to pass us by—to do so would be a tragedy.

I for one intend to support the only responsible welfare reform bill and urge my colleagues to do the same—support the Deal substitute.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State [Mr. McDERMOTT], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, three times in the Gospel the story is told about our Lord, the children being brought to him, and the story is, of course, that the parents are trying to bring the kids to Christ, and Christ said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me as long as your mother is over 18 and she's married."

Now, Mr. Chairman, my colleagues know that is not true, and this bill is the most cruel and shortsighted view in public policy I have seen in 25 years. The first 2 years of life are the years when children develop what they are going to be for the rest of their life. I say,

If you don't take care of them with Medicaid, if you don't take care of them with health care and food supplements during that period of time, you doom them to a life of difficulties in this society.

Mr. Chairman, many of our Republican colleagues would like us to believe that most welfare recipients get on welfare because they do not want to

work, and they stay on because welfare recipients are just being lazy. I think it is just the opposite. I think most people get on welfare due to unforeseen circumstances, and those that remain do so not because they are lazy, but because they are not smart enough to know—they are smart enough to know it is not the best option for them. Welfare recipients know their option. They know if they work, even with the earned income tax credit, that just does not make it.

Let me lay out the example:

A young woman with three kids goes out and gets a job at a gas station making the minimum wage, \$4.25 an hour. She works all year. She makes \$8,500. With the earned income tax credit on top of that, of \$3,000, she makes about \$11,500. The poverty line in this country established by the government and accepted by all for a family of four in 1995 is \$15,000. Now that is \$3,500 more than she makes. If she works the whole year, she will have 75 percent of the poverty line. She will not have health care benefits. She will not have day care.

Mr. Chairman, to say to her, "Leave your kids at home, lady; go on out, and get a job, and don't have a chance to take your kids to the doctor," simply is not a reasonable thing to expect of anybody.

Now this situation is not unusual. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Mr. Chairman, 4.2 million people in this country, paid by the hour, earn at below the minimum wage. Furthermore, the percentage of working families that are poor has risen. In 1976 the percentage of families with children that had a parent working that was below the poverty line was 8 percent. In 1993, Mr. Chairman, it is up to 11 percent.

Now the Republican response in this bill? This bill is a bad bill as it sits here, responds to that situation to make welfare look so mean and so severe that makes working full time at 75 percent of poverty look like a good deal. I think that instead of making welfare tougher we should make welfare or work pay. That means we have to raise the minimum wage.

Mr. Chairman, I would oppose the bill as it stands.

□ 1700

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, a member of the committee.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4 because I think after 30 years and \$5 trillion, the taxpayers and welfare recipients deserve better. We need fundamental changes. We need a system that does not trap welfare recipients in an endless cycle of dependency.

I cannot believe that Members can come to this floor and say this bill is cruel or mean-spirited. It is those who protect the current system that are cruel. They believe that bureaucrats administering a one-size program that

fits all know how to run a system better than State and local communities.

The bill is tough, but it is fair, and we ask those on welfare to work in return for benefits. We insist fathers live up to their responsibilities, and we quit giving cash to those who continue to have children while on welfare. We ask families and people to be more responsible, be responsible Americans. That is not cruel, that is true compassion.

I also want to set the record straight on funding. Under this bill we increase funding, we increase funding, I want to repeat, we increase funding. Look at this chart. CBO baseline spending goes up over the next 5 years. We are increasing spending, according to CBO estimates, \$1.2 trillion over the next 5 years, helping people escape the welfare trap.

You know the difference in those two lines? Earlier estimates said we were going to raise spending 53 percent. You know what? We are doing what the American people wanted us to do, and that is reduce spending. We are cutting the increase to 42 percent. Goodness gracious. If you cannot stand a 42-percent increase in spending, if your own budget could stand that, I defy you to say there is something wrong with that. We are not taking money away from anybody. We are increasing as the need requires.

This bill targets money to the most needy, gives the States the ability to create their own solution. This bill is fair. It is real reform. Talk is cheap. The Democrats have proven that.

It is time to act. It is time to repeal and reform the welfare program. Vote against big government, and let us help Americans help themselves to have a better future.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, please do not take the chart away. Let me point out what is wrong with it. It does not take into consideration inflation that is endemic in the American economic system. It does not take into consideration growth in population. That chart is just useless.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the welfare reform package brought to the floor today by the Republican majority.

This mean-spirited attack on children and poor families in America fails every test of true welfare reform.

The Republican bill is tough on children and weak on work. This plan will punish children who happen to be born into poverty. At the same time, this plan cuts child care funding and other programs that are essential if an adult on welfare is to get a job and leave the welfare rolls.

Instead of fixing welfare and moving Americans from welfare to work, the

Republican bill is simply an exercise in cutting programs that serve children, the disabled, and families living in poverty.

What can possibly be the motive for launching such a cruel attack on the children of America? The answer is the Republican majority will cut programs for the poor to provide tax cuts for the wealthy. Cuts in child care, school lunches, and programs for the poor will be used to finance tax breaks like the capital gains tax cut. We are literally short-changing America's children to give tax breaks to individuals with incomes over \$100,000 a year.

The Republican bill will punish over 15 million innocent American children. It would punish children who are born out-of-wedlock to a mother under the age of 18. It punishes any child who happens to be born to a family already on welfare. This bill does not guarantee that a child will have safe child care when their parents work. It cuts SSI benefits to over 680,000 disabled children. Under this bill, State accountability for the death of a child is limited simply to reporting the child's death. Finally, this bill adds to the injuries of abused and neglected children by cutting \$2 billion from Federal programs to care for these children.

Americans must ask what will happen to these children? The result, without a question will be an increase in the number of children who go to bed hungry.

The Republican bill will increase the risk of a child in poverty suffering from abuse and neglect. And yes, the result will be that some mothers who want to give birth to a child will be pushed to consider ending their pregnancy.

The Republican bill is a cruel attack on America's children but it also fails to provide the essential tools needed by parents who want to move from welfare to work. A mother who takes a minimum wage job can only do so if she has access to safe child care. Unfortunately, this bill will cut Federal funds for child care by 25 percent in the year 2000. This means that over 400,000 fewer children will receive Federal child care assistance. Pennsylvania alone will lose \$25.7 million in Federal child care assistance funding by the year 2000. That means that over 15,000 children in Pennsylvania will be denied Federal assistance for safe child care.

The legislation will result in America's poor children being left home alone. Mothers who are required by the State to work will no longer be guaranteed child care. States that seek to provide child-care assistance will have to make up for Federal child care cuts by raiding other State programs or increasing State taxes.

Again, the Republican bill is tough on children and weak on work. It allows States to push a person off the welfare rolls and then count that person toward meeting the Republican's so-called work requirement. There is no requirement for education, training, and support services for individuals who need help moving from welfare to a job. In fact, nearly \$10 billion for job training programs have been cut from the first Republican welfare plan. Apparently these funds were needed more to pay for tax cuts for upper income Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican plan is not welfare reform. It is a cruel attack on children that fails to solve the welfare mess. I urge that the House reject the Republican plan.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], a member of the committee.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today we have a great opportunity, an opportunity to overhaul a welfare system that is currently failing millions of Americans, an opportunity to restructure the welfare program to work effectively, and, I believe, with lots of thoughtfulness, to work compassionately.

Over the last few months, members of the Committee on Ways and Means have heard from hundreds of witnesses from President Clinton's Secretary of Health and Human Services to many of the mothers who live on welfare. Every witness, Republican, Democrat, liberal, conservative, every single one of them has told us that the current welfare system is an unmitigated disaster.

Yet during these days as we work hard to redesign this system, I continue to be disappointed by the tone of the opposition's rhetoric. Opponents of this bill assert that the reform-minded Republicans want to change the welfare bill only to save money, regardless of how it would affect the poor.

Make no mistake, Mr. Chairman, our changes save money, nearly \$67 billion over 5 years. But to my friends who say that these savings will help the poor, I ask, how much good has the \$5 trillion that we have spent in the last 30 years on the welfare program done to solve or even lessen America's poverty?

Could it be that it is not the amount of money that we are spending that is wrong, but rather the way in which we spend it? To the liberals in Congress, I salute your intentions. You, too, want to help the poor, those people who truly do need our help. But the welfare system you built is a failure.

The welfare mothers whom I met with last weekend in my district at a Head Start meeting told me that the welfare system, or AFDC, is a negative system that pulls people down and robs them of their self-esteem, and too often devalues them and their ability to be productive members of our community.

Today we begin the process of lifting the weight of the old welfare system from the backs of America's poor, the reevolution of America's welfare systems. We are removing the perverse incentives that encourage people to go on to welfare and, once they are on there, that capture them and keep them on an endless cycle of dependency of government.

The status quo fosters government dependency while our proposal fosters personal responsibility. And it provides the hope of work and the promise of self-respect. We want to give people self-respect. We want to restore their self-esteem through the dignity of

holding a job. We want to provide them with day-care and medical benefits that can help them again become productive citizens of our society.

Mr. Chairman, we are a nation of great wealth and compassion, but we are neither compassionate nor wise when we spend \$5 trillion over 30 years and still allow so many Americans to remain trapped in this endless and hopeless cycle of poverty. It is lunacy to continue with the liberal welfare system that promises only the likelihood of a life with more crime, less education, and lifelong government dependency.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt by the end of this week we will pass a bill that offers people a hand up and out. And to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, this week we have the opportunity to truly end welfare as we know it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] a member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, whatever we do in welfare reform, there are some things we should not do. And one thing we should not do is dismantle the nutrition programs that are working so well around the country.

H.R. 4 would eliminate the School Lunch Program and other nutrition programs, replacing them with block grants. Proponents keep saying this will not make a difference.

But if they are right, then why do the child care and child nutrition block grants have a 5-year change that picks up \$11.8 billion? Something has to change, and I am afraid that it will be the whole point of the program—its nutritional value.

The same goes for food stamps. This country has been blessed with abundant farm land. It has been said we could feed the world. With the suggested changes in welfare and other budget changes such as the elimination of more than \$7 billion in fuel assistance program and more than \$2 billion in low-income housing, food stamps become more important.

Yes, we should get rid of waste and fraud. Yes, we should prosecute those who traffic in food stamps. But do not take food stamps away from those who need them.

Changes such as eliminating benefits for children born out of wedlock and their mothers make food stamps more important for a healthy child. If people lose benefits and can't find a job, food stamps are important.

Let's not risk our children's health and education by enacting a cut-and-run nutritional block grant to replace a successful Federal nutritional program.

Also, let us not get rid of national standards. In the School Lunch Program, the elimination of standards put

at risk the whole point of the program—providing nutritional meals.

And I am very worried about the elimination of minimal standards in child welfare programs, which will be even more underfunded and overburdened if these block grants happen and could mean increased numbers of abused children.

Minimal Federal standards have been adopted in the past because we believe there is a national interest in protecting children. Let us not forget that important point in the rush to pass welfare reform.

I strongly suspect H.R. 4 started off in the right direction when it was first conceived. I am sure that there were substantive conversations about the need for child care, training, and work.

But it is no surprise that those deliberations changed when it was realized that real welfare reform is very hard to do. It is certainly much easier just to send the entire problem back to the States and take the \$64 billion in savings and use them off the top to pay for tax cuts.

I am also worried about taking children off disability. Yes, there has been abuse, particularly in Arkansas and Louisiana, but fix the abuse. When I read the bill, it takes 250,000 off the rolls. There were not 250,000 abusers. God help the family that has a truly disabled child.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], a member of the committee.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4, the Family Responsibility Act, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I urge them to vote in supporting it, to reduce dependency, to slash bureaucracy, to promote personal responsibility, and to strengthen families.

Our legislation maintains the safety net for the poor, but in reforming the welfare system, it will sound the death knell for the failed liberal welfare state.

Our bill is a mainstream approach, and I urge Members not to be deluded by the harsh, partisan, intemperate rhetoric they have heard here today. Our bill is tough on bureaucracy, not on kids. Our bill is cruel to the status quo, not the under class.

I heard my colleague from Michigan characterize this bill as extreme. Perhaps in Washington it is considered extreme to give power to the States instead of elevating the HHS bureaucracy. But this I believe is a mainstream proposal. It is also a compassionate proposal.

□ 1715

The current welfare system is not compassionate and we need to stop measuring compassion by how many checks we cut, by how many bureaucrats we employ, by the size of our appropriations. Instead, we need to start measuring compassion by how few people are on AFDC and on welfare and on food stamps and by the access every

child has to hope, to independence, and to opportunity.

We have offered here, in my view, a tough love approach to welfare reform. It is a sound one. Our reform plan has a tough work requirement that will reintroduce many families to the dignity of work. Our bill stops subsidizing out-of-wedlock births. Our bill establishes real time limits to welfare, 2 years, and then up to 5 years, if someone stays in a work program. And talking to people in my district, they feel those time limits are fair.

Our bill cracks down on deadbeat dads with tough new child support enforcement. Our bill links welfare rights to community responsibilities and cuts bureaucracy, consolidating a Byzantine maze of Federal welfare programs into four flexible block grants.

Our legislation bars cash to unwed parents but it provides other services to those parents. And our bill guarantees funding to the States so that they will be able to provide those services.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania talked about the Republican bill, H.R. 4, having these tough work requirements. I just want to know, what page are these tough work requirements on in this bill? We need to see them.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, Republicans and Democrats alike agree that the current welfare system does not work. Instead of requiring work, it punishes those who go to work. And instead of instilling personal responsibility, it encourages dependence on the Government; instead of encouraging marriage and family stability, it penalizes two-parent families and rewards teenage pregnancies. We all agree that welfare must be drastically changed and that welfare should only offer transitional assistance leading to work and not a way of life.

That is why I wish to speak on behalf of the Deal substitute to the Republican bill, because we, the cosponsors of the Deal substitute, are committed to making major changes in our Nation's welfare system.

We support welfare reform that emphasizes work, personal responsibility, and family stability. The Deal substitute imposes tough work requirements while providing opportunities for education, training, child care, and health care to support working people.

It provides States with the resources necessary for welfare reform to succeed without shifting costs to local governments or requiring unfunded mandates. And it gives States the flexibility to design and administer the welfare programs they need without sacrificing accountability to the Nation's taxpayers.

Real welfare reform must be about replacing the welfare check with a paycheck. The Deal substitute's time-limited work first program is designed to get people into the work force as quickly as possible, requiring all recipients to enter into a self-sufficiency plan within 30 days of receiving benefits.

The Republican welfare reform bill allows recipients to receive cash benefits for up to 2 years before they are required to work or even to look for work.

The Deal substitute provides the necessary resources for welfare recipients to become self-sufficient, but it also requires recipients to be responsible for their own actions by setting clear time limits on benefits. And no benefit will be paid to anyone who refuses to work, who refuses to look for work, or who turns down a job.

In addition to making individuals responsible for their own welfare, we demand that both parents must be responsible for their children. The sponsors of the Deal substitute recognize that in order to reform welfare, States must have the flexibility to design and administer welfare programs tailored to their unique needs and their own circumstances.

We believe that the States should not have to go through a cumbersome Federal waiver process in order to implement innovative ideas in their welfare programs. So the Deal substitute establishes the Federal model for the work first program.

I believe the Deal substitute is the only welfare bill which gives the American people what they really want, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN], a member of the committee.

(Mr. ENSIGN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, one of the most difficult tasks to perform in the Federal Government is to propose fundamental change to a Federal program. The most difficult task is actually to go about making this change law. A Federal program is like a huge cargo ship. As long as the ship is slowly laboring ahead on a set course, it may operate relatively well. When the time comes to change course, however, the size and speed of the vessel create tremendous momentum making the change of course difficult.

Of course, the longer that change is delayed, the more off course the ship gets, requiring more significant and more difficult and painful changes.

The other night on CBS, there was a welfare documentary. Dan Rather, who is not exactly known for his conservative thoughts, was the host of that documentary. And I found it very interesting.

There was a single mom. She was in a wheelchair, making \$15,000 a year.

They interviewed her. And she questioned why someone should be receiving welfare when she worked. She was in a wheelchair. She worked making \$15,000 a year. Her health care was not provided for her, and she resented her tax dollars going for somebody else to be on welfare.

The interviewed another young woman who had gotten off of welfare into work. And the pride that she now took of having her young children see her go every day into work.

I grew up with a single mom. There were three of us at home. My father provided no child support when I was young. And I watched my mom get up every day and go to work. That is what we need in this country is to have children watching their parents go to work on a daily basis.

This welfare reform bill will help ensure that people go to work.

During that same program that Dan Rather hosted, they had two welfare moms on that program. And they asked them, if you knew that your welfare payments were going to stop in a couple years, what would you do? The response was immediate, both of them said, well, I would go out and get a job.

We had testimony in front of the human resources subcommittee from a woman who counsels welfare recipients. She asks every one of her classes, what would you do if you knew that your welfare payments would end tomorrow? Every single one of them in her classes respond by saying, I would go get a job.

People say that the work requirements are not tough in this bill. Well, I am sorry, but I think that they are. If after 5 years you can no longer get any kind of welfare benefits, I think that that is a pretty tough work requirement, because work is a lot better than going hungry.

I rise in support and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER], who until this last election was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means but has to withdraw because of the ratio.

(Mr. BREWSTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act, and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Deal substitute.

I want to commend my colleagues for developing a comprehensive welfare reform proposal which I believe is the only real alternative for replacing the welfare check with a paycheck. I am a strong advocate for welfare reform. Unfortunately, our current system rewards beneficiaries for staying on welfare.

Welfare recipients are often penalized when they get a job because they often have less money than they had while on welfare.

The Deal substitute guarantees that those who can work will work. The substitute ensures that a welfare recipient is better off economically by taking a job than by remaining on welfare.

The substitute provides transitional assistance in health care and child care, and it also improves outreach efforts to ensure that both recipients and employers make use of the earned income tax credit.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Deal substitute.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], a most important and valuable member of the majority in putting together this bill and one of the first advocates for the block grant approach.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased to be able to support this welfare reforms bill, the Personal Responsibility Act. I believe that welfare reform is simply the most important issue facing our country today. Welfare reform must be done. We all know this. And I would like to talk today for just a minute about the incentive nature of the current program.

Within the next 5 years, if we do nothing and continue our growth rate as it has been, over 80 percent of minority children and 40 percent of all children in this country will be born out of wedlock. Unmarried women who bear children out of wedlock before finishing high school are far more likely to go on welfare and stay there for at least 8 years. That is why more than 2 years ago, I began pushing to end cash benefits to teenagers who have a child out of wedlock because what had started as a helping program had become an incentive.

For the past 30 years our welfare system has sent a message to young women that the Federal Government will make it okay. If you have a child out of wedlock, the Government will give you \$500 a month AFDC, \$300 a month food stamps, pay all your medical bills. In many cases, find you a place to live and pay for it. In many cases, send you to a job training program or even a college, pay for your child care and your transportation.

This bill is not cruel and mean spirited. What is really cruel is the current incentive that pulls young women into the system and holds them forever in this cruel trap. That is mean spirited. That is cruel to both young women and their children.

We should continue our commitment to the vulnerable and the needy, but it is high time our Federal welfare policies reflected that goal.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the current welfare system is at odds with the care values Americans share: work, opportunity, family, and responsibility.

Too many people who hate being on welfare are trying to escape it—with too little success.

It is time for a fundamental change.

Instead of strengthening families and instilling personal responsibility, the system penalizes two parent families, and lets too many absent parents who owe child support off the hook.

Our society can not—and should not—afford a social welfare system without obligations.

It is long past time to “end welfare as we know it.”

We need to move beyond political rhetoric, and offer a simple compact that provides people more opportunity in return for more responsibility.

I have a few commonsense criteria which any welfare plan must meet to get my vote.

It must require all able-bodied recipients to work for their benefits.

It must require teenage mothers to live at home or other supervised setting.

It must create a child support enforcement system with teeth so that deadbeat parents support their children.

It must establish a time limit so that welfare benefits are only a temporary means of support.

It must be tough on those who have defrauded the system—but not on innocent children.

And it must give States flexibility to shape their welfare system to their needs, while upholding the important national objectives I have just listed.

The Republican bill fails to meet these criteria.

The Republican bill is weak on work.

It only requires 4 percent participation in fiscal year 1996, far below the current rate established under the 1988 Family Support Act.

It is outrageous that any new work requirement would fall below current law.

The Republican bill denies benefits to children of mothers under 18.

We must make parents—all parents—responsible for taking care of their own children.

But denying children support is not the best way to do that.

Instead, teenagers should be required to demonstrate responsibility by living at home and staying in school in order to receive assistance.

The Republican bill is tougher on children than it is on the deadbeat dads who leave them behind.

The Republicans waited until the last moment to put child support enforcement provisions in their bill—and then removed the teeth that can bring in more than \$2.5 billion (over 10 years) for kids.

Instead of attacking deadbeats, the Republican bill attacks children.

It eliminates the guarantee that every child in this country has at least one good meal a day.

Despite rhetoric to the contrary, the Republican bill cuts spending for child nutrition programs \$7 billion below the

funding that would be provided by current law.

Instead, kids' food money will be used for tax cuts for the rich.

Funding for the Women, Infants and Children Program is also reduced—and provisions requiring competitive bidding on baby formula have been removed.

That decision alone will take \$1 billion of food out of the mouths of children each year, and put the money in the pockets of big business.

This simply defies common sense.

No one in America could possibly argue that this is reform.

At a time when the need for foster care, group homes, and adoption is likely to rise dramatically, the Republican welfare plan would cut Federal support for foster care and adoption by \$4 billion over 5 years.

We can do better.

We must do better.

This week, Democrats will offer NATHAN DEAL's bill as a substitute, which reinforces the family values all Americans share.

It gives people access to the skills they need, and expects work in return.

It does not wage war on America's children.

Most importantly, it is a common-sense approach, which gives back the dignity that comes with work, personal responsibility, and independence.

□ 1730

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT], who has been very active in the preparation of H.R. 4.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, today we enter on an historic debate about a bill that will replace a failed welfare system with a system that is based on marriage, on family, on responsibility, and on work. I want to address in my remarks now, and I am sure it will come up later as well, the whole issue of work.

There have been past welfare reform bills which have purported to be workfare bills. The 1988 bill, which was a bipartisan bill, purported to be a workfare bill. Everybody was going to work under the bill. Six years later we have less than 1 percent of the case load working.

People need to understand what work has meant in the past to people who have really been defending the status quo. It has been an excuse for vast new expansions of the welfare state, constructing vast new bureaucracies, and nobody ends up working, but they will tell you that x percent of the case load is working.

What they do not tell you is that they exempt up front a huge percentage of the case loads from the workfare requirements, so if they say 50 percent of the people who are working, they have already exempted 80 percent or 90 percent of the people from the beginning.

The key to an honest workfare requirement, and our bill has that, is that it talks about percentages of the total case load. When we say 50 percent of the welfare case load is going to be working by the beginning of the next century, it means 50 percent of the people are going to be working by the beginning of the next century, and it means they are going to be working. They are not going to be looking for a job an hour a week, they are not going to be sitting in a class that somebody calls education, they are going to be working. That is the standard that we need to measure work everywhere throughout this debate.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], and I appreciate his efforts in this regard, is flawed in several important respects. For one thing, he defines work as job search, so people can be classified as working under his bill, even though they are not working, they are searching for a job.

The States will presumably be given the authority to define that. That is part of the problem that we had in the past. He counts toward meeting the work participation requirements, people who normally move off of welfare anyway. In any given year there is like half a million people who will move off welfare, at least temporarily.

My understanding of the gentleman's substitute is that it permits those people to be counted by the States toward meeting the participation requirements. They would get off welfare anyway, at least temporarily. If you are going to do that, you need to count the net increase of people who are getting off welfare because of work.

We are going to go into this in a lot more detail in the days to come, Mr. Chairman. The point I want to make about work is that it has to be an honest work requirement, people working, people actually working, not looking for a job, not consuming an enormous amount of the taxpayers' money to be trained for some kind of vice president's job, but working.

There are a number of States that are already doing that. It is very effective in introducing the dignity of work into those families. It is effective in moving those people who are almost employable off of the welfare rolls and into work. That is how we ought to measure the success of the program.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, on page 26 of the Personal Responsibility Act, the work activities under the Republican bill, one of the things the gentleman has talked about, the Deal bill, the job search, is a part of that bill as well.

Members on the gentleman's side roll people off the welfare rolls but they go out with no job. There are absolutely no jobs at all. I need to just find out where it is in H.R. 4 that all these jobs will take place.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, that is why our bill, and as the gentleman will recall, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], and I wrote this language in the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, that is why our bill focuses the work requirements on people on welfare who are closest to employability. Two-parent AFDC families, parents with school age children or above, those people can go to work.

Mr. FORD. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the vast majority of people on welfare are single mothers on welfare. The two-parent family component is something that the gentleman addresses, but the participation level at 50 percent by the year 2002 will not send anyone into the work force.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have served as chairman, co-chairman of a task force here in the House, on the Democratic side, in support of reforming the current welfare system. I think we can all agree today that the current system ill serves the taxpayer and ill serves the beneficiary.

My experience in coming to this House is different than most of the Members because I served as mayor of a major city. We have all concluded, as ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON has said, that the current welfare system is decadent. Senator MOYNIHAN warned us 30 years ago that the system had to be changed. President Clinton 2 years ago suggested that we should end welfare as we know it, and he ought to get some credit for that suggestion.

Mr. Chairman, 1 out of 3 children in America is currently born out of wedlock. One of my constituents, Barbara Defoe Whitehead, has done remarkable research in drafting those conclusions. In 1976, at the Democratic State convention in Massachusetts, I spoke in support of a workfare requirement. However, I want to say today in the well of this House, that it is that sage and principled conservative on the Republican side, the gentleman from Illinois, HENRY HYDE, who said "there is no such thing as illegitimate children. There may well be some illegitimate parents." We should acknowledge today on the Democratic side that we are the ones that pushed for a strong child support component.

The Republican alternative did not even speak to the issue of child support, and they called their bill the Personal Responsibility Act. What indicates more personal responsibility than supporting the children we bring into this world?

Mr. Chairman, I offered in committee a series of amendments that stated emphatically that those amendments had the support of Bill Weld and Bill Clinton. Not one of those amendments was passed at the Committee on Ways and Means level.

Mr. Chairman, I am astounded today that there is no work requirement in the Republican bill, but there is a work requirement in the Democratic bill. We suggest that you have to be enrolled in a program of self-sufficiency from day one. Work is the ultimate personal responsibility.

If we want to reverse the decadent system of welfare, we have an opportunity to offer a hand up and not a handout. That is what the Democratic proposals suggest.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say today that the Democratic legislation offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], is a piece of legislation that all of us in this House ought to be able to rally around. Just as importantly, it seems to me at the end of the day that if we really want to honor personal responsibility, that we do that through a strong and sound work requirement. That is what our bill has done.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to tell the gentleman that was just in the well praising the Deal deal that the Deal substitute would wipe out the work requirements in the Massachusetts law. It is a law that the gentleman should be very proud of and that he should protect.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI].

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, 30 years of ever-expanding and growing anti-poverty programs have not erased poverty from our midst. We have spent \$5 trillion trying to address this problem, yet the percentage of children living in poverty is unchanged from what it was in 1965.

Worse, we have seen illegitimate births more than quadruple, and have subsidized the rise of the single-parent family in our country.

Today nearly 30 percent of all births in our Nation are illegitimate. In 1992, the Federal Government alone spent \$305 billion on 79 overlapping means-tested social welfare programs, but our problems still persist.

Congress and the bureaucracy in Washington continue to insist that they know what the poor in our communities need. For years they have been beholden to the ill-conceived notion that we can only consider ourselves a compassionate Nation if Washington prescribes solutions to societal problems.

Mr. Chairman, this system has done worse than fail us. It has betrayed us. Something needs to change, but for years this body has been unwilling to address welfare reform. Finally, today, we are debating a genuine attempt at a

significant overhaul of our societal safety net.

Go home and listen to your constituents; these reforms represent the will of the people. No longer will the Government reward children for having children. No longer will we reward families for having a second baby when they cannot afford the first. No longer will the taxpayers pay to support addiction. No longer will Washington impose top-down solutions to problems they do not understand.

We will put an end to the big Government attempt to address these problems and return to a sense of responsibility, a sense of right and wrong, to the American safety net.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the three chairmen in the three committees on the fine work they have done, and this body for finally bringing this issue before the American people, and urge support of this bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, welfare is the biggest hot button issue of the year. Let us reform welfare, not try to see who is the meanest or the toughest.

Welfare has not worked. The American people want us to move individuals from dependency to work, they want us to cut Federal bureaucracy, and they want us to fight fraud in the current system. The Republican plan does not accomplish any of these goals, because they do not have the same goals most Americans have. They have washed their hands on the real welfare problem, and moved on to finance for the tax cut, finance on the backs of legal immigrants who pay taxes, abide by the laws, and enrich our culture.

The Republican bill does not even try to solve the root problem of poverty, education, jobs, training, nutrition for kids. In fact, their plan does not contain strict work requirements and actually creates disincentives to work. It destroys temporary child care and transportation for people who want to work. The Democratic plan is strong on work, actually requiring proposals that enable recipients preparing for and engaging in work, providing resources for the assistance needed to become self-sufficient, such as education, training, child care, and transportation.

The Democratic plan supports children, maintaining the national commitment of providing a safety net for kids, while requiring their parents to become self-sufficient, guaranteeing child care to families while the parents are preparing for work or working, and maintain the national commitment to protecting children from abuse and abandonment.

□ 1745

Mr. Chairman, this is a historic bill and a historic debate. We have a

chance to be bipartisan on this issue. The Senate will move, also. The President wants welfare reform. Let us do it right instead of trying to be the toughest or the meanest.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following for the RECORD:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 1995.

DEAR MR. LEADER: This week, the historic national debate we have begun on welfare reform will move to the floor of the House of Representatives. Welfare reform is a top priority for my Administration and for Americans without regard to party. I look forward to working with Republicans and Democrats in both houses of Congress to enact real reform that promotes work and responsibility and makes welfare what it was meant to be: a second chance, not a way of life.

In the last two years, we have put the country on the road to ending welfare as we know it. In 1993, when Congress passed our economic plan, we cut taxes for 15 million working Americans and rewarded work over welfare. We collected a record level of child support in 1993—\$9 billion—and last month I signed an executive order to crack down on federal employees who owe child support. In two years, we have granted waivers from federal rules to 25 states, so that half the country is now carrying out significant welfare reform experiments that promote work and responsibility instead of undermining it.

I have always sought to make welfare reform a bipartisan issue. I still believe it can and must be. Unfortunately, the House Republican bill in its current form does not appear to offer the kind of real welfare reform that Americans in both parties expect. It is too weak on moving people from welfare to work, not as tough as it should be on deadbeat parents, and too tough on innocent children.

Last year, I sent Congress the most sweeping welfare reform plan any administration has ever presented. It did not pass, but I believe the principles and values at its core will be the basis of what ultimately does pass:

First, the central goal of welfare reform must be moving people from welfare to work, where they will earn a paycheck, not a welfare check. I believe we should demand and reward work, not punish those who go to work. If people need child care or job skills in order to go to work, we should help them get it. But within two years, anyone who can work must go to work.

This is not a partisan issue: Last year, 162 of 175 House Republicans co-sponsored a bill, H.R. 3500, that promoted work in much the same way as our plan. But the current House Republican bill you will consider this week fails to promote work, and would actually make it harder for many recipients to make it in the workplace. It cuts child care for people trying to leave welfare and for working people trying to stay off welfare, removes any real responsibility for states to provide job placement and skills, and gives states a perverse incentive to cut people off whether or not they have moved into a job. When people just get cut off without going to work, that's not welfare reform. I urge you to pass a welfare reform bill that ends welfare as we know it by moving people from welfare to work.

Second, welfare reform must make responsibility a way of life. We should demand responsibility from parents who bring children into the world, not let them off the hook and expect taxpayers to pick up the tab for their

neglect. Last year, my Administration proposed the toughest child support enforcement measures ever put forward. If we collected all the money that deadbeat parents should pay, we could move 800,000 women and children off welfare immediately.

I am grateful to members in both parties for already agreeing to include most of the tough child support measures from our welfare reform plan. This week, I hope you will go further, and require states to deny drivers and professional licenses to parents who refuse to pay child support. We have to send a clear signal: No parent in America has a right to walk away from the responsibility to raise their children.

Third, welfare reform should discourage teen pregnancy and promote responsible parenting. We must discourage irresponsible behavior that lands people on welfare in the first place, with a national campaign against teen pregnancy that lets young people know it is wrong to have a child outside marriage. Nobody should get pregnant or father a child who isn't prepared to raise the child, love the child, and take responsibility for the child's future.

I know members of Congress in both parties care about this issue. But many aspects of the current House plan would do more harm than good. Instead of refusing to help teen mothers and their children, we should require them to turn their lives around—to live at home with their parents, stay in school, and identify the child's father. We should demand responsible behavior from people on welfare, but it is wrong to make small children pay the price for their parents' mistakes.

Finally, welfare reform should give states more flexibility in return for more accountability. I believe we must give states far more flexibility so they can do the things they want to today without seeking waivers. But in its current form, the House Republican bill may impede rather than promote reform and flexibility. The proposal leaves states vulnerable to economic recession and demographic change, putting working families at risk. States will have less money for child care, training, and other efforts to move people from welfare to work. And there will not be any accountability at the federal level for reducing fraud or protecting children. We will not achieve real reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives the states more burdens and less money, and fails to make work and responsibility the law of the land.

While the current House plan is weak on work, it is very tough on children. Cutting school lunches and getting tough on disabled children and children in foster care is not my idea of welfare reform. We all have a national interest in promoting the well-being of our children and in putting government back in line with our national line.

I appreciate all the work that you have done on this issue, and I am pleased that the country is finally engaging in this important debate. In the end, I believe we can work it out together, as long as we remember the values this debate is really about. The dignity of work, the bond of family, and the virtue of responsibility are not Republican values or Democratic values. They are American values—and no child in America should ever have to grow up without them.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Republican plan doesn't attack fraud—in fact it will dismantle many programs where fraud has been nonexistent—such as the Nutrition and School Lunch Programs.

These programs have undisputed health and education benefits, and nutritious meals are served to children, who may not get an-

other meal each day, at a cost of only \$1 per student.

In the last few days Republicans have been claiming they are not really cutting the School Lunch Program—apparently they realize how ludicrous their plan is and are running for cover—but this is a false claim: Their supposed spending “increases” don't take into account rising food costs, inflation, or increases in number of kids who need the program; in fact, many of the increases were written on committee worksheets, not in the proposed legislation.

New State allocation formulas are flawed—they are based on number of meals served in a State, without regard to whether meals are served free to poor children.

Also, States may divert 20 percent of its nutrition funding to other programs under the Republican proposal. Flexibility is a popular theme right now, but the Republican plan simply abandons any Federal safety net for innocent, hungry kids.

Can Republicans truly say they are not dismantling the school program? No, but they can say they've saved billions of dollars to help their wealthy friends at tax time.

For the food programs alone, 175,000 New Mexicans will become ineligible for assistance; State estimated to lose \$5 million for School Lunch Program, \$21 million for child and adult care food programs, and \$45 million for food stamps.

New Mexico also slated to lose \$21 million for assistance for needy families, \$21 million for blind and disabled children, and \$5 million for child care costs.

Can the Republicans truly say they have not devised a cold-hearted, ineffective program?

Can Republicans deny that they are creating a long list of unfunded mandates? States have asked for flexibility. But clearly they have not asked for the additional burdens the Republican welfare plan imposes.

Finally, lost in much of the debate over welfare reform is the fact that the Republican plan is financed almost entirely on the backs of legal immigrants.

That's right—not undocumented workers, but legal immigrants.

Their plan denies nearly all benefits to people who pay taxes, abide by the laws, enrich our culture and our economy.

Studies show that immigrants actually create a net benefit of \$28 billion to the American economy.

But Republicans haven't studied the real facts to know what their cost and block grants will create—because that's never been their goal.

Don't be deceived—this entire plan is about tax relief for rich people, it has nothing to do with reason or ending welfare as we know it.

Democrats are strong on work: Democratic proposals actually require that recipients prepare for and engage in work; provide resources for the assistance needed to become self-sufficient, such as education, training, child care, and transportation.

Democrats support children: Democrats maintain the national commitment to providing a safety net for kids, while requiring their parents to become self-sufficient; guarantee child care to families while the parents are preparing for work or working; maintain the national commitment to protecting children from abuse and abandonment.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS], a member of the committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the President during his campaign ran on the platform of changing welfare. In fact he said, “We're going to end welfare as we know it today.”

Well, to end it does not mean you reform it. It means you change it. Because to reform it only just changes the shape of it and leaves the same substance. Is change necessary? It is long overdue and the answer is yes, it is.

Why? It is because 26 percent of the families in this country are in some way, some shape, some form or fashion drawing some type of government benefit that comes under the entitlement of welfare. Twenty-six percent of the families.

What is the real problem with welfare, the real root of the problem? It is called cash. The old saying cash is the root of all evil. Cash has been the real problem and is the real problem in welfare.

What is the history of cash in welfare? It goes back to the mid 1930's. In fact it was called Aid to Dependent Children, later called AFDC. It was actually created in 1935 as a cash grant to enable States now, I want to repeat that, to enable States to aid needy children, children who did not have fathers at home.

Was the AFDC program intended to be an indefinite program? No, it was not to last forever. The priority of it was to help children whose fathers were either deceased or disabled or unable to work. The program was supposed to sunset after the Social Security laws were changed but they never were sunsetted. When AFDC was created, no one ever imagined that a father's desertion and out-of-wedlock births would replace the father's death or disability as the most prevalent reason for triggering the need for assistance. No one ever dreamed that fathers would abandon children as they have.

In order to facilitate the sunset of the AFDC program, in 1939 the Federal Government expanded Social Security benefits by adding survivors benefits. This was to help wives and children of workers who died at an early age.

In 1956 the Federal Government added disability benefits to Social Security to try to cover those children whose fathers were unable to work because of some severe disability. But rather than sunset AFDC, the program continued to grow and has ballooned in recent years, because the very nature of the program has encouraged illegitimacy and irresponsible behavior.

Let me give Members a few statistics. In 1940, 41 percent of children on AFDC, their father had died. The fathers had abandoned 30 percent of the children. The fathers were disabled to work for 27 percent. In 1992, listen to

these figures: 1.6 percent of the children's fathers have died; 86 percent of children on AFDC, their fathers have abandoned them; and only 4.1 percent, the fathers are disabled to work.

Mr. Chairman, the AFDC system has created a problem, a real problem. It has encouraged irresponsible behavior by embracing a philosophy that says the government will take care of a child if a father won't. H.R. 4 stops this problem. It stops cash benefits in certain years, requires personal responsibility and it gives the States the flexibility, the very same thing that was supposed to happen in 1935 to handle the situation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Deal substitute to the Personal Responsibility Act.

This substitute bill reforms welfare by helping those who want to help themselves. It does not punish the poor. It will not cut school lunches. It will not force children off SSI without due process.

The goals of work and responsibility are achieved by combining work first with time limits and requirements that recipients follow an individual responsibility plan. In addition, the substitute's estimated \$10 billion in savings will be earmarked for deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that after the last speech is given and the final vote is cast, that the Deal substitute will prevail. This plan will really help our fellow Americans move from welfare to work.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLDEN].

Mr. HOLDEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Deal substitute and its provisions for greater child support enforcement.

Members of this core group of moderates have worked hard to expand upon last year's mainstream forum proposal and build a consensus among those wishing to make meaningful and long-lasting changes to our current welfare system.

As the former sheriff of Schuylkill County in my home State of Pennsylvania, I have firsthand knowledge of how difficult it can be to collect unpaid child support.

Under the Deal substitute, all parents would be accountable to their children through:

First, increased paternity establishment;

Second, central registries of child support orders in each State;

Third, uniform interstate enforcement procedures; and

Fourth, punitive measures for deadbeat parents such as direct income withholding and State option to revoke

occupation, professional, and driver's licenses

We owe it to our children to have the financial support of both parents and to the taxpayers who fund the irresponsible behavior of deadbeat parents.

I urge my colleagues to lend their support to the Deal substitute and real welfare reform.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

(Mr. FATTAH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] the distinguished ranking member for his gracious decision to allow me some time.

Mr. Chairman, we begin now a debate on one part of the process of reforming welfare in the United States of America. I would like to point to two reports, one by the Progressive Policy Institute, and the other by the Cato Institute which refer to corporate welfare in this country, and they talk about the direct subsidies of Federal taxpayer money, some \$86 billion in direct subsidies to corporations, and another \$100 billion or so in tax breaks to aid to dependent corporations in our country.

I find it interesting that this Congress and the new majority would want to begin its assault on welfare by attacking children and families who are in the greatest need rather than attempting to address a more fair approach in terms of this issue that could have been followed if one would have taken the time to look at these reports. The \$84 billion that would be affected by the actions relative to aid to families with dependent children and the child nutrition programs and school lunches, those savings could have easily occurred by scaling back some of the outrageous benefits that we provide as a Nation supposedly in fiscal crisis to corporations, multi-billion-dollar corporations each and every year.

I would just ask that as we begin this debate that the Members of this House be mindful of the contradictions of this process today.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], the chairman, for his work on this very, very important issue.

When I go home and I read the papers over the weekend, I wonder what we are all doing up here because the reports are very draconian.

The Republicans are taking food out of the children's mouths. That we are really just throwing people out in the streets.

The President suggests deadbeat dads, we take their driver's license. They must be quaking in their boots that we are going to take their driver's license.

These are people who are not paying for their children's welfare and they

are going to be frightened about losing their driver's license? Take their professional license. That is a good idea, too. Now they will not be able to work. That is another person on welfare.

Let's garnish their wages to the IRS. We will find ways to get after their money.

Food stamps—\$1.8 billion wasted on food stamps through fraud and abuse and we are on this floor talking about we can't reform it, we can't fix it. We are going to fix it. We are going to reform it.

What is wrong with work? I can't believe what people are saying here. Not enough job training.

I worked as a dishwasher. I cleaned toilets. My grandmother came from Poland. She made 28 beds a day in a Travel Lodge Motel. She cleaned 28 toilets a day to be an American citizen. She learned to speak English. She was proud to be an American and proud to be in this country.

But today, no, jobs aren't good enough. Can't take that job. Don't have enough training.

I was a wrecker, an auto mechanic. I worked at a golf course. Now I am a proud Member of the United States Congress. No job is beneath me.

But we are talking like unless we given them an appropriate level of training to seek the job that they have always dreamed of, then they are going to stay on welfare and we are going to spend billions and billions of dollars of our tax dollars on deadbeats, on people that don't want to work.

I have got to tell you, this Congress has got to be serious about reform, not about just throwing out threats, having lunches with children in schools in our district, saying that the Republicans are going to end feeding children at school lunches, the Republicans are going to starve children.

Don't believe it for a minute, America. We are not going to starve our children. A 4.5-percent increase per year in the Republican bill for school lunches increased. We are not going to starve people. We are going to take care of America. We are going to make it work again.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes and 40 seconds to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

(Mr. ORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, there are few things that more people agree upon than the fact that our welfare system is a failure. Today, our welfare system often provides people who choose not to work with a better deal than those who choose to take a job. I am pleased that Congress has committed to reform this failed system.

However, it is not enough to say we have reformed the welfare system. We must reform the system so that it works. By that, I mean we must create

a system that meets what the American people consider the premise of welfare reform: a system based on work, that provides transitional assistance to those in need, and that does not harm innocent children.

Many of the things I am hearing about the Personal Responsibility Act today sound right on target. For instance, I support State flexibility and allowing programs to better meet the needs of unique communities.

In addition, I agree that we should discourage out-of-wedlock births and promote marriage. Finally, I wholeheartedly agree that we should end the cycle of dependency.

In fact, I think the majority of the Nation would join me in commending these laudable goals. The unfortunate thing about the Personal Responsibility Act is that it does not achieve these goals.

Instead of allowing State flexibility, the bill limits the people who can be served with block grant funding. These limitations directly contradict the stated purpose of enhancing State flexibility. I would like to illustrate the negative impact that restrictions in this bill will have on successful reform efforts currently being implemented at the State level.

In Utah, we have a demonstration program that is enjoying great success in assisting people into the labor market. The AFDC caseload in one area has decreased by 33 percent in just 2 years—the best part of this statistic is that it represents people who are working in private sector jobs.

The premise underlying the Utah program is universal participation: everyone works toward self-sufficiency. This program has enjoyed national and local support, and is exactly the kind of program you would expect welfare reform to be based upon. Certainly, you would expect that the Utah program would be allowed to continue down the same successful path under a reformed system.

Yet the Utah State Department of Human Services is concerned because restrictive work participation definitions in the Personal Responsibility Act pose a threat to the program. A restrictive definition of participation means that a person faithfully following a self-sufficiency plan specifically designed to best assist them in entering the labor market could be considered a nonparticipant by the Federal Government. The Federal Government should not be creating a definition that prevents States, who are dealing directly with individuals, from determining what would best assist a person getting a job.

Ironically, while the bill would not allow states to count many active participants toward meeting mandatory rates, people who have been forced to leave the system because of reaching a time limit could be counted toward meeting work participation rates even if they have never received any work-related services.

I find it astounding that a bill can simultaneously restrict successful state reform efforts and offer no protection to people on welfare who are willing to work—it is the worst of both worlds. The bill guarantees that people will get kicked off the system if they meet a certain time limit, but it ties the States' hands in designing a program that would avoid this outcome for people who are willing to work.

We are back to the old one-size-fits-all Federal solution, only this time we are prohibiting certain actions rather than mandating them. Congress is on one hand saying that it trusts States to make sensible fair choices about block grant monies and on the other than saying States must adhere to federal restrictions.

I am also concerned that there is no method provided under the Personal Responsibility Act that allows states to contest the restrictions defined by the block grant if they hinder the State's ability to meet the purposes outlined in section 401 of the bill.

The Utah program required 46 Federal Government waivers. I think it would be a tragedy if Utah had not had an opportunity to address some of the incredible perverse incentives in the current system. In the same light, I do not want to see a new Federal system created under which States like Utah have no means to address problems with Federal dictates. Conservative mandates are no better than liberal mandates.

One thing is clear about the bill before us: a successful program in my district would not be able to function in the same way. This bill would force a State like Utah to create a parallel State bureaucracy to serve people that do not meet Federal definitions.

Proponents of this bill claim that they trust states with more flexibility, but instead of creating a bill that allows States to operate varied versions of welfare reform, they have created a restrictive, uniform approach to welfare reform based on Federal assumptions. I cannot support such a restrictive and narrow view of reform.

□ 1800

I want to say I am concerned that the bill that we are looking at will not in fact allow State flexibility. I have proposed an amendment which would grant flexibility to States. Unfortunately that amendment will not be allowed to this bill.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, did you hear what I heard here today? Members of the loyal opposition, the new minority one after another acknowledged that it is time to reform welfare. That is an astonishing acknowledgment on the part of the minority, the loyal opposition.

And then they proceed on top of that to attack the bold and fearless effort that is being made by the new majority to do something about it. And, in the words of many of the people on the new minority, they want to offer a substitute, some new refinement of wel-

fare reform, which is another acknowledgment that indeed welfare systems in our country have to be changed.

Their attack ours as saying why denationalize welfare and allow 50 new bureaucracies to crop up in the 50 States. The answer is a question: Has the national program worked? The answer is no. They acknowledge that it has not worked or else they would not be offering substitutes or calling for a bipartisan effort now after 40 years, after 40 years to try to reform the system.

The question is: Shall we do something about it now, move ahead boldly and fearlessly to try to change the system? The answer is yes, and it is agreed to by every American who thinks about the subject. And it is acknowledged, I repeat, by the new minority, the now new seekers of welfare reform whom we asked to join with us in passing meaningful new majority-type of welfare reform.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a clever debater, but his facts are wrong. I introduced a welfare reform bill last year, had hearings on it, ran into a filibuster of great magnitude and we could not make progress on it.

We reformed the welfare program in 1988. We reformed it in the 1960's. No one here, no one here I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] defends the current system. We have all been trying to change it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have followed the debate over the withdrawal of Federal support of poverty programs which has passed for a debate on welfare reform over the past few weeks with considerable interest. It seems to me that we have been avoiding a broader discussion of the deep structural problems in our society which the growth of welfare expenditures represents. I do not want this debate to end without some discussion of the real scope of these problems.

The conservative Republicans seem to be proceeding from the assumption that the welfare system has created poverty in this country, and that the welfare system is the problem. If so, then it follows that by excluding people from the welfare system, the problem will be solved. Do any of us really believe this?

The ultimate absurdity in all of this is that we all seem to be under the impression that by cutting the expenditures on these programs, we will save taxpayer dollars. This is not at all obvious to me. We are offering our constituents a false choice: pay for poverty programs, or save money and use it more productively on something else. The other things

most commonly acknowledged are: deficit reduction, tax cuts, and increases in defense spending.

The real choice that we face is not whether to pay or not pay to deal with the problems of poverty. It is whether we will pay for positive programs that will move people permanently off of welfare and out of poverty, or whether we will pay for programs that deal only with the negative consequences of poverty such as crime, homelessness, and poorly educated children, to name a few. We are about to choose the latter.

And Mr. Chairman, make no mistake, the programs to deal with the negative consequences of poverty already cost our taxpayers dearly and, I strongly believe, will cost our taxpayers even more under the Republican welfare reform plan. For example, if we simply throw people off of welfare and provide no job or safety net income, which is what the Republican plan would do after two years, then I think we can be assured that crime will rise. To deal with this we will need more police, more judges, more prisons, and more correctional officers.

We will also need increased expenditures on public health to control dangerous communicable diseases which are associated with poverty such as tuberculosis (which is already on the rise in some of our cities) and AIDS. Non-communicable diseases such as drug addiction, alcoholism, and malnutrition which already cost us too much, are all likely to increase. In short, Mr. Chairman if you think that the crime and public health problems are bad now in our country, wait until we see the full effects of the Republican welfare reform bill.

The current welfare system is not working, we all know that. It has not alleviated poverty in our country. Although there are people who are temporary recipients of this assistance, there are many who are permanently trapped below the poverty level, and who merely survive by making these programs a way of life. I do not know why we are expressing any sense of outrage over this. The old adage, "You get what you pay for" certainly applies here. We have not designed or been willing to pay for a suite of programs aimed at moving people from poverty to prosperity. We have essentially paid for maintenance, and that's what we have. The situation of inherited poverty that Michael Harrington and Robert Lampman warned of back in the early 1960s has been realized.

The nation is therefore beginning the sixties with a most dangerous problem: an enormous concentration of young people who, if they do not receive immediate help, may well be the source of a kind of hereditary poverty new to American society. If this analysis is correct then the vicious circle of the culture of poverty is, if anything, becoming more intense, more crippling, and problematic because it is increasingly associating itself with the accident or birth. (Michael Harrington; p. 183: *The Other America* 1962)

We cannot hope to correct this situation by falsely diagnosing the problem. And we cannot diminish Federal, State, or local poverty-related expenditures until we make a commitment as a nation to have full employment as an economic goal and recognize its imperative as a social goal. It is our failure to deal with this problem that has resulted in the rapid growth of welfare expenditures that have occurred over the past decade.

The real problem is unemployment, and the culture of despondency and poverty that it creates. We seem to be proceeding under the assumption that there are enough jobs in our economy to accommodate those who are now on the welfare rolls, and that those now receiving benefits will be equipped to accept the jobs that do exist. I doubt it. I would draw your attention to an example of the type of portrait that we have been presented with by the media of the "True Faces of Welfare."

An article by this title appeared in this month's Readers Digest. We have all seen many like it recently. The people described in this article are not the type of people that engender sympathy among our hard-working, taxpaying constituents. In fact, I suspect that these descriptions of unmotivated individuals who are irresponsible parents and frequent participants in criminal activities make it easy for us to vote to cut the system that subsidizes their antisocial behavior. But I would like us to think carefully about these portraits from the perspective of an employer. We are being led to believe that by cutting them off, these people will enter the labor force. But would you hire such a person? Would this person, who we are judging to be an unacceptable recipient of public assistance, be a desirable job candidate? Absolutely not. Serious intervention would be required to convert these people from destructive to productive members of this society. It is far more likely that without intervention these people will turn to criminal means of survival rather than to jobs in the legitimate economy.

These articles are also doing a serious injustice to the many poor in our country who continue to struggle to be productive, responsible citizens in the face of insurmountable odds. There are many on public assistance who work hard every day for wages that are simply too low to allow them to rise above the poverty level. We should not forget these people or lump them together with the unsympathetic persons described above. They need our help, and they should get it.

Even if the current welfare recipients were ready and qualified to work are there enough jobs to accommodate them? Unfortunately, the Department of Labor does not collect data on the number of available jobs that exist. However, I decided to investigate the job availability in my region of California by examining as much data as are available. I believe that what I found for my region will mirror what exists throughout the country. In San Bernardino County, CA there are 64,000 AFDC welfare families, which means that at least one adult in that family is unemployed or employed at such a low income level that they still receive some AFDC benefits. Thus, if we want to fully employ at least one adult from each of these families, we need to have 64,000 vacant jobs.

Mr. Chairman, that is a lot of jobs. Now, how many vacant jobs are there in San Bernardino County? The two daily newspapers in the county listed a combined total of 1,363 jobs in recent Sunday classified ads. Clearly, not all jobs openings are listed in newspapers, but the classified ads listed enough jobs to accommodate only 2 percent of our region's welfare recipients. A more precise figure comes from the State of California employment office, which currently has listings for 1,056 jobs in San Bernardino County. A rule of thumb is that State employment offices have listings for about 20 percent of available jobs. That

means that there might actually be 5,280 public and private sector jobs available in the County right now. And yet, we have a need for 64,000 jobs if we are going to employ at least one adult from each welfare family.

Obviously, if we are going to tell adults in welfare families to just go and get jobs, which is what the Republican welfare proposal would do, then we are setting up these families—and ourselves as public policy creators—for a real disappointment. The bottom line: without some kind of public commitment to create large numbers of entry-level jobs, we cannot have a solution to the problem of welfare dependency which we seek to solve.

If we consider the bigger picture, the macro-economic trends are even less comforting. The current trend in both the public and private sector is downsizing, and economists spend a good deal of time monitoring labor productivity, hoping to see it increase. What does this mean in human terms? Downsizing means fewer people doing more work (or the same amount of work). What is an increase in labor productivity? More units of product output for fewer units of labor input. This is fine if overall output rises, but if it does not, this simply means that fewer people are doing more work. Our population is not downsizing. It continues to upsize and probably will for the foreseeable future. Therefore, we need more jobs, not fewer.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly believe a successful welfare reform package would have work as its central focus. It would cost more money in the short run, but save money as people move into permanent jobs. We should not be afraid to spend money to combat the compelling suite of social problems that stem from the existence of poverty. We took an oath to defend this nation against enemies foreign and domestic. At this time, I can think of no greater domestic enemy than the persistent poverty in our urban and rural areas.

If there are not enough jobs in the private sector then we should create them in the public sector. This is not as radical as many of my colleagues will suggest. We justify many Federal expenditures on the basis that they will create jobs. There is much work to be done in this society. If the private sector cannot or will not pay for it, it is the role of Government to do so. Through programs that are focused on creating jobs that pay a living wage and training people to fill them we can transform taxtakers into taxpayers, welfare recipients into workers, and slums into communities.

We must also stop pretending that the problem of illegitimate births is strictly a women's problem. We are going to have to stop trying to legislate morality and acknowledge that there are many female-headed households with children, and child care and health care are necessary support services to enable these women to work. What will we have accomplished if the standard of living for families actually declines when parents leave welfare and go back to work? Ironically, obtaining employment and losing public

child care assistance and health benefits often forces many working poor families back onto the welfare rolls. If our goal is to achieve short term Federal savings, then we will have succeeded in our efforts through this legislation. But if we are sincere about lifting families out of poverty, then let's do something that will move parents to work and support parents in work through real reform.

We cannot have more people working without doing much more in the area of job training and education. Many of those who have become permanent welfare recipients are illiterate and lack the basic skills necessary to qualify for a decent paying job. Until they acquire these skills, they will remain permanently unemployed, especially since our economy has changed to require higher skill-levels of workers. If we are to finally recognize child-rearing as the important and complex job that it is then we can acknowledge its importance by paying women to do this job. However, many will require job training in this area as well, since many, as teenage mothers, have not acquired the necessary parenting skills that they need to raise children to be productive citizens.

If you want to end the Federal Welfare Program, and pass this national problem and all of its related social ills onto the States, vote for this legislation. But if we want to end poverty, empower all of our citizens, and diminish the expenditure of funds on welfare programs and social damage control, we had better start over again. Until we are ready to acknowledge the true dimension of this problem and have the political will to allocate the resources to solve it, we will be doing nothing more than passing this problem on to future generations.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to take this opportunity to address and explain two provisions contained in the Republican welfare reform bill, a bill which I fully support because it fixes our broken welfare system.

As we are all aware, the Personal Responsibility Act rightfully prohibits illegal aliens from receiving aid under all federal and state means tested public benefits programs. The bill also bars legal nonimmigrants like students, tourists and businessmen from receiving the same benefits, with a few exceptions. One of these exceptions allows temporary agricultural workers to remain eligible for medical services provided through migrant health centers and a few other means tested programs. We are *not* explaining the eligibility of these workers for other benefit programs, merely allowing them to remain in the programs for which they are currently eligible. It is important to note that employers request these workers be brought into the United States, and the request is only granted after the employer demonstrates that all measures have been used to employ U.S. citizens for the vacant positions.

The alien workers enter the country legally and are paid the same rate as a U.S. citizen would be employed in the same position.

These workers are, again, legally here for a specific time and for a specific reason. It seems appropriate that these invited workers should be able to receive limited assistance like medical attention at a migrant health center.

Let me now address the school meal provisions included in the bill. Although liberals consider me something of a pinch-penny, even most severe critics had never accused me of scheming to take food from the mouths of impoverished children. At least, not until recently.

What inspired a harsh reassessment of my character, and the character of other House Republicans, is the proposed overhaul of food and nutrition programs that provide nourishment for the nation's needy school children.

As a Member of the Opportunities Committee, the committee which worked diligently to craft the school meal reforms contained in this welfare reform bill, I support efforts to simplify regulations, cut red tape and grant States greater flexibility in operating school food and nutrition programs.

Essentially, here is what these changes would mean:

Current separate State and Federal applications, rules on eligibility and regulations would be replaced with a single system.

States could allow school districts greater latitude in meeting their specific needs.

Funding would be made in block grants to the States, which would establish their own spending and program priorities.

The net results of these changes would be to increase—not reduce—funding for nutrition and food programs, and to simplify (not further complicate) their administration.

That, in a nutshell, is what all the fuss is about. Does that sound like cruel indifference?

I do not deny—or apologize for—being frugal with the taxpayer's money. At the same time, I do not begrudge even one of the billions of dollars spent on food for hungry children. Indeed, if we are to err in our estimate of how much should be spent on this vital program, I would prefer come down on the side of generosity.

However, much of the money we are now earmarking for nutrition is being consumed by a Federal supply and regulatory system that is needlessly complex and wasteful.

President Clinton, among other critics, has attempted to portray this proposal as Republican indifference disguised as reform. That is pure poppycock.

What we are attempting to do here is introduce administrative efficiency and fiscal sanity to a program that will nurture children rather than continue to feed an insatiable Federal bureaucracy. If that makes me a tightwad, so be it.

Mr. GIBBONS. As we come to the close of this debate, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD], the ranking minority member, the ranking Democrat on the Human Resources Committee and a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] and the Republicans on the Committee on Ways and Means have talked about this welfare reform bill as being tough love. I would have the gentleman from Florida know today that this is tough luck for the children of this country. When you look at what this bill does, it punishes the child until the mother is 18 years old for being born out of wedlock. And we must do something about children being born out of wedlock, but this is not an answer.

This is what we are trying to do today to give to the wealthiest of this Nation, at the cost of those who cannot pay those lobbyists to represent them here in the halls of Congress.

You punish children. You are weak on work and you are mean to children in this country for the purpose of a \$600 to \$700 billion tax cut, with 80 percent of those revenues going to the rich and wealthy of this Nation.

I do not know how, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] and the Republicans, would have the heart to come here to say that we are going to be weak on work, not offer a work program that we can put people who are on welfare to work to make an income to provide and take care of their children. But instead, it is like you roll them on a conveyor belt and they roll off after 5 years and that is the end of it. People are off of welfare, they are in our cities, they will be in our counties, they will be in our neighborhoods, and they will be on our doorsteps.

Do not be so cruel. We as Democrats want a bill. That is why we have embraced the Deal bill, and we think the Deal bill makes plenty of sense, and the Deal bill should pass this House, and we should reject the Republican bill that is before the House today.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying that "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Well, the American people know that our welfare system is broke, and they are demanding that we do something about it.

In the roughly 30 years since Lyndon Johnson declared war on poverty, we have spent nearly \$58 trillion, that is trillion with a "T," on the war on poverty, a war we are clearly losing.

In 1965 we had a 7-percent illegitimacy rate. In 1990 it increased nearly fivefold to 32 percent and it is still climbing. Only 11 percent of families on AFDC spent any time on a monthly basis getting more education, or looking for work. And fully 65 percent of all of the families on AFDC will be on that program for 8 years or longer.

The people hurt worst with this debate are not the taxpayers who are saddled with this unconscionable cost, it is the people trapped by the system, people who are denied the American dream of getting a better education, of owning a home, of having a job and the self respect and dignity that comes with having that job. The American people know that the present system is broken and they are demanding that we do something about it. This bill makes a good start. It deserves our support.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as remains.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, this is an important day and an important piece of legislation, but this is a cruel hoax. The Republican bill is weak on work. It will allow the States to take a block grant, put the money in their pocket and pass regulations that will just drop all of the potential welfare recipients from their rolls. And the money that they save here at the Federal level will be used for a tax cut. Not a tax cut for people who are in need. In fact the tax cut that they offer, the child credit, a person working full-time, with 4 children, will get no tax credit if that person has \$20,000 worth of income, will not get a penny. But if the person has \$200,000 worth of income, they will get \$2,000 in tax credit.

This is a cruel, cruel hoax. It is not welfare reform, it is welfare perpetuation. It will pass the burden from those of us in Washington who are responsible for these things down to States who will slough off the responsibility to the local communities and nothing will get done.

There will be hungry children on the streets. There will be ignorant children on the streets. There will be homeless families on the streets. And all of this in the name of welfare reform.

Let us vote down the Republican bill, and let us adopt the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, we have heard now for over 2 hours many speakers from the minority side to come before this body in a desperate attempt to rewrite, not only rewrite history, but to rewrite the Republican bill. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] said there was a filibuster last year. I do not know of anyplace you can have a filibuster in the House

of Representatives. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] filed the President's bill, that is true.

□ 1815

In the subcommittee we had one or two hearings, that is true. The bill never came to a markup. It was never presented to the full committee. We never had a hearing in the full committee. This simply did not happen.

And where the filibuster occurred, I have no earthly idea. But I do know that the minority side has chosen not to introduce the President's bill this year, for some reason unknown to me. Now, the President does not have any bill that is before the House of Representatives, and I feel that the President should, because the President did advance this debate 2 years ago in his campaign. In fact, last summer in Florida the President asked me if I thought we could get welfare done last year, and I said, "Only if you tell the people on the Committee on Ways and Means that that is exactly what you want."

But instead, all we found was that the whole process was stonewalled. We never got a bill to the full committee. We never got a bill out of the subcommittee, and we never got a bill to the floor. Nothing happened. Nothing happened the year before, the year before, the year before, the year before. For the last 40 years, nothing has happened. The Democrats have blocked and blocked and blocked anything to be done to change welfare as we know it today, to genuinely reform welfare.

Now, we have heard speakers come down. One speaker compared the Republican bill to the Holocaust. Read the bill. You want to know where the work provision is? It starts on about 23 and goes on. You want to know where it is in the Deal bill? The Deal bill says if you are looking for a job, you have to get cash benefits. You know, there are some States that will require work in the first 2 years. You talk about State flexibility. The Deal bill will destroy that.

Massachusetts has a plan where they try to put people to work during the first 2 years. I think Michigan either does or is working on such a plan, and the States should have that flexibility. The Deal bill said, huh uh, huh uh, you cannot do that, you cannot require them as long as they are looking for a job. That is making out a resume, that you have to give them their benefits.

These are just some of the things that have been misstated.

Talk about mean to children, this bill has a 40-some-percent increase in the funding, a 40-percent-something increase in the funding, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] said something about well, what about inflation. Forty percent? My goodness, that is over 5 years. That is way above the level of inflation, the anticipation of inflation.

I would ask the committee, read the bills. Do not listen to just the rhetoric, because the rhetoric is just simply

wrong. Support the Responsibility Act. Support the Republican bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time which is dedicated to the Committee on Ways and Means has expired.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 45 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] will be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, today we begin debate over one of the most important issues that will face this Congress, the debate over the future of the welfare system—or what might better be called our country's "despair" system. For although the current welfare system was built, I believe, on compassionate intentions, it has in fact helped to create a system of despair for far too many people. It has become a system that fosters dependence on Government and rewards behaviors destructive to individuals, to families, and to our society. We must change if we are to move from a system of despair to one of hope. A former chairman on several occasions said "Bill, these programs are not working the way we intended." To change we must first make the admission they are not working.

A survey of the public conducted last year showed that 71 percent of the public believe that the current welfare system "does more harm than good." An overwhelming majority of the public believes the system could be improved or has some aspects that need to be fixed. The public understands, and with good reason, that a system for which it is paying billions of dollars each year actually does more harm than good. That is not a matter of "not getting your money's worth." That is paying for the wrong thing.

And when we are talking about the welfare system, then "paying for the wrong thing" is promoting tragedy for people. Those of us who talk about changing the system are accused of being uncaring, of lacking compassion. But what is caring, what is compassionate about a system that fails to demand personal responsibility? And how is it that a "caring" system is by definition one run by "one size fits all" regulations and programs issued by distant bureaucrats in Washington?

I said at the very first hearing which the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities held on welfare reform this year, I do not believe that there will be any quick fixes or easy answers, but neither can we nor should we continue down the same path of simply adding programs and spending more money. We need to change the direction. Today's welfare system destroys families and the work ethic and traps people in a cycle of Government dependency. We need to replace a failed system of despair with reforms based on the dignity of work and the strength

of families, that move solutions closer to home and offer hope for the future.

During most of the past 30 years, the answer to every problem and the meaning of every reform provided by Congress had been to create another Federal program. Today we have literally hundreds of Federal programs intended to "help" people of limited incomes. Of course, each one requires separate regulations, separate applications, separate eligibility rules, separate reporting. Each one requires additional personnel—in Washington, at the State level, and by the people actually providing the services—to administer the program, to check the paperwork, to write and interpret the regulations. There are good intentions behind these programs, but much of the good intentions is lost in the maze of red tape and one-size-fits-all regulations. That is part of what we are trying to change in H.R. 4.

Mr. Chairman, title III of H.R. 4 contains most of the legislation reported by the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. Title III consolidates programs in three areas: child care, school based nutrition programs and family nutrition programs.

With regard to child care, the bill consolidates the Federal Child Care Programs into the existing child care development block grant. The present system of separate entitlement programs based upon the parent is on AFDC, has just left AFDC, or is determined to be at-risk of going on AFDC, has resulted in an administrative nightmare for states and administrators, and a maze of child care programs and eligibility rules for parents and children. Among others, the National Governors Association has urged the Congress to consolidate the Child Care Programs into the child care development block grant, and we have done so in H.R. 4.

Under H.R. 4 the child care development block grant would be funded at the level that the four major child care programs received in fiscal year 1994. However, the bill increases by about \$200 million the money available for actual child care services, by eliminating mandatory State planning set asides and limiting administrative costs.

The school based nutrition block grant will allow States to create a single school food program for their schools, and allow schools to operate food programs under a single contract with the State. The school based nutrition block grant would be increased by more than 4 percent per year, and the school lunch portion would be increased by exactly 4.5 percent per year.

We have heard a lot of false information from the other side over the past few weeks about the School Lunch Program, and I'm afraid we will hear some more during this debate. Let me simply say it as clearly as I can: H.R. 4 does not eliminate the School Lunch Program. H.R. 4 does not cut spending on the School Lunch Program. It in-

creases spending by 4.5 percent per year.

Every State and every area receives more money in 1996 than they get in 1995. Every State but five receive more money under our program in 1996 than they do under the existing program.

Let me give you some indications here. California gets \$5 million more. I just pick certain States, of course. Michigan gets \$3 million more. Missouri gets \$2 million more. Indiana gets \$2 million more. Montana, sparsely populated, gets \$650,000 more. New Jersey gets \$2 million more. New York gets \$5 million more. Ohio gets \$2 million more. Rhode Island gets \$250,000 more. Texas \$2 million more, Illinois, \$2.5 million more. That is more than they would receive if the existing program were in effect in 1996. So every State gets more than they got in 1995, but the States I am mentioning, in most of the States, receive more than they would under the existing program. It is also above, well above, President Clinton's budget. I want to take a moment to point that out on this chart. When the President makes a show of going out and having lunch with some school kids, and says that somebody is trying to cut the School Lunch Program, well maybe he needs to check his own budget. H.R. 4 funds the School Lunch Program above the President's own budget.

Mr. Chairman I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

(Mr. CLAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

We must reject the cynicism, the greed and the brutality that inspired it, that permeates it, that drives it.

No one would argue that the current welfare system does not need reform. However, in reforming the system, our actions must reflect our sense of fairness and our concern for those who, through no fault of their own, need Government assistance.

The process for consideration of this bill in committee was deeply flawed. After three hurriedly called hearings with limited participation by expert witnesses, the committee marked up its bill just one day after it was introduced. No subcommittee markup was ever held.

In their haste to carry out this part of the Contract With America within the first 100 days, the majority insults this great institution. In their haste to shred 60 years of social safety nets, the majority places millions of children and their mothers at risk.

This bill is not about welfare reform. It is a giant money laundering scheme designed to write blank checks to governors while imposing no standards or accountability. Block grants constitute a political conduit for transferring Federal dollars to curry favor with State executives.

The Republican welfare reform proposal promotes an extremist agenda that does little to ensure meaningful jobs at livable wages for those on welfare. An agenda that abdicates the Federal responsibility to protect poor children from the ravages of hunger and homelessness. An agenda that prescribes a reduced Federal role against abuse, neglect, and abandonment.

At a time when studies tell us that more and better child care is critically needed, this bill would cut resources for child care programs already seriously underfunded. It would allow governors to transfer already precious child care funds to other programs.

Mr. Chairman, there is no guarantee that the Appropriations Committee will fully fund the child care block grant. The appropriators are already decimating domestic programs to finance tax cuts for the rich.

Mr. Chairman, the nutrition provisions in this bill violate all sense of human decency. The Republican assault on the school lunch and breakfast programs, which successfully promote the health and educational performance of more than 25 million children, is frightening.

The Republican proposal to eliminate WIC and allow the State to develop WIC-type programs is an appalling gamble with the lives of the 7 million women, infants, and children served by the program.

The WIC Program is one of the most effective national social programs ever instituted. WIC has reduced the rate of very-low birth weight infants by almost 50 percent and has nearly eradicated iron-deficiency anemia among participants. WIC participation greatly decreases the incidence of premature births. WIC also saves money for the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the Contract with America should have made it illegal to utter the words welfare and reform in the same sentence. In most cases, politicians who use the phrase neither believe in the fundamental concept of welfare nor the meaning of reform. What is happening in the name of welfare reform borders on criminality.

Welfare dependency can only be reduced by providing education, training, adequate child care services, and most importantly, by providing stable jobs that pay a living wage.

Mr. Chairman, today's minimum wage is not a living wage. Later in the proceedings, I will offer an amendment to increase the minimum wage to \$5.15 an hour. My amendment will restore the purchasing power of millions of working families. If we really want to end welfare as we know it, we should keep working families out of poverty by paying an adequate wage.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in recent days our Republican colleagues have admitted that they expect savings from this bill to finance tax cuts for the rich. The goal of welfare reform should be about one thing, and one thing only; and that is to have the most humane

and effective welfare system possible. Let us begin today with an honest debate, not rhetoric. Let us show compassion, not vengeance. Let efficiency be our means, not our end.

This bill is a bad bill and should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

It is, to me, a tremendous opportunity to be able to be here to take part in what I think will prove to be a very historic event in the history of our Nation. For 40 years we have had more and more spending on these programs, and what we have been getting is more poverty, more illegitimacy, and more social problems in our Nation.

Bill Clinton ran on a lot of promises in 1992, and one of them was that he was going to end welfare as we know it, and he did not. It has just continued.

Indeed, in 1993, the Census Bureau reported that poverty in America had reached an all-time high under Bill Clinton. Indeed, at the end of the first year of the Clinton administration there were 39.9 million poor persons, the highest since 1962. The number had been going up ever since Ronald Reagan left office. Indeed, it was only during the Reagan years that those numbers came down.

And now, for the first time in 40 years, the Republican Party is in control of this Congress and implementing policies that will, indeed, attempt to end welfare as we know it.

□ 1830

And the reason why we need to implement these changes, particularly the changes in this particular welfare bill, is because it is more compassionate. Indeed, the American people have been very compassionate and very patient, but they want change and they want real change that will end the cycle of poverty and despair.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. J.C. WATTS], a member of our class, was quoted as saying,

We can no longer measure compassion by how many people are on welfare. We need to measure compassion by how many people are not on welfare, because we have helped them climb the ladder to success.

Today in this Congress we are beginning that change, and I thank the gentleman again.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ].

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, today the majority in this House is ravaging a series of sensible programs that have served well the needs of the Nation. Programs that have assisted many in need, particularly disadvantaged children and mothers at risk, are under attack.

In an effort to score political points with the very popular notion of welfare reform, Republicans have refused to discuss sensible approaches to real reform. Of course we need to reform many areas of the existing welfare system; but there is no need to wage war against current programs that work well, such as school nutrition programs and the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. These two programs have a proven positive track record.

To compound the unnecessary assault on these programs, the majority has lashed out against two constituencies that have no political clout in Washington because they do not vote: that is, poor children and legal immigrants.

Republicans, touting the banner of savings, are slashing programs and directing large amounts of the so called savings not for deficit reduction, but for special tax breaks for wealthy individuals and corporations.

You want savings? You want to reduce the deficit? Then have some courage and take aim at the greatest of all welfare programs—corporate welfare.

Various Washington think tanks, both liberal and conservatives ones, as well as the media have identified billions and billions of dollars in tax giveaways and special provisions for rich corporations and special interests. Why has this Congress opted to protect these interests instead of investing in people, in education, in health, in affordable housing, in decent meals for low income students?

Why are the regular folks in America, our middle class, taking a back seat to the interests of a very select powerful group that defends corporate welfare at all cost?

In my own district, Congress condones giving over \$3 billion per year in special tax breaks to multinationals while at the same time it deprives millions of U.S. citizens from participating in programs that can assist in improving their quality of life. I call this the Reverse Robin Hood policy, whereby the Federal Government takes away from the elderly, the children, the handicapped and the middle class, in order to give to the rich. There are plenty of Federal policies that illustrate this point. Take a look at section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code, look at some agricultural and mining subsidies.

In section 936 you will find a program that has cost taxpayers over \$40 billion in 20 years, the primary beneficiary being foreign and American pharmaceutical firms with hundreds of millions of dollars in annual net profits while low wage working families are denied the earned income tax credit; while children, handicapped and other citizens in need are deprived of adequate medical and hospital care and needy children are denied a first class education.

The President genuinely wants to work with this Congress to end welfare

as we know it. But Republicans insist in targeting just about every conceivable Federal program notwithstanding the merits that they may have. Take aim at corporate welfare and stop blaming the poor and legal immigrant communities for the fiscal mess. We need to balance the budget and everyone needs to share the burden, but with this bill, children, the elderly, the handicapped and middle income families are financing the special tax giveaways for the rich.

Start with corporate welfare, then bring all the other programs to the table, so that Congress can craft, in a bipartisan way, sensible restructuring moves which will prove to be true reforms that will benefit the Nation, not hurt it.

I urge our colleagues to defeat this bill. Put people first! Consider the substitute bill that our colleague from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] has put forth.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, Nearly 30 years ago, President Johnson initiated the war on poverty. Today, after decades of losing the war, we begin Operation Restore Trust—trust in our State and local leaders and communities to care for their own.

H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act, would eliminate many Federal regulations and policies that have hamstrung States and local governments for decades. Under H.R. 4, Washington will not be telling State's what is best for their citizens. The States will get the credit, or the blame, for enacting policies and programs that will take people off welfare, into jobs, and out of dependency.

For the last few weeks we've seen many of the opponents of H.R. 4 go through all kinds of statistical contortions on what H.R. 4 will do to our children and families.

Case in point are the changes we seek to make to the School Lunch Program. Basically, we offer two changes while maintaining the Federal commitment to providing meals for needy children.

First, by maintaining a 4.5-percent annual increase, eliminating Federal paperwork, and better targeting of Federal dollars, H.R. 4 will allow States to feed more children.

Second, we given State and local communities, which know best the needs of their States and towns, the ability to tailor-make programs that can serve the nutritional needs of children.

H.R. 4 would also continue to provide support for the Food Stamp Program. This program, which has been racked with abuse, is significantly reformed while allowing for \$131 billion in additional funding over the next 5 years.

By having the Food Stamp Program as a Federal safety net, people will be

able to supply their families with food and keep their dignity in the process.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot say that H.R. 4 isn't risky. But the risk of maintaining the status quo, by far, greatly jeopardizes our children and our future. H.R. 4 begins the battle of Operation Restore Trust—trust in our States and communities to do what is best.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, for nearly 50 years Congress has shown a bipartisan commitment to alleviate the worst of human suffering in our Nation, especially hunger. Today we begin debating a proposal that would end this commitment.

The Nation's nutrition programs are cost-effective and target the truly needy.

Study after study shows that children who get a school meal perform better academically.

I am puzzled as to why we would want to fix a program that works so well.

The National School Lunch Program came into being for a strong national purpose in 1946. Many recruits failed physical examinations for the draft because they were found to have been malnourished during their formative years.

Republicans claim that they are increasing funding. But everyone recognizes that compared to current law there will be less money for each child who receives a school lunch. The bottom line is either less money for each child or fewer children eating.

Why are we putting this program into a block grant? To save money? To reduce the deficit? No; it appears that the savings will be used to pay for tax cuts for those who are not as needy as our children.

If the motive of this bill is to save money—why does it remove the requirement in the WIC Program for competitive bidding for infant formula?

Most States were not using competitive bidding before Congress required them to do so in 1989. When we enacted this law we found that it saved over \$1 billion a year.

What can the savings be used for? That billion dollars can be used to serve 1½ million more women and children per month in the WIC Program.

It bewilders me, in this time of budget crunching, why we would want to give the three infant formula companies \$1 billion if our purpose is to better serve women and children.

For the richest nation on Earth to deny food to its own children is a shortsighted betrayal of our values and our future. It is also unnecessary.

In the name of our Nation and its children, we call upon reason to prevail in Congress. The 104th Congress should not be remembered as the Congress

that abandoned our Nation's most vulnerable—our children.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are convinced that the welfare system is out of control. As one prominent citizen of New Jersey, a Democrat at that, said to me last week: "No other civilized nation in the world pays young girls to have babies. But that's what our welfare system does."

You know, he is not far from wrong. And that is the perception among many other good, generous, caring people who are deeply concerned about this country.

They worry that we are wasting billions upon billions in hard-earned taxpayer dollars to support a system that promotes unhealthy, unproductive, dysfunctional families that sentence children to a lifetime of economic, social, and emotional deprivation.

In a system like this, it is the children who are the first victims. But the taxpayers are not far behind.

We must act now. We need welfare reform based on the notion of individual responsibility. Reform must restore public assistance to its original purpose: a temporary safety net for those in need—not a permanent way of life for generations of families.

H.R. 4 makes a number of important changes.

First, this plan requires that 50 percent of welfare recipients must be working.

There is no good reason why able-bodied welfare recipients cannot, and should not, be required to work for their benefits.

Second, this bill allows States the flexibility to terminate a family's welfare benefits after 2 years, and it requires States to terminate a family's welfare benefits after 5 years.

It is clear. Some people take advantage of the current welfare program's lax bureaucracy and simply live off welfare—generation after generation—by skillfully gaming the system.

We all saw the article last month in the Boston Globe about four generations of one family—one mother, 17 children, 74 grandchildren, and an unknown number of great-grandchildren—living in Massachusetts on welfare of some kind or another.

Is it any wonder that the American taxpayers are enraged?

Also, H.R. 4 clearly denies welfare benefits to illegal aliens and legal immigrants, thereby limiting welfare eligibility to only citizens of the United States.

While the exclusion for legal aliens has received quite a bit of criticism, I

want to make sure that everyone realizes an often-overlooked, but essential component of our immigration laws—for decades, our immigration laws have required immigrants to stipulate that they will be self-sufficient once they arrive in America, as a condition of their being allowed to immigrate in the first place. Consequently, receiving welfare has been grounds for deportation for these very same immigrants for generations.

H.R. 4 only makes explicit what has been implicit for so long. The United States of America welcomes immigrants of all kinds to our Nation. However, an important prerequisite has always been that immigrants will not become wards of the State, but rather self-supporting members of our society.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee and I support the committee-reported package of welfare reforms.

I am a strong believer in the block grant approach and feel that this is the most effective means for administering the array of services available to those who are eligible. Block granting nutrition program funds will give States the necessary flexibility to target programs which demand the greatest amount of services as a result of increased eligibility and participation.

However, I do have some concerns about certain aspects of this bill's impact on nutrition programs. Members of the committee have heard me say this before and I will say it again: Children will not go hungry and homeless. Not on my watch.

Our committee adopted my amendment prohibiting the States from transferring money from the nutrition block grants unless the State guarantees it has enough money to meet food needs.

But this is not enough.

However, I do have concerns about our responsibility to monitor maintenance of effort by the States and the need to maintain accountability standards. In these respects, I do have some concerns about certain aspects of this bill's impact on nutrition programs.

We must be certain that we are not just writing the States a blank check. We have a fiduciary responsibility to assure the taxpayers that the programs are being honestly administered.

During committee markup, concerns were raised over questions of establishing minimum nutrition standards and allowing for a 22 percent transfer provision. I believe that it is critical for this country to have uniform minimum nutrition standards because children across the country, whether they are participating in school lunch or WIC, should all be provided with foods comparable in nutritional content.

To me, this seems like a practical and straightforward approach—providing equally nutritious meals to all low-income children who are eligible. However, many oppose maintaining minimum nutrition standards established

by the USDA because they believe that keeping such requirements would be a mandate on the States. I find this charge perplexing since there are numerous mandates in this bill already.

I would also argue that, if this is considered a mandate, then it is a necessary one. We all agreed that there should be some set of standards established by the Federal Government, no matter how broadly defined. What do we accomplish by allowing 50 States to devise 50 different sets of nutrition standards? Children participating in the various nutrition programs available should have access to meals that are equal in nutritional value because all children need the same essential nutrients to develop both physically and mentally during the critical years of early childhood.

The amendment I offered which passed and is included in the bill requires the National Academy of Sciences to establish voluntary model nutrition standards for the States to follow is a small step forward in reinstating minimum national nutrition standards. However, I would like to see H.R. 4 go much further and maintain the standards already in place. Indeed, I believe it will not be too far in the future when we will evolve back to updated standards based on the academy research.

The 20-percent transfer provision clause is a second area of concern that I feel needs to be addressed. My fear, both during committee markup and presently, is that, if up to 20 percent of block grant funds can be transferred to other titles in H.R. 4, then certain programs, particularly those under the school-based nutrition block grant and the family nutrition block grant, would not be able to carry out services to those low-income children participating. Moving funds from one program to another is not a solution. Instead, it only creates problems permitting political decisions to take precedence over the nutritional needs of children.

For this reason, I offered an amendment during markup which prohibits the transfer of funds from either of the food assistance block grants unless the appropriate State agency administering this money makes a determination that sufficient amounts will remain available to carry out the services under the two nutrition block grants. While this establishes an important safeguard against depriving children of free and low-cost meals, I believe that we must do more.

Therefore, I submitted to the Rules Committee an amendment to H.R. 4 that prohibits the transfer of funds outside of these nutrition block grants when States experience unemployment above 6 percent.

Those who support the 20-percent transfer provision claim that it gives States additional flexibility during times of recession to address increases/decreases in demand for different programs. However, I would argue that this does not happen. Instead, as I have

already mentioned, a decision to transfer funds only shifts existing problems to new programs, creates entirely new problems, and makes no sense.

During economic downturns, participation in various nutrition programs, such as school lunch and WIC, increases. It is critical to ensure that during such periods, these vital nutrition services continue to be provided both to those who become eligible and to those who already qualify. The argument that not less than 80 percent of the family nutrition block grant funds must be used to carry out WIC services holds no water during times of recession. Therefore, we must make sure that all low-income people participating in the numerous nutrition programs receive healthy and nutritious meals despite fluctuations in the economy.

The second of three amendments I submitted to the Rules Committee also deals with unemployment as it affects changes—in particular, increases—in nutrition program participation. This amendment would establish a trigger to increase a States funding for both the school-based and family nutrition block grants when that State experiences an economic downturn. More specifically, it would allow up to a 1.5 percent increase in funding of both block grants for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2000 to address this problem.

Under the Opportunities Committee bill, now folded into H.R. 4, block grant money under the two aforementioned block grants is distributed quarterly. My amendment says that for every two-tenths of 1 percent that a State's quarterly unemployment level rises above 6 percent, that State will receive an additional 1 percent of the total block grant money that it received for that quarter. And, because of the funding difference between the two food assistance block grants, the additional money is authorized for the family nutrition block grant, and it is appropriated for the school-based nutrition block grant.

Many Governors, including Governor Whitman from New Jersey, have strongly endorsed a trigger-based safety net as a necessary mechanism for ensuring that States can meet participation increases.

Common sense and experience show that the needs for free and low-cost lunches, breakfasts, WIC and other nutrition services increase during times of unemployment. This additional money will help to make sure that States have the ability to administer current levels of service during such a time period while also being able to accommodate those who currently qualify. Moreover, this funding helps to prevent children from losing their eligibility to school meals and reduces the possible reduction in quality, portions, and frequency of meals being served.

Those who argue that we can always vote for supplemental appropriations are ignoring the needs of children and

the added stress to State treasuries. States will end up tapping into their own treasuries and subsequently draining State resources during the many months that it takes Congress to draft, approve, and enact supplemental appropriations bills.

My last area of concern was also brought up during the Opportunities Committee markup, and it deals with the issue of cost containment.

Under current law, States are required to participate in competitive bidding for infant formula provided to WIC-like programs, or some other system of cost containment that yields equal to or greater savings than under competitive bidding. As a result, States achieve considerable savings, which is reliably estimated to be \$1 billion annually, which in turn is used to provide additional services to WIC participants. However, under our block grant proposal, while States are encouraged to continue these systems, they are not required to.

Therefore, my third and final amendment under review by the Rules Committee would require that States implement cost-containment measures for infant formula included in food packages under the family nutrition block grant. In addition, it would require that a State use all savings achieved under this system for the purposes of carrying out services for all programs under this block grant. And, the amendment also has the State report annually on the system it is using as well as how current savings compare to that of the previous fiscal year.

Cost containment is a fair way for infant formula producers to compete for the WIC recipient market which accounts for roughly 40 percent of the entire infant formula market. The objective of this type of cost containment is to provide the maximum savings for the State so that it can in turn use this savings to provide additional WIC services for those who are eligible. Infant formula producers still have free access to 60 percent of the market. If we increase that to 100 percent, then we jeopardize the ability of a State to provide the necessary WIC nutrition services to those who qualify.

It is also important to point out that this amendment would allow a State's cost-containment savings to go toward providing services under the other programs within this block grant: Child & Adult Care Food, Summer Food, and Homeless Children Nutrition. As a result, the State is given the flexibility to use savings where it sees the greatest need.

I support the Opportunities Committee block grant approach, but the program will be greatly enhanced with my amendments. They will make the States accountable for their administration and maintenance of effort. And, most importantly, we will maintain the safety net to assure that in this land of plenty—no children will go hungry.

And finally, I want to conclude my statement with some remarks about the Child Support Enforcement title of H.R. 4.

Let me make clear one unequivocal fact: effective child support enforcement reforms must be an essential component of any true welfare reform plan. In fact, nonsupport of children by their parents is one of the primary reasons so many families end up on the welfare rolls to begin with.

Research conducted by Columbia University and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has found that anywhere between 25 and 40 percent of mothers on public assistance would not be on welfare if they were receiving the child support they are legally and morally entitled to.

It's a national disgrace that our child support enforcement system continues to allow so many parents who can afford to pay for their children's support to shirk these obligations. The so-called enforcement gap—the difference between how much child support could be collected and how much child support is collected—has been estimated at \$34 billion.

Remember, we are addressing the problems of deadbeats who are willfully avoiding their legal obligations under the divorce edicts of their individual States. They are avoiding both their legal and moral obligations.

Failure to pay court-ordered child support is not a victimless crime. The children going without these payments are the first victims. But, the taxpayers who have to pick up the tab for deadbeat parents evading their obligations are the ultimate victims.

Strong, effective child support enforcement is welfare prevention. The single best method to reduce welfare spending is to ensure that custodial parents with children get their child support payments on time, every month.

I've been a leading voice in this debate for 10 years now, having helped draft both the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984 and the Family Support Act of 1988. In addition, I served as a member of the U.S. Commission on Interstate Child Support Enforcement, which issued a comprehensive report, and recommendations for change, of our interstate child support system in August 1992.

I am very pleased to see that the Ways and Means Committee included many of my legislation's provisions in its child support enforcement title. In 1993, I authored legislation, H.R. 1600, that sought to enact the Commission recommendations, and I reintroduced that bill as H.R. 195 on the first day of the 104th Congress earlier this year.

Perhaps the most salient fact we must keep in mind as we seek to improve our child support enforcement system is: Our interstate child support system is only as good as its weakest link. States that have made enforcing and collecting child support payments a priority are penalized by those States which have failed to reciprocate. In

other words, the deadbeat under the existing loopholes can slip over the State line or just across the Delaware River and escape his legal obligations to his kids.

That is precisely what we need—comprehensive Federal reform of our child support system—to ensure that all States come up to the highest common denominator, not sink to the lowest common denominator as has happened all too frequently in the past.

There are, however, two important and effective get tough reforms which I have long endorsed and supported, which the Ways and Means Committee has chosen not to include in its bill. Consequently, I have asked the Rules Committee for permission to offer them as floor amendments to H.R. 4.

The first amendment, which has been cosponsored by Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA of Maryland and Congressman MAC COLLINS of Georgia, requires that States adopt a program that revokes or restricts driver's licenses, professional/occupational licenses, and recreational licenses of deadbeat parents.

The second amendment would require that States enact criminal penalties, of their own design and choosing, for those parents who willfully fail to pay child support.

In both cases, I expect that once deadbeat parents realize exactly how serious we are about ensuring that they pay their child support, the overwhelming majority will do so, rather than lose a driver's license, a professional license, or face the prospect of a jail sentence.

It's funny how, when the sheriff knocks on their front door, how many delinquent parents who previously claimed they had no money, miraculously find some money and begin making child support payments.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I believe that H.R. 4 contains the kind of reforms to our long-broken welfare system that the American people have been expecting. In general, this bill has earned my support, and I look forward to the amendment process where I believe that this important measure will only be improved upon, prior to House passage. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

Mr. MARTINEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic substitute, what they will offer as reform, and in opposition to the bill before us now.

Mr. Chairman, there are none of us, I think this has been said before by several people, that we are all for welfare reform, and we are. But this bill is misnomered. I think it should be called the Lack of Responsibility by the Congress Act. Sure, there are a lot of welfare abuses, and we all know it. But this begins with a society that breeds several generations of welfare recipients. There are a lot of social problems

that contribute to these factors. In no way is this bill addressing any of those problems.

To put people into productive employment I thought was the goal of this bill rather than destructive dependence. But I do not see it in this bill. I am afraid this bill under consideration presently does not achieve any of the things it should try to achieve to eliminate the abuse of welfare.

There are some States doing a tremendous job in this area. Maryland is a good example of cutting out the abuse from the sale of food stamps, et cetera, et cetera, by going to a system with a nonforgery identification card in terms of goods and supplies that families might need.

If you go back to the original reason why we created welfare, it was for the children, not the parents, not the abusive parents. It was to protect the children. It was at the time only for widows because we understood that widows of the men who had died would be terribly into poverty because the times were tough. That was back during the Depression. There are a lot of us here who are recipients of the programs that were established then, and we did not turn out so bad. But there are a lot of other factors in our society that exist today which did not exist then that we have to deal with. The fact is that right now conditions are very much like the Depression-type conditions with regard to the availability of work in many areas and neighborhoods. That is something that we have to realize if we are going to focus on making sure that we take care of the children.

This misnamed bill, as I have said, does not contain, as far as I am concerned, a job creation in it, which is terribly important if we are going to take these people off welfare and put them to work. It does not contain any provisions that make sure that the people we put here, especially in a single-parent home where the mother is the single parent and that parent needs child care for these children, where they can leave them at home, where they can be relatively sure these children are going to be safe.

You know, the bill as it is constructed, they do away with the child protections that are in the law now. They say they do this by a provision in the bill that says it will allow the States to certify.

□ 1845

Let me tell my colleagues what is wrong with that. The States will only be certifying those that are licensed. Over 40 percent of the people that provide day care are not licensed, and so that leaves a whole group of people.

There are so many things that, as we get into the rest of the bill, we will debate, but I really want to tell my colleagues this, to those on the other side, those of my colleagues who have, I think, no less compassion than those of us on this side. I wish they really

would rethink what they are doing here because together we can form a welfare reform package that deals with the abuses that are out there and make sure that we provide opportunities to succeed to people that are on welfare. That is what happened during the Depression, and that is why a lot of us that are of the Depression age are here today in this House, because there were programs that did in a bipartisan way address the societal problems that we have.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the American people widely support maintaining a strong social service system which provides for children, the handicapped, the elderly and those who truly cannot find employment. At the same time, Americans have come to believe that the system now in place, not only fails to foster self-reliance, but may actually promote out-of-wedlock births.

While we must maintain a compassionate social safety net, I am convinced that we can do a better job of instilling self-reliance and discouraging irresponsible behavior within our welfare system.

H.R. 4 offers the first comprehensive package of welfare reform measures in nearly half a century. Its fundamental tenets are: (1) those welfare recipients who are able-bodied must work in exchange for benefits; (2) programs must be designed to discourage—not facilitate out-of-wedlock births; and (3) the States, which already operate their own welfare programs, will receive blocks of Federal money to provide additional social services within Federal guidelines.

The media has done a less than complete job of informing the general public about the nutrition and child care portions of H.R. 4. It is time that they know all of the facts.

First, we are not reducing funds for school lunch. The truth is this measure increases funding for school lunch by \$1.1 billion over 5 years.

Second, we are not reducing funds for women, infants, and children. The truth is the bill increases WIC funding by \$776 million over 5 years.

Third, we are not reducing funds for child care. The truth is the bill makes \$200 million more available for direct child care services.

I care about the future of our Nation's children. However, if the Federal Government continues to add hundreds of billions of dollars to the national debt each year, our children won't have a future. Establishing flexible, State-based programs that promote personal responsibility and self-reliance is a necessary step toward developing a sound fiscal policy.

As a former social worker and the father of four, I know the importance of ensuring the safety and health of all children. H.R. 4 offers compassionate, fiscally sound solutions which allow us

to effectively help those in greatest need. As a former State Legislator, I am confident that the States and localities can effectively administer welfare programs without the Federal Government micro-managing their efforts.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my ranking member for yielding me this time.

As the only Member of Congress who has actually been a single, working mother on welfare, my ideas about welfare do not come from theory or books. I know it, I lived it.

Make no mistake, I know the welfare system is broken. It does not work for recipients or for taxpayers, and it needs fundamental change.

But I also know that H.R. 4 will gut the welfare system and shred the safety net that enabled my family to get back on our feet 27 years ago.

I will never forget what it was like to lie awake at night worried that one of my children would get sick, or trying to decide what was more important: new shoes for my children or next week's groceries.

Even though I was working the entire time I was on AFDC, I needed welfare in order to provide my family with health care, child care and the food we needed in order to survive. So my colleagues see I know about the importance of a safety net, and I also know about the importance of work.

That is why, as cochair of the House Democratic Task Force on Welfare Reform, I can tell my colleagues that the Democrats are committed to getting families off welfare and into work. We do this by helping them with education, with training, by providing the child care they need so that they can go to work.

Mr. Chairman, the choice comes down to this. We could punish poor families by voting for H.R. 4, or we can invest in our children and their families so they can lead strong, productive lives. I beg my colleagues to vote against H.R. 4 that would put people on the streets and vote for putting people to work.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK].

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, this is the most important week of the 104th Congress. It is more important to the future of America than all the weeks we will spend on term limits, the line item veto, and the balanced budget. This week we decide if we will continue down the morally bankrupt path the liberal/left has led millions of Americans or will we blaze a new path for hope, responsibility, and freedom.

This debate is also about two visions. The first is offered by the same people who created the welfare nightmare. Their view of the world begins and ends with big government. In their world, government regulates and dominates every walk of life, it replaces the fam-

ily, the church and the neighborhood. They promise you happiness in exchange for a check and the loss of your liberty. The second view—our view—begins and ends with the individual. Our view of society is one in which people have the right and the opportunity to work, invest, and raise their children as they see fit. We have faith in the American spirit; the liberal Democrats have faith in Washington, DC.

I have had enough of the Democrats' big lie about welfare reform. Day after day they come to the floor and repeat the lie that Republicans are waging war on children. It is offensive because it comes from those who have trapped millions of American children in a never ending cycle of despair and dependence. Who are they to lecture to anyone about taking care of our children after they spent decades destroying the American dream for the poor.

Mr. Chairman, for the last thirty years we watched them create a national tragedy. Since 1965 we spent \$5 trillion on welfare. What do we have to show for it; disintegrating families, children having children, burned out cities, a thirty percent illegitimacy rate, and three generations of Americans who do nothing but wait at home for the next government check.

Bill Clinton promised to "end welfare as we know it." What happened? His first "reform" expanded welfare spending by \$110 billion and gutted what was left of workfare. It was business as usual; more government, more taxes, more bureaucrats. But, the American people said, "enough is enough." They understood that the liberal/left's "reform" is to spend more of other peoples' money. They know the left is happy with the "poverty" industry and those churning out more of the perverse regulations and programs which have turned so many of our people into a mass of "favor seekers."

Mr. Chairman, we came to Washington to put people to work and get government's hands out of the peoples' pockets. Let me tell you where we will be if we do not stop the runaway welfare train. Today federal welfare spending stands at \$387 billion, by 2000 we will spend \$537 billion on welfare entitlements. The madness has to stop.

Our bill eliminates the federal middleman and cuts the heart out of the Washington bureaucracy. It says the real innovators are in the states and the counties.

Mr. Chairman, the best welfare program is a job. By cutting government, taxes, regulations, and bureaucrats we can create a new era of opportunity that will make it easier for poor Americans to get back on their feet and share America's promise. Mr. Clinton is right about one thing, it really is past time to end welfare as we know it. We had better get on with it because time is running out.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to the last speaker, and I have to agree that the debate this week over welfare reform does come down to one thing, the well-being of the American family. But I would just simply have to disagree that this is not about replacing the American family. We have known for a long time that parents who finished school and who work at real and meaningful jobs are more likely to have kids who do well in school themselves and who go on to become productive citizens and raise families that are strong in their own right.

Families that function well must have access to a network of affordable support services to help them balance the demands of work and parenting. That is probably truer of families and young people today than it has ever been before. For many parents, the lack of affordable, safe child care prevents them from pursuing additional education or taking a worthwhile job; that very pathway toward solving the problem, nurturing the family, is cut off.

Now, we hear that we want to cut federal funding for child care by 20% over 5 years, providing no provision for additional funding when demand increases during difficult economic times.

We know that too many children are receiving inadequate care while their parents work, and yet this bill eliminates current health and safety standards for child care. It eliminates the requirement that states use funds to improve the quality of child care.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot have it both ways.

If we want people to move from dependence on welfare to long-term, gainful employment, we have to provide the options that make that possible.

There is nothing more important than making sure that children are in safe and healthy settings while their parents work.

We would not want anything less for our own children. We should provide nothing less for all children.

So, I would urge my colleagues to keep this in mind as they vote against H.R. 4 in its current form.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

(Mr. GUNDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman and Members, I think it is important we understand exactly what this debate has become all about.

This debate is about whether my colleagues want to defend the Washington bureaucracy or whether they want to be advocates of real reform and change. It used to be that we were all for a bipartisan commitment to children, but now our defense of the bureaucracy has taken precedence over that. I do not know of any area wherein child nutri-

tion is part of the school lunch debate which has been more intentionally misrepresented and where children have been used as pawns for political purposes than they have in this particular area.

Let me give my colleagues some facts:

For all of those who say that the school lunch program is a wonderful program without any problems I would point out that according to the General Accounting Office in the last 4 years that they have kept records, over 302 schools have developed out of the Federal school lunch program, and their No. 1 reason for doing so was the rules, regulations and paperwork required by Washington. Second, I would point out that 46 percent of all non-poor or full-priced students voluntarily choose not to participate in America's school lunch programs today. Finally as a part of the administration's attempt last year to increase the regulations on the school lunch program through their nutrient standards, even Washington, even USDA in their budget request, say they will have to ask for at least 25 million plus to assist schools in meeting the computer requirement of this particular provision just in fiscal year 1996.

So, we have come forth with a proposal for change, a proposal that increases funding, that increases flexibility and that decreases Federal rules, regulations and paperwork. Our proposal recognizes that there is a need for increased funding. So we provide a 4.5-percent increase through fiscal year 2000.

□ 1900

We cap State administrative expenses each year at 2 percent, so 98 percent of that money goes not to States to balance their State budgets, but right to that local school to provide school nutrition. And we eliminate the Federal bureaucracy at a projection of over \$300 million in savings over the next 5 years.

In addition to that, second, we provide flexibility at the State and local levels, so they can take our resources and combine them with their own State innovation and create something new and different, a creative and interesting and appetizing and appealing school lunch program.

Third, we do establish minimum Federal safeguards. We establish voluntary national nutrition guidelines available for every State established by the National Academy of Science in concert with the school dieticians.

Second, as I said earlier, we require that 98 percent of that money go to the schools and 80 percent of that money go to the low-income students.

Now, there is something that has been missing in this discussion. I would like to challenge my Democratic friends, if they believe that in an era of deficit reduction we ought to continue providing the 11.3 million students, the sons and daughters of the bankers and rich people in this country, whether we

ought to provide them with a school subsidy for every meal they take at a cost to the Federal Government of \$556 million a year. There is not a Member in this Congress who believes that that \$556 million would survive our efforts to balance the budget, and there is not a person who understands the school lunch program who knows that if you eliminate that \$556 million, that you can continue the school nutrition programs or the school lunch program as it exists today.

So there has to be reform. We are the leaders in advocating that reform. But we are not cutting school lunch by \$556 million. What we are doing is increasing it 4.5 percent for every year for the next 5 years.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation that we will be debating this week in the House that will be offered to us by our Republican colleagues is the most comprehensive and the most focused assault on poor children in this country that we have witnessed in the past 30 years. It is not that the press has got it wrong, it is that the press has started to explain it to the American people, and as the American people have started to understand it and started to see its components, they are starting to reject it. Because, while all of us agree about welfare reform, and every Member has said that on the floor and clearly the public agrees with welfare reform, the public is starting to ask what is it about welfare reform that requires you to take severely disabled children who suffer from cerebral palsy and other disabling diseases, what is it that requires you to take them off of the rolls so that their parents, many of whom are single parents, who are struggling to work and to keep their children at home and out of an institution, what is it about welfare reform that requires you to abandon these children?

What is it about welfare reform that requires you to repeal the child welfare protection for abused children, who need protective foster care so that they can be rescued from families that are dysfunctional and disabled in terms of their ability to take care, and many times lash out and injure these children and in some circumstances kill these children? What is it about welfare reform that required the Republicans to do that?

What is it about welfare reform that required the Republicans to rip away from working poor parents who have struggled to get off of welfare but now need child care to stay off of welfare so they can contribute to the well-being of their family, and with a little bit of

assistance and child care and maybe some food stamps lighten the load on the Government and retain their dignity? What is it about welfare reform that told the Republicans to rip that away from those working parents?

What is it about welfare reform that asks them to rip away \$7 billion from the child nutrition programs; in our child care programs; in our school lunch programs; in our women, infants and children's programs? I appreciate that they say that all of these programs are there, but none of them are mandated. None of them are provided to these children who need these programs, who are enabled to have these programs, because of circumstances beyond these children's control.

What is it about welfare reform that says that if a child happens to live in a State that suffers from an economic downturn, that they may not get their school lunch because there will be no entitlement for that child, a child who finds himself in a family that is now, because of an economic downturn, unemployed, and yet the family seeks to hold itself together?

What is it about welfare reform that demanded these kinds of harsh actions? What is it about welfare reform that no longer provides an entitlement to a pregnant woman at nutritional risk to protect her pregnancy for the healthy birth of her newborn infant and to care for that infant when they have been medically certified at nutritional risk and the likelihood of giving birth to a low-birth-weight baby, babies that have a 30 or 40 percent greater frequency of coming back and needing help later with special education, with remedial education, because of the brain development they suffered? What is it about welfare reform that demanded that?

You talk about people who spend generations on welfare, and yet you are creating the very children who are going to be candidates for welfare because of your inhumanity, because of your callous nature, and because of the war you wage on the poor children of this Nation.

What is it about welfare reform that requires you to treat the children, to punish the child of a young woman who has a child out of wedlock under the age of 18, to punish that child and to rip away the resources? Sixty percent of all of the pregnancies in this country, no matter what your class, your status, no matter what your financial well-being, 60 percent of all of the pregnancies in this country are unintended. Half of them are resolved by abortion. Half of them are resolved by abortion. So what do we do? We tell individuals if you have an unintended pregnancy, we are going to make your life more desperate, more complicated, more hostile to bringing that child into this world.

That is not welfare reform, that is a war on America's children, on the poorest of America's children.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that was a very impassioned speech that we heard, but one thing needs to be kept in mind when we hear these kinds of comments that all of the terrible problems that this gentleman spoke of have actually increased over the past 30 years with all of these programs that we have seen emanating from Washington. They have not decreased. What we are trying to do here with our welfare reform program, Mr. Chairman, is reinvigorate the family, reinvigorate personal responsibility, do something about the terrible problem of illegitimacy.

I as a physician worked in inner-city obstetrics clinics and I saw 15-year-olds coming into the clinic pregnant. I would ask them why they are doing this? And they would tell me they want to get out of their unit, they want to get out from under their mother, they want to get their own place in the project, and they want to get their own welfare check.

This system that has been created over the past 30 years is broken. We need to strengthen families. We need to deal with this problem of illegitimacy.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, there is almost 100 percent agreement that welfare as we know it should be reformed. We all want to reform welfare, make the necessary adjustments to allow it to accomplish what it is supposed to accomplish in terms of helping victims.

We help victims of earthquakes, we help victims of floods, we help victims of hurricanes. We should help victims of a mismanaged economy which produces a situation where there are no jobs for men and families as a result are forced to go on welfare.

All big government programs should be reviewed occasionally. We should certainly look at all programs and look at ways to reform them. We should try to reform programs like the farmers home loan mortgages, which were so badly repaid that the Department of Agriculture decided to just forgive \$11.5 billion in loans over a 5-year period. We gave away \$11.5 billion in loans for the farm welfare program.

We also have welfare for electric power users out in the West and Midwest, where they are using Federal power at within half the rate that we have to pay in the big cities. So that is a welfare giveaway we ought to take a look at and see if we can reform it. We have enormous amounts of welfare for the farmers, and we ought to take a look at that. We are spoiling America's farmers by smothering them with socialism, and we ought to take a look at rich farmers as well as poor farmers receiving welfare.

Aid for dependent children is a welfare program for poor children that costs \$16 billion. Aid to rich farmers through the farm price subsidy program is not means tested. Rich farmers can get that as well as poor, and there are very few poor farmers left. Less than 2 percent of the American population lives on farms, so most of the \$16 billion goes to the welfare program for farmers just as \$16 billion goes to needy children.

That \$16 billion that goes to farmers, we need to look at how to reform that. We need to be serious about that. We should not demonize poor children and poor families suffering as a result of economic dislocations that are perpetrated by people making decisions far beyond their control. Welfare for farmers is not means tested. Millions receive government checks.

Two recent articles, one in the Washington Post and one in the New York Times, said that city dwellers, they listed the names of people who are city dwellers who never set foot on a farm, who are receiving welfare farm checks. So I hope we are going to reform that as well, because in order to make the budget balance and in order to do things that need to be done, we need to reform that.

We need to go back and take a hard look at the savings and loans debacle and the unfortunate steps we took there which did not reform that system. Two hundred billion dollars of the taxpayers' money went down the drain as a result of our not paying attention to reform. Reform is very much needed.

The Republican welfare reform program, unfortunately, shows contempt for work. At every level, it refuses to deal with job training, it refuses to make some kind of pledge to provide work for people, it refuses to deal with minimum wages that are necessary in order for people to get off welfare, to make enough money to live on. They have a great contempt for work. It is a big lie that they are interested in having people get off welfare and go to work. They have abandoned the goal of work.

It is the Democrats who now carry the goal of work, as we did in 1988. This is not the first time we have tried to make adjustments to the welfare program. In 1988 we attempted to make an adjustment in terms of job training and jobs for people on welfare.

The Republican welfare program swindles poor children through the block grant mechanism. It swindles poor children in two ways. When you take away the entitlement for aid to dependent children, it means you are swindling them, because they do not have a right if they are poor, they do not have the Federal Government standing behind them. They do not have the power of the Federal Treasury, which guarantees that no matter how bad the economic conditions may be and how many people may be forced on welfare the money will be made available to meet their needs. They are

swindling poor children through the school lunch program. You are taking away an entitlement, so as the numbers increase, we expect 20,000 more youngsters to enroll in New York City schools next year. Enrollment is skyrocketing. Just enrollment alone produces a greater need, so that the block grant will not take care of that increasing need by enrollment.

But when economic conditions get worse, the number of people goes up who are eligible. Block grants place the poor at the mercy of State and local governments, and the history of State and local governments is they have been very mean-spirited and very cruel and some of the worst and most corrupt government in the country has been at State and local government levels. We are not helping people by placing them at the mercy of State and local governments. School lunches were created in the first place because State and local governments refused their needs.

Mr. Chairman, now we are saying to the children of America, Children of America, there is a fiscal crunch; this great Nation now needs your lunch.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to respond to some of the remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], who talked about the inhumane and callous nature of those of us on this side of the aisle. I have to tell you I take a little bit of umbrage at that.

I am a former child welfare worker. I have spent a number of years of my life in the homes of some of the most abused and neglected children in my community. I met my wife while she was a child protective worker there and she is still a social worker. I am the founder of the Pennsylvania Children's Coalition, a caucus that we formed in the Pennsylvania legislature, and I have been a child advocate for 20 years.

□ 1915

When I was a social worker trying to spend all of my time protecting children, I had to take away from my time at least a day and a half each week to fill out the Federal forms so the bean counters in the bureaucracy in Washington could account for my time. I was not able during that time to go out and protect the children in my community.

What we are doing is simply taking this program of child protective services, giving it to the States who have been operating it for years, increasing the funding from \$4.4 billion to \$5.6 billion over the next 5 years. And I will tell you from my personal experience, that is a smart and that is a compassionate thing to do.

The gentleman also made reference to the notion of punishing teenage girls who have babies. What punishes teenage girls who have babies who are 14

and 15 years of age is to say to them, you and your little baby live in a tenement somewhere. We will send you this meager allowance and pretend that you can survive, and we know that they do not survive and we know that they are the most likely young people to abuse their own children. And what we are simply trying to say is, you do not become an adult by having a baby. If you are 14 or you are 15 and you are 16 and you have a baby, you still need more than ever the care of responsible adults, and we want to make sure that those teenage girls and their babies are cared for in proper settings where there are rules and there are limits and there is safety and they can be taught to raise their children properly and help to become successful as adults.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refute what was just said by the previous speaker. I think he ought to know, even though he worked in this kind of a position, that most of the teenage pregnancies under 15 years of age take place in the home where that kid comes from. It is a violation of that kid's personal self-esteem.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding time to me.

I am not a member of a committee which has had under consideration this welfare reform bill so, when I got the bill finally on Friday of last week and it was finalized, I went rushing through that bill, looked and spent an awful lot of time reviewing the provisions of that bill. And two things jumped out at me.

No. 1, I had heard my Republican colleagues talk about how they were going to get people off the public dole and make sure they went to work. And I looked and I looked and I looked, and I did not find anything in this bill that would provide jobs for people who want to work at the end of their welfare stay or any time during their welfare stay. So that is the first bogus promise that I found.

No. 2, I went looking and I found that this bill punishes children for the conduct of their parents. If your parent is poor, the children get punished. If the parent has a child out of wedlock, the child gets punished. No Federal benefits for children or mothers under age 18, if they are unwed.

If the parent is on welfare, has another child, the child gets punished. No benefits for that child because he or she was born to a mother who was on welfare.

If the parent will not work, the child gets punished. After 2 years, whether they can find work or want work or will work, if they do not have a job, the child will be punished and the child will be off of welfare. If the parent cannot find a job, who, the child gets pun-

ished. Cut off the parent and the innocent child.

This is a mean, mean, mean bill. We should be nurturing, encouraging, supporting our children, not punishing them for their parents' shortcomings. We should be providing jobs for those who want to work, not calling a cutoff after 2 years welfare reform.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a hoax. It does not provide any jobs. After we heard so much about jobs to get people off the public dole, no jobs. And it is mean spirited and mean to children.

They did not do anything to deserve this. Why would we punish children in the name of welfare reform?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

We have heard all this about whether there is workfare, whether there is not. H.R. 4 eliminates the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Jobs Program. Why? Because it failed. Success in this program is an exception to the rule. Although it is billed as a welfare to work program, after 7 years in operation, Jobs boasts a mere 26,000 recipients in work. The GOP bill in the first year alone will ensure 180,000 welfare recipients will be in work. By 2003, 2.25 million welfare recipients will be working a minimum of 35 hours per week in exchange for the benefit; 90 percent of the American people support this.

The Clinton proposal would not have placed any recipients in work for the first 2 years. At its peak, it would have moved only 394,000 recipients into work.

So it is very, very clear that there are strong work requirements in the bill that will really make the difference.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TANNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I just simply want to find out where in this bill those jobs are. It is not in this bill. You can protest all you want. There is nothing in this bill that provides any jobs. If you can tell me where that is, I would be happy to hear it.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, in this general debate, I am going to remain general, but I know that over the next 2 days there will be a lot of specifics.

I have been in the Congress for 6 years. I have been aware and working on welfare reform for that time, particularly the last 3 years. And I want to thank the Members who have brought this bill to the floor because I think Republicans and Democrats can both agree that the time for welfare reform is now.

I come to speak tonight as one of the original cosponsors of the so-called Nathan Deal bill. I believe that we have the best approach, the Contract With America notwithstanding.

The Deal approach, and our approach, is for a stronger work requirement to bring the dignity of work to the American people. We also, unlike any other proposal, make sure that the value of a welfare dollar is no more than a dollar earned by the sweat of the brow. And our final bottom line in our approach is simply this, if you want something from the Government, then you must be willing to do something for yourself.

Let me talk just a minute generally about the Deal substitute to the Contract With America. All of us any many Members have said tonight and this afternoon that the present welfare system, Federal welfare system is broken. Its evolution has trapped many in broken families and generational dependence with little, if any, hope. That is wrong and we know that.

In the present system all too often the emphasis is on how to receive a welfare check rather than how to return to work. The present system has built in disincentives against two-parent families. It has a powerful incentive, actually, for young unwed motherhood. That is also wrong.

There is nothing in the present system really requiring personal responsibility for one's own future. This is our fault. This is the fault of the American people and the policymakers.

The Federal system is broken. We all know that. We must fix it, in my opinion, here, before we take the Republican approach and block grant it and dump it in the hands of the States and their Governors and their legislatures. That is not the way we need to fulfill our obligation as Federal legislators. We abdicate it by just saying we will block grant it and our hands are clean.

The Nathan Deal bill has a way, I think, to address this problem and give the States the flexibility they need to address the problem. In our bill, the Deal substitute, is work in exchange for assistance with a 2-year time limit. If you are offered a job and do not take it, benefits end. And if you find a job and refuse to accept it, the same is true.

We encourage families by ending the disincentives in the present system to favor marriage. We end the incentives that lead to unwed teenage motherhood by demanding liability from parents and requiring minor mothers to live with a parent or guardian and remain in school. Personal responsibility is demanded in our bill and, unlike any other proposal here, we make benefits from AFDC and food stamps subject to taxable income, ensuring, as I said at the outset, that a welfare dollar is not worth more than a dollar earned by work.

John Kennedy once said,

Our privileges can be no greater than our obligations. The protection of our rights can endure no longer than the performance of our responsibilities.

Let us exercise our responsibilities as Federal legislators and fix the Federal system before we dump it on the

States. I think that is the responsible thing to do. I think the Deal substitute will do that, and I would encourage all of my colleagues, as this debate continues, to give it great consideration, great weight and put aside partisan differences and consider voting for it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. SAM JOHNSON].

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, Democrats are scared of losing 40 years of tight-fisted control over the States. This scares them so much they have embarked on a big lie campaign to defeat a bill that gives the States and individuals the power to create solutions. They still believe Washington knows best.

This example is best illustrated by the Republican proposal to improve the school lunch program. This bill does not cut lunches. It does not cut funding. We increase funding for the program by 4.5 percent per year. Let me repeat, 4.5 percent every year. We are not taking away food from anyone.

Republicans believe in change, and this bill represents it. The Democrats continue to believe in the status quo. This was shown by their event last Sunday. And would you believe they used children as props to help their special interest friends raise money, big labor unions, welfare state bureaucrats and extremist organizations?

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote for the real change. Vote against big government. Vote for this bill.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in strong support of Mr. DEAL's alternative welfare reform proposal. Like most Americans, I feel that the time has come to seriously evaluate the structure of our system and provide constructive solutions to problems within it. Our current system is broken. It must be fixed.

I come before you today in strong support of a plan that transforms our current system into the type of program that it should be—a temporary helping hand for those who need a chance to get back on their feet again. I think we all agree that the focus of welfare reform should be getting people off of the welfare rolls and into work. It has become very obvious, however, that while we may agree on the goal, it is not as easy to agree on how to get there. Having said that, I feel that the welfare reform proposal we have developed provides a centrist approach to intelligently reforming our welfare system, without hurting those who need a helping hand. We must not take the more limited view that welfare reform simply means cutting the cost of welfare. Welfare reform is not simply cutting services and denying benefits in order to find a budgetary fix. Welfare reform involves real people with real

needs, which do not just disappear once the funds are cut. Their needs will continue, the same as before, unless we provide some of the necessary assistance to move them off of welfare into jobs.

The welfare reform proposal that we have developed addresses these basic problems by, first, emphasizing work over welfare. One of the basic tenets of the proposal is the establishment of the Work First Program, which fundamentally reforms the JOBS Program of our current welfare system. The new Work First Program requires participants to begin job activities as soon as they enter the program, providing individuals with the opportunity to immediately begin working their way toward self-sufficiency.

Second, we change the focus of welfare from a seemingly endless hand-out to a temporary hand up. The perception of our welfare system as a permanent way of life has evolved through years of providing benefits to recipients without a sensible plan for moving them off of the welfare system. Therefore, we propose a time limited assistance program that would empower individuals to move from welfare to work. As an incentive to work, the plan would provide transitional assistance to make work pay more than welfare. We extend the transitional medical assistance from 1 year to 2 years so that individuals do not have to fear losing health coverage if they take a job. We also provide child care assistance for moms so that they are able to take a job and begin working toward self-sufficiency. After 2 years in a work program, States also would be allowed to deny AFDC benefits to recipients who do not have jobs.

Third, we propose changing the perception that Government bears all of the responsibility for those in need. Individuals also must accept their share of responsibility in providing for their families. In order to do this, we require recipients to develop an individual plan for self-sufficiency, which would include the tools needed to get the individual off of welfare and into work. We also strengthen child support enforcement and hold the parents of minor mothers and fathers liable for financial support of their children. The proposal allows States to deny increases in AFDC funding to mothers who have additional children while receiving these benefits and requires minor mothers to live with a parent or a responsible adult.

Finally, we realize that a one-size-fits-all approach to welfare reform is impractical, if not impossible, because it does not take into account the wide range of needs and programs that exist. Therefore, we have provided States with the flexibility necessary to develop effective programs that meet their own specific needs. While the Federal Government has a role to play in setting broad guidelines in order to maintain a level playing field, State

flexibility is the key to reforming our welfare system.

In addition, I believe it is very important to include local communities in the process, as well. To that end, we have provided Federal grant assistance to community-based organizations for coordination of services. The one-stop shop idea is already being explored in many communities and many others could streamline services with some additional assistance.

As a participant in the current welfare reform discussion, I have heard many times that we should get rid of fraud and abuse in our welfare system and I agree. As the former chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Department Operations and Nutrition, I have worked tirelessly to correct deficiencies in the Food Stamp Program and I am well aware of the need for continued improvement. That is why I am pleased to say that we have incorporated a very tough food stamp fraud and abuse provision in our proposal. We have also made additional improvements to the current Food Stamp Program while maintaining the basic food safety net for people in need.

Finally, I strongly believe that we should not fund tax cuts with welfare reform, particularly considering the enormous deficit problem we are currently facing. Our substitute, therefore, specifically designates any additional savings from the welfare system for deficit reduction purposes. We are already threatening the future of our children with the unbelievable responsibility of financing our current spending behavior. I cannot justify adding additional responsibility to our children by requiring them to finance a tax cut before we control our deficit.

□ 1930

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], one of the leaders in helping to put this bill together as far as our committee is concerned.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have a book for my colleagues on the other side. I have gone to town hall meetings. They understand the lie about whether we are adding or cutting nutrition programs. That book is called basic mathematics, or the DICK ARMEY syndrome that says "If you add more money the following year than you have this year, that is an add. If you have less, that is a cut."

I have also prepared a book in here and it is called "How to tell the truth." I think our colleagues need to take a look at both of those books.

The real reason for why are we doing welfare reform, Mr. Chairman, why would we tackle this after the other side of the aisle has the rhetoric that they want to reform the system, they want to reform it, and they have done nothing for 40 years but create the system that we are under today.

The current welfare system, Mr. Chairman, is not compassionate. Look at the problems that we have across

the country. Nothing could be more cruel to welfare recipients and children than the system we have today. We as a policy have created that system. That is an effort to change that particular system.

Look at the children's nutrition program. Who are we trying to feed with those programs? We are trying to make sure that our poorest children are fed, but yet we continue the policies that would create those poverty children living in poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for my colleagues, and many of them on the other side in the Black Caucus; the gentleman from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, who walked in Alabama. However, the Members are wrong in this.

When we look at the welfare systems in the communities with Federal housing that persist, with crime-ridden, with drug-ridden, with black children, two out of three, being single parents, and to perpetuate that system, when they talk about cruel and unusual punishment, to foster that kind of a program, Mr. Chairman, is more than comprehension.

The real reason why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the socialists, the Clinton liberals, we have added money in the nutrition programs, but the real reason they are fighting this, and I went to great efforts, and the one thing that we cut is the big Federal bureaucracies. They cannot stand it. That is what they are fighting, over and over and over again.

Mr. Chairman, the system traps recipients in an unending cycle. It hurts those, the children, and those that we are really trying to help. This brings deadbeat dads for responsibility, a system that encourages fathers that have run away from their responsibility to get back together with the family.

The gentleman says there is no creation of jobs. If I can bring a family together by not penalizing the father that comes with that welfare recipient mother and child, and have one of them work, that is better. That is compassionate. What is incompassionate is the current system, where we have disincentives to bring those families together. We have disincentives to break out of the Federal housing programs.

The personal responsibility, illegitimacy, we have to attack it, because it also ties in with child abuse and it ties in with the nutrition programs. We have increased the nutrition programs by 4.5 percent. President Clinton in his first budget increased it by 3.1 percent. In this budget just a few weeks ago, the President stood up here and only allowed for a 3.6-percent increase in the nutrition program. We increased it by 4.5 percent. Why?

There was a movement on our side to cut it, not to zero, but to cut it 5 percent, to actually go in and cut the program. I went to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and said "If you do that, I will resign my chairmanship of the committee," because at

that point we will hurt those nutrition programs.

Let me read what is really wrong with the system: "Cash benefits going for drugs, generations of dependency, children having children, killing children." Nothing could be more cruel to the kids that exists than the welfare systems that we have today.

I look in Chicago, and police found 19 children living in squalor in a cold, dark apartment. Two children in diapers were sharing a bone with the family dog. Why? Because the parents were living on cocaine and drugs.

Child abuse services need to be brought in, and yes, we need to provide services for those kids, but we also need to eliminate the systems in which those people are not held accountable.

Karen Henderson of Bakersfield, CA, was charged for murder after breastfeeding her baby while she was on crack cocaine.

In August 1994, a couple was sentenced to 6 years in prison for neglecting their 4-month-old son. He bled to death after being bitten 100 times by rats because they took the money and stuck it up their noses in cocaine. That was in a Federal housing project, which breeds that kind of contempt.

While an 8-year-old brother screamed in vain for help, 5-year-old Eric Morris was dropped to his death from a 14-story public housing project by two older boys, aged 10 and 11. That is what is cruel, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let us embrace personal responsibility. Let us embrace where we take deadbeat dads. I applaud the President for what he has done in following suit. I embrace you, to take care and make sure that we have the responsibility of parents, so that we can draw less and less for those programs, because we have less people that need it because their economics are better. We can do that by encouraging families and increasing the nutrition program for those children that need it. That is what we have done, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the mandatory work requirements contained in H.R. 4. Consistent with 90 percent American voters, H.R. 4 requires that recipients of welfare work in exchange for their benefits.

Under H.R. 4, every welfare recipients is required to participate in some form of work activity within a minimum of 2 years. After 5 years, recipients face the ultimate work requirement, the end of all cash welfare, period.

In addition, we require States to have a minimum of 50 percent of adults in one-parent welfare families working by the year 2003 and require that 70

percent of two-parent families work by 1998.

Under this bill, with limited exceptions, all work participants must be in real private-sector jobs, paying real wages, and they must work for a minimum of 20 hours per week, rising to 35 hours per week by 2003.

Under the GOP proposal, 2.25 million welfare recipients will be participating in work by the year 2003. In the first year alone, 180,000 recipients will be working. How do other welfare-to-work proposals fare under these guidelines? The current program, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Act, while boasting a 20-percent participation rate, has a mere 26,000 recipients working. The Clinton proposal would have had zero recipients working in the first 2 years, and at its peak would have had just 394,000 participants in a real job. Mr. Chairman I beg the question, who's serious about work?

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I just want to add that work provides more than a wage, it provides a sense of being, increases self-esteem, and provides a role model for the societal value of self-sufficiency, reducing the pattern of dependence which currently is passed from one generation to another.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I just want ask the gentleman, at what wage rate would people get work under this bill? Would they be paid less than minimum wage? Would they go back to slavery?

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation. The issue is, first of all, distorted. The issue is not about the irresponsible mother in America. The issue is what is in the best interests of the child, what is in the best interests of our children in America.

We talk about in 2 years a mother will be off of welfare and will not receive the benefits. First of all, the benefits we send to these so-called mothers is not money for the mother. This money is for the child. The reason we send it to the mother is because the last time I checked, an infant cannot wake up in the morning, grab a check out of a mailbox, and go to the bank and cash it, so that is why we send the money to the mother. It is for the child. It is in the best interests of the child.

Mr. Chairman, we talk about "Two years and you are off." That sounds real good, but who is going to suffer? Children are going to suffer. In 2 years, children are going to be dying of malnutrition in this country, because they will not have milk to drink.

We say they have to work. If they do not work in 2 years, that parent is off.

Why not mandate that the States provide job training? Mothers cannot get up and work in the morning if they do not have day care. If Members will take some time and think about this proposal, they will know that in order for a mother to go to work and learn a skill, she has to have somebody to take care of that baby. We have to talk about what is in the best interests of the children in this country.

Lastly, child nutrition. The gentleman from California said we did not cut money in child nutrition. That is absolutely incorrect. The proposal was 5.2 percent. This proposal is 4.5 percent. Anybody who is not even a mathematical wizard knows that is a cut.

Not only that, under this block grant proposal, 20 percent of the money could be used for other purposes and not child nutrition.

□ 1945

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds, just to say that Louisiana gets \$1.5 million more under our proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the distinguished chairman, for yielding me the time.

I would like really to point out to my colleagues and fellow Americans that this is one of the most consequential debates not only of the first 100 days or even of this Congress but one of the most consequential debates that this House will hold in decades. Very few Americans would disagree that our welfare system no matter how well-intentioned at its inception is a complete failure today. However, there are many people in this town who have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo, and they will argue stridently as we have heard tonight and as we will continue to hear over the next few days, and often misleadingly against our efforts. So it is important that every Member of this Chamber understand the bill that we are bringing to the floor, why it is important, and why defenders of the status quo are wrong.

Toward that end, I want to talk about just some of the myths that have already been suggested regarding our welfare reform efforts and provide a little reality check for each one of those myths.

Myth 1. Your pro-family provisions are cruel to children. Reality. It is the current system that is hurting children by encouraging self-destructive behavior, dependency, and out-of-wedlock births. Our bill does not end assistance to children, only cash assistance. No responsible parent would reward an irresponsible child with cash payment for an apartment. No responsible employer would give workers a raise simply because they have additional children. Taxpayers should not do those things, either.

Another myth. Your bill is weak on work. Reality. Our work requirements

are tough on work. We require that States make cash welfare recipients go to work after 2 years or less at the option of the States. After 5 years, recipients face the ultimate work requirement, the end of all cash welfare.

We require States to have 50 percent of adults in one-parent welfare families today, working by the year 2003. We require States to have 90 percent of two-parent families working by the year 1998. And we define work as real private sector work for pay. States that do not meet these standards lose part of their block grant, and that is tough on work.

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Americans, we are embarked on a tremendous debate on historic significance. We are going to replace a failed system of despair with more compassionate solutions that encourage work and families and offer hope for the future.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, the ranking member of the committee, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering the Personal Responsibility Act and it is an easy bumper sticker name and people will hear for the next few days some of the easy names, that this bill was going to solve out-of-marriage births. I would hope that we have some reality checks on the other side of the aisle, also, because what this bill does, it is a transfer of power to the Governors of the country. This bill allows Governors to deny legal immigrants State-funded assistance. The bill allows governors to remove 20 percent in the 3 block grants for child care, family, and school nutrition. That is where we would see the cuts on the State level. The Governors could do that. Congress should provide a great deal of latitude for State governments, but we also need to make sure that the food actually gets to those children instead of saying, well, we're guaranteeing it to a Governor but we're not guaranteeing it to that child.

I wish to make it clear that that is what we are doing. We are guaranteeing funding to that Governor but not to that child. Welfare reform is requiring for work, requiring transitional assistance, requiring going to job training. We can reform food stamps. Those are all goals that we should have and I think we should have on this side of the aisle but I am on the committee that this bill was considered and we did not have a bipartisan bill. This was laid out and literally rolled over in two days' time. That is why a lot of us are opposing it, because it will cut children's nutrition, because the only guarantee it is to the Governors of the States and not to the children of our country.

The House of Representatives is debating the Personal Responsibility Act.

A bumper sticker name for a bill which will place sweeping powers in the hands of Governors to reform welfare.

What are some of powers that Governors will be given?

The bill before us will allow Governors to deny legal immigrants and State funded assistance based on economic needs.

The bill also allows Governors to move 20 percent of funds from the three block grants for child care, family and school nutrition programs.

Congress should provide a great deal of latitude to State governments to be innovative and imaginative, but Congress must also ensure Federal assistance is used by the people who most need that help.

This bill provides a guarantee to Governors for the funds included in the block grants.

I wish to be very clear on this point: A Governor is guaranteed funding but not a child.

Welfare reform is called for, requiring work requiring transitional assistance, reforming food stamps are all goals which must be obtained but not at the cost of school children, and nutrition.

The fatal flaw in the school breakfast and lunch block grant is it does not guarantee a child a meal but just as important it does not take into affect that foods costs increase along with school population.

Without increasing the funds as a result of food cost inflation and increased population, a local school district will be forced to increase local tax rates to make up the short-fall.

We will hear on one side that funding is increased and on the other side there are cuts.

The simple fact is we are all guessing because this bill has been rushed through the Congress like a runaway train.

Mistakes have been made. At one point 57,000 military children were left out.

We must be diligent in reforming welfare but when we are forced to take up legislation which has been run through with little discussion, mistakes are made.

Earlier, A fellow Texas colleague states that we should not take away someone's dream, and I agree but we should also not take away a helping hand.

Reform is needed, but informed reform is real reform.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 4 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman my ranking member for yielding me time.

I rise today to decry the punitive measures contained in the Republican bill which would desert the most impoverished and youngest citizens in our country during their time of great need.

The drastic changes proposed by the Republican bill would devastate communities in every State by eliminating vital programs as you have heard discussed this afternoon that these communities have relied on for many, many decades.

This shortsighted and intolerant legislation does not put forth the constructive agenda to reform. It is to punish people merely because they are poor.

Although most welfare mothers try hard to support their families and try to find a decent job that pays a living wage, the Republican bill makes no effort to help them. Instead, the Republican bill gives every recipient family a ticking time bomb by putting time limits on the amount of time that they can receive benefits and cutting them off even if they have tried hard and cannot find a job and they do not even provide child care while the woman goes out to hunt for work. This bill turns a cold shoulder also on legal immigrants that have been lawfully admitted into the country by denying them many of the programs, and they came to America in search of opportunity and they are being cut off arbitrarily, in my view unconstitutionally.

There are 9 million children in a total of 14 million people who are receiving welfare benefits today. The Republican bill would arbitrarily cut these children off from cash benefits because of what their parents did or would not do. If their parents are unable to find work, if their mother is teenaged, if they cannot locate their fathers, they would be cut off arbitrarily. It would destroy the frail chances these children would have to survive by relegating them and their families to the status of second-class citizens in this country just because they are poor, because their mothers were teenagers or because they were born out of wedlock.

Republicans say that the answer is that welfare parents must go to work. We agree. I believe that the working potential of welfare recipients is very high. I have studied this issue for years. The average recipient already has 4½ years of work experience when they come on to welfare. They want to work. Their problem is some personal problems have affected their ability to hold down a job. Perhaps someone is ill or they do not have adequate child care. 56 percent come into welfare with a high school diploma or more. Most of the recipients stay on only for 11 months. The problem with the current system is it has not offered a helping hand to the women. If they had the help they probably would have gone off welfare much sooner.

So the help that the Democratic substitutes provide is the help of finding a job, giving them adequate education, and providing the essential child care which cannot be left out of the program. This is what the Republicans do not seem to understand. You cannot simply block-grant money to the States without mandating the essentials, which is education, training and a good child care support program.

What the Republicans have done in their bill is to repeal the jobs program. Yet they say their bill is for work? How can you provide a work ethic or incen-

tive if you do not have a jobs program which can do the training and education with the supportive child care?

The Republicans completely ignore the child care aspects of it. The current law today requires and guarantees that every welfare recipient who finds work must be provided with child care. That has been repealed.

The AFDC families are willing to work, want to work, need the help, and the Democratic substitute is the bill that must pass this Congress.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. Then I will close the debate.

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman again for yielding me the time.

I just wanted to respond since the question of immigrants came up and make clear again, reality check, we are not bashing immigrants, we are giving strength to the longstanding Federal policy that welfare should not be a magnet for immigrants, legal or illegal.

To accomplish this, we do 4 things: We prohibit legal aliens from the big 5 magnet programs, cash welfare, food stamps, Medicaid, title 20, and SSI which has been an especially egregious source of abuse by legal aliens. We make the alien sponsor's affidavit legally binding and enforceable. We apply the existing deeming rule to all Federal means-tested programs so that in these programs the income of an alien sponsor is deemed to be the alien's.

Lastly, we authorize Federal and State authorities for the first time to go after deadbeat sponsors. We are strengthening current immigration policy, not bashing anyone.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is recognized for 5½ minutes.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, at least I am glad to hear as I have heard all evening that everyone now has a welfare reform program. I am also happy to hear that everyone now believes that the system is broken and needs fixing. We have come a long, long way. If nothing else, we have gotten that far.

It was interesting to hear a good friend of mine say, at least on two occasions on the other side this evening, he had this welfare program but they filibustered it to death. I did not know we had such an opportunity. I thought 5 minutes and you object and that is the end of anybody speaking, and I am sure he was talking about the House of Representatives.

What we are trying to do is take these people out of slavery, not put them into slavery. That is where they are at the present time, because we have denied them the opportunity to ever get a piece of the American dream. For 30 or 40 years, the situation keeps getting worse and worse, and we

deny more and more an opportunity for a piece of that American dream. We have to admit the failure, which we are doing this evening on both sides of the aisle, and now do something to change it.

Let me talk just a few minutes about the provisions from our committee. I am sure everyone knows that the Personal Responsibility Act which was part of the contract included a proposal for a single food and nutrition block grant. To that I said, "No way, Jose," which is the same thing that I said in the early 1980's. The leadership then said, and I think using good judgment, "Okay, then you, as the majority members of the committee, come up with your program." And we did.

We have also heard many times this evening how wonderful the program is working when you talk about school lunch and child nutrition. No one has defended it more than I have. But there are problems, folks. It can be a much better program. If you only have 50 percent of the free and reduced-price people who are eligible participating, there is something wrong with the program. And you can look at the statistics and that is exactly what it tell you. If only 46 percent of the paying customers who are eligible are participating in the program, something is wrong with the program.

Secondly, the American school food service people have told us over and over again, the rules and the regulations and the red tape are killing them. They are taking money out of the children's mouths to do all of the paperwork that is required by the Federal Government. So we can change that.

And then there is some fraud, because we encourage some of it the way it is set up, because it is much more advantageous to count as many as you can possibly get away with as free, because the reimbursement is far greater if you do that.

So as I indicated, we are trying to set up programs that will meet the local areas' needs. What might work in Flint, Michigan may not work in Kansas, or in York, Pennsylvania. We have to allow some flexibility so that we can get more people participating in these programs. We know you cannot educate a hungry child. So what is happening to that 50 percent that are not participating? They are probably not doing too well in school. We get reports from parents who say, "We're not going to send that money to school, or sign up for them to participate if they are going to not participate or they're going to throw the food away."

Again, I say over and over again, we positively owe it to the millions that we have enslaved in this welfare system that has been created well-meaningly over a 40-year period, we owe it to those people to have an opportunity, like I have had and everyone in this Congress has had, to get a part of the American dream.

They are not getting it at the present time. We must make change and

change I realize upsets everyone. But change is necessary. It is also inevitable.

I would hope when we come back and begin the amendment process, and there are a couple of amendments that will deal with a couple of issues that I heard mentioned tonight, which I have concerns about, and they will be taken care of in that process, but I hope when we finish, we will no longer go on saying, "Well, the system doesn't work and we ought to do something about it." We will take the bold step to make the necessary changes to free the millions who are now enslaved with the existing system.

□ 2000

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage all to support those changes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

To control debate from the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] will each be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995. We all know the hour is late, but we also know that the debate in regards to welfare reform, if it is a late-burner topic, it is also a front-burner topic in this town, and all throughout the Nation.

Last November, the American public spoke very decisively on wanting change, and welfare reform was a central theme in the election, was a central theme 2 years ago in the President's election. The component in regards to food stamp reform that comes under the jurisdiction of the House Agriculture Committee is in reference to food stamps.

I would inform my colleagues that food stamp spending has increased almost every year since 1979. We are all familiar about the good work that the food stamp program has done in terms of workers who have been unemployed or of families that have had real tragedy.

The food stamp program provides that needed bridge during a time of hardship and when the economy slipped into recession. We must maintain that bridge, and H.R. 4 does just that. It provides a Federal safety net, but it eliminates food stamps as a way of life.

However, I would point out that during the last 15 years the economy has not always been in a recession, and we have had record growth in regards to the economy. But food stamp spending kept increasing.

Now common sense would suggest that food stamp spending should go down when the economy is strong, but that has not been the case. Why? Because our Congress kept expanding the benefits, and the American taxpayer, who really foots the bill for the pro-

gram, has said enough, and that is why welfare reform strikes a chord with the American public.

The food stamp program provides benefits to an average of 27 million citizens in this country, upward of maybe 28 million each month at an annual cost of more than \$25 billion on an annual basis. For the most part, these benefits really go to families in need of help and are used to buy food to feed these families, and there is no question in my mind that the food stamp program helps poor people and those who have temporarily fallen on hard times. However, there is also no question in my mind that it is in need of reform.

Recently, I reviewed a September 22, 1981, subcommittee hearing. Let me repeat that, 1981. And the hearing was on fraud in the food stamp program. I reviewed that 14-year-old record with some degree of concern and dismay.

In both hearings, and we just held a hearing in the Committee on Agriculture as of this year on February 1, and in both hearings the reports were almost identical, the one in 1995 and the one in regards to 1981. There were reference to food stamps as a second currency, food stamps being used to buy guns, drugs and cars. It is discouraging that these events have not changed.

On September 3, 1981, the TV investigators and the news reports talked about the great food stamp scandal. In January of 1995 and again in March of 1995 various news teams did similar stories and picked up on the film, the tape we have from the new Inspector General from the Department of Agriculture. As I said, it is very discouraging.

The good news is we have a very strong fraud provision, anti-fraud provision. It is bipartisan. It is backed by the administration and by the minority and the majority.

However, the situation is much worse today in 1995 than it was in 1981. Abuses in the food stamp program involve selling food stamps at discount grocery stores. They are not grocery stores. It is a sham. They are set up to launder food stamps, even abuse of the Electronic Benefit Transfer system.

Also, the Department of Agriculture reports that for the most recent year \$1.8 billion in food stamps was issued in error, meaning that the eligible families receive too much in food stamps or people who are not eligible receive these benefits. That is \$1.8 billion. That is a combination of errors, some on the part of States that administer the food stamp program, some on the part of the participants receiving food stamps and some, unfortunately, willful and intentional violations of the act. That is \$1.8 billion of taxpayer money lost to fraud and error.

It is also lost to the recipients, the true recipients of the food stamp program. Unfortunately, the food stamp program does not always really deliver the benefits to eligible people, and

those who are eligible do not always use their benefits for food, and so others really participate in this activity including grocery store personnel, middlemen and criminals involved in illicit behavior.

Let me quote from one report. "In September, 1994, the U.S. Justice Department indicted a couple on charges they used their restaurant supply business to illegally acquire and redeem \$3.5 million in food stamps." \$3.5 million, one couple. "Undercover agents say they watched family members carting shopping bags of cash to the banks in \$2,000 bundles of \$20 bills. Once deposited, the money was almost immediately transferred to accounts in Hong Kong," Mr. Chairman, "where it was withdrawn, usually by relatives within 24 hours."

Or another report, "a USDA undercover officer got a taste of how complacent the big-time traffickers can get when he investigated an Orange, NJ, family that used their little store to fence stolen goods and traffic in food stamps. And the undercover officer used the food stamps to buy cars, TV sets, children's toys, cocaine, microwave ovens, and a video camcorder from the family. Then he used the video camera, one to test it, then filmed the roomful of stolen goods and the agreeable family of crooks."

This bad reputation has undermined the public support for the Federal food stamp program and for welfare. It is unfortunate. It is wrong. Polls indicate that half of the American public support cuts in the food stamp program, and I believe this is due to the flagrant abuses that are seen on the street almost any day. We don't want this.

As I indicated before, the food stamp program is a bridge. It is a needed program. It has helped the poor. And so the commitment in regards to the anti-fraud provision is a good one, and it is bipartisan.

After careful deliberation, the Committee on Agriculture determined that the food stamp program for the present should remain a Federal program for the following reasons: First, States will be undergoing a transition to State-designed welfare programs. During this period, the food stamp program will remain the safety net program and able to provide food as a basic need while this transition is taking place. The food stamp program will be reformed, costs will be controlled, and we will ensure that every American in need will have access to food.

Now, given the hearing record, the lack of public support and the dollars involved, the committee could not continue the program without significant reforms. Our five hearings held between the 1st of February and February 14 of this year dictated the course of the changes needed in the food stamp program. The food stamp program is taken off automatic pilot, and control of spending for this program is returned to the Congress.

We are going to hear a lot of rhetoric, have heard a lot of rhetoric. It has been said in the press over and over again and by certain critics of reform that, for goodness sakes, there might be a problem with food stamps down the road because we only allow for a 2 percent increase. Used to be before we had it as an entitlement program and before 1990 when we had a spending cap that the Congress had that responsibility, we would come back every year and determine whether or not additional funds were needed. That is the responsibility of the Congress.

The food stamp deductions are kept at 1995 levels instead of being adjusted automatically. Again, it is off of the automatic pilot for increases in the Consumer Price Index. Food stamp benefits will increase, increase, not a cut, increase, increase up, not down, not a cut, at the rate of 2 percent per year to reflect increases in the cost of food. Food stamp spending will no longer grow out of control.

Oversight from the committee is essential so that reforms are needed or the committee will act. And, yes, if we would have a recession and, yes, if food prices would go up and, yes, if in fact it were needed I am sure the Congress would support a supplemental appropriation.

States are provided the option of harmonizing their new AFDC programs with the food stamp program for those people receiving assistance from both programs. Since 1981, the committee has authorized demonstration projects aimed at simplifying the rules and regs for those receiving assistance from AFDC and food stamps. States have complained, recipients have complained for years about the disparity between AFDC and food stamp rules.

We need one-stop shopping, one-stop service. This bill provides them the opportunity to reconcile these differences. It is now time to provide all States, all recipients with this option.

H.R. 4 contains a tough work program. We have heard a lot about that. Able-bodied persons between the age of 18 and 50, with no dependents, no dependents, will be able to receive food stamps for three months. Eligibility, however, would cease at the end of the 3-month period if they are not working at least 20 hours per week in a regular job.

This rule will not apply to those who are in employment or training programs, such as those approved by a governor of a State. A State may request a waiver of these rules.

Let me repeat that. A State, a governor, may request a waiver of the rules if the unemployment rates are high or if there are a lack of jobs in the area. We have that waiver. We just expect able-bodied people between 18 and 50 years who have no one relying upon them to work at least half time if they want to continue to receive the food stamps. It is essential to begin to restore integrity to the program.

Abuse of the program occurs in three ways: fraudulent receipt of benefits by recipients, street trafficking in food stamps by recipients and trafficking offenses made by retail and wholesale grocers.

H.R. 4 doubles the disqualification periods for food stamp participants who intentionally defraud the program. For the first offense the period is changed to 1 year. For the second offense the disqualification period is changed to 2 years. Food stamp recipients who are convicted of trafficking in food stamps with a value over \$500, they are permanently, permanently disqualified.

Also, H.R. 4 requires States to use the Federal tax refund offset program to collect outstanding overpayments of food stamp benefits. The trafficking by unethical wholesale and retail food stores is a serious problem. Benefits we appropriate for needy families are going to others who are making money illegally from the program. That is wrong.

Therefore, H.R. 4 limits the authorization period for stores and provides the Secretary of Agriculture with other means to ensure that only those stores abiding by the rules are authorized to accept the food stamps.

Finally, H.R. 4 includes a provision that all property used to traffic in food stamps and the proceeds traceable to any property used to traffic in food stamps will be subject to criminal forfeiture. Big step in preventing fraud.

The Electronic Benefit Transfer systems have proven to be helpful in reducing the street trafficking in food stamps and to provide better administration of the program. They have provided law enforcement officers a trail through which they can find and really prosecute. The EBT systems do not end the fraudulent activity, but they are instrumental in curbing the problem.

Additionally, the EBT is a more efficient method to issue food benefits for participants, States, food stores and banks.

For all of these reasons, H.R. 4 has included changes in the law to encourage States to go forward with the EBT systems.

□ 2015

Mr. Chairman, this bill and the contribution of the Committee on Agriculture to the bill, I think, represent a good policy decision. We have kept the Food Stamp Program as a safety net for families in need of food. We have taken the program off of automatic pilot and placed a ceiling on spending. We save approximately \$20 billion over 5 years.

Congress is back in control of spending on food stamps on a periodic basis. If additional funding is needed, as I have said before, Congress will act to reform the program so that it operates within the amount of funding allowed, or it will provide the additional funding as necessary. States are provided with an option to really harmonize

food stamps with the new welfare reform programs, the AFDC programs.

We take steps to restore integrity to the Food Stamp Program by giving law enforcement and the Department of Agriculture additional means to curtail fraud and abuse. We encourage and facilitate the EPT systems. We begin a tough work program so able-bodied people with dependents who are between the ages of 18 and 50 can receive food stamps for a limited amount of time without working.

I think this represents good food stamp policy. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I would like to first express to all of my colleagues the fact that I do not consider this entire legislation in any part welfare reform, although we have a strong section on fraud and abuse. Otherwise, it is merely a reduction in funding over \$21 billion, and it will cause hungry people to no longer be able to attain a nutritionally adequate diet.

I know there is great controversy about the Food Stamp Program in the abuses, in the fraud, but the fact is that the average, or more than 40 percent of the recipient households have income below 50 percent of the poverty guideline and only 20 percent have significant earnings.

The program has always been responsive to the needs, and in this year of our lord, 1995, in the United States of America, the most powerful country in the world, we should not have to admit that there is hunger in the countryside, that there is hunger in the cities. I know that there is great policy debate and disagreement, but the fact that you cannot deny is that there are hungry people. There are children who go to bed hungry at night. That cannot be denied. That cannot be covered by policy. That cannot be covered by saying Democrat or Republican. That is a fact. That is a fact that cannot be denied.

And my concern here this evening is that we go solely on cutting. We should not have to do that, because this committee, and the distinguished chairman has worked on this effort, has reduced by over \$65 billion in the past 12 years, more than our share of responsibility in the budget. Had every committee in this House done what the Committee on Agriculture has done, you would not have to worry about a deficit. You would not have to worry about deficit reduction if everyone had done what we have done.

So our concern here is that each year the size of a household food stamp allotment is adjusted to reflect any changes in the cost of food. This goes back to the old policies for 40 years. We have not had the Food Stamp Program for 40 years, but nonetheless, the old

policies, the old policies took care to see that this was accommodated for.

Under the present bill, it cannot be. It cuts 2 percent annually of increase, but if the food prices go beyond that, then it does not cover. Then you will have a problem, and there are those who would say, well, you can always come back and ask for more.

Under the Budget Act and the atmosphere around here today, you cannot come back for more. What this bill does, it places a cap on annual food stamp expenditures, and that gets into some, and I have never seen it before, and I feel maybe that we may be yielding to outside factors, but the way that the dollar levels would be arranged in that will be the CBO projects low unemployment, assumes no recession in the next 5 years. But if that assumption is not correct, then we have a problem that we have here somehow that we will act according to what the CBO projects, and that figure, that CBO gives, will be the figure used, and I do not know how that works. That has never been tried before.

That does not mean that you do not do something that has never been tried before. That would not be right to say that. But in this case, we know how it has worked, and it would be virtually impossible under the Budget Act since to get an added expenditure you would have to have offsetting tax increase or offsetting cuts someplace.

So the fact is that you have to go take from the poor to help the poor. And those that would lose jobs during a recession will not have food benefits adequate for their families to have a healthy diet. We do not accept the majority's assumption that there are plenty of jobs available, and if hungry people are denied food benefits, they will get a job.

The fact is that there is little welfare reform in this bill. There are no job-training requirements in the bill. It only says that States will provide employment and training to food stamp families. That is deleted, and funding for this activity is eliminated, and so we have to look at what it is that we are doing, and if given adequate job training and employment counseling, I know people will work. I know that they will work.

There are those that say, "Well, they don't want to work. I can't find anyone to cut my lawn." There are people who would like to work even if it is cutting a lawn, but if you only have one of those in a month, what would you do? And in my area, I see a lot of people doing that with this help.

In other areas, also, AFDC, the WIC, school lunch, we are making radical reforms that, when coupled with changes in the food stamp provision in H.R. 7, greatly compromise our Federal food safety net. Reason argues for leaving one program as a backstop in case reforms in other programs falter or fail.

We have now learned that the CBO estimates that the reduction in food stamps, as I have said before, will equal

over \$21 billion over 5 years. If this savings was the result of people moving from welfare into jobs, this bill would have the support of every Member of this House, I am sure. However, 4 saves money simply by reducing benefits and kicking people off the program who cannot find jobs on their own.

And let me tell you, I can categorically state to you, because I hear this at home, I mean, these moneys that we use are hard-earned dollars paid to the U.S. Government in taxes, and we have a moral responsibility, we have a sacred responsibility to see that these funds are used adequately, and there is no way to reform a program that is designed to keep our children from going hungry.

How do you reform that? Make more people go hungry?

But we are responsible. We have been responsible. But you do not do your responsibility, as we have done, to the tune of \$65 billion for 12 years, a little over 12 years. We have done it, but not by reducing benefits and kicking people off programs where they get food or in some other areas attention for their needs.

So the reduction in spending resulting from implementation of this bill, also, we insist if it is to be done, it should go for deficit reduction. That is what people are speaking on throughout the countryside, "Reduce the deficit." I just heard it before I boarded the plane this morning, "Reduce the deficit." This we must do, that the reduction be used to address the deficit.

And I urge my colleagues to commit themselves to true welfare reform. Welfare reform does not mean saying it. Welfare reform does not mean 30-second sound bites. Welfare reform does not mean saying there are no-account, lazy people out there. Welfare reform is what we have been doing, what we have done before there was a contract, before there were many of the new Members that are here. We have done that. We have been doing that. We did it in 1977, we did it in 1981, we did it in 1985.

We have addressed these issues, not necessarily only in the Food Stamp Program. But we have. We have had chairmen of the subcommittee that have worked diligently and throughout that process. The distinguished chairman, our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], has been a part of this.

So no one can say that we did not address the issue. Not one can say that we were not responsible. No one can say that in any way we reduced simply for the sake of reduction. We reduced because it was the right thing to do. We went to areas where the program needed change. We have made those changes.

So what we do today is for other reasons besides welfare reform. It is for other reasons besides doing the right thing. It is for other reasons, and you, all of my friends, know what the other

reasons are, and this is no way to legislate.

Mr. Chairman, the food stamp provisions of H.R. 4 cause me great concern. Although I am relieved that the Food Stamp Program, unlike the National School Lunch Program and other child nutrition programs, including the WIC program, will not be immediately turned into a block grant by this bill, the enormous reductions in funding, over \$21 billion, will cause hungry people to no longer be able to attain a nutritionally adequate diet. As we strive to find the most effective ways to help poor parents achieve self-sufficiency, there is no excuse for limiting their ability to adequately feed their children.

The Food Stamp Program is the country's largest provider of food aid and one of its most extensive welfare programs. In fiscal year 1994, it helped feed more than 1 in 10 people in this country. Half of the beneficiaries are children, and over 15 percent are elderly or disabled. More than 40 percent of the recipient households have monthly income below 50 percent of the poverty guideline, and only 20 percent have significant earnings.

The program has always been very responsive to changes in the economy in two major ways. In the first instance, each year, the size of a household's food stamp allotment is adjusted to reflect any changes in the cost of food. Here is how that works: Maximum monthly food stamp allotments are tied to the cost of purchasing a nutritionally adequate low cost diet, as measured by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, plus 3 percent. Food stamp benefits are based on 103 percent of the Thrifty Food Plan to acknowledge the fact that food prices usually have increased between the time that the cost of the TFP is determined and the time that benefits are adjusted and distributed. (The cost of the TFP is determined in June, and benefits adjusted beginning the following October. Those adjusted benefits are not adjusted again until the next October, 15 months after the TFP adjustment.) This formula helps assure that families receive benefits reflective of the cost of food at the time they are purchasing the food. This diet is called the Thrifty Food Plan [TFP], and it is the cheapest of four food plans designed by USDA. USDA determines the cost of a market basket of low cost food items necessary to maintain a nutritious diet. The TFP is priced monthly, and food stamp allotments are adjusted, up or down, each October to reflect the cost of the TFP in the previous June. The October adjustment in 1995 is expected to be an increase of approximately 3.5%, reflecting the percent of increase in the cost of food. This mechanism assures that no family will get less than what it needs to maintain its ability to purchase a nutritionally adequate, albeit low cost, diet.

H.R. 4 will limit any increases in the food stamp allotments to 2 percent annually, even if food prices increase nationally more than 2 percent. While the majority can argue that nominal benefits will not be reduced under their bill, benefits will no longer keep pace with the cost of food. Given current estimates of what will happen to food prices in the future, it is expected that in 2 years food stamp families will no longer receive benefits adequate to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet. Allotments will have fallen below 100 percent of the Thrifty Food Plan. Each year thereafter, under the majority's bill, benefits will be further

eroded. We cannot stress enough the importance of maintaining a nutritionally adequate diet. It is the linchpin upon which this program is based and upon which all changes to the program must be measured. This bill completely abandons the principle that poor and hungry families deserve, at minimum, a nutritionally adequate diet. I am submitting for the record a chart showing that in two years H.R. 4 will begin to deny hungry families the chance to purchase a healthy diet.

In the second instance, the bill becomes even more unresponsive to economic fluctuations by making it extremely difficult for the program to respond to increases in need during recessions. H.R. 4 places a cap on annual food stamp expenditures at the exact dollar levels that the Congressional Budget Office estimates the program will cost given implementation of the provisions in the bill. The CBO projects low unemployment and assumes no recession in the next five years. We hope that this assumption is correct, but if it is wrong and the Nation faces a recession, benefits to poor and hungry families will be reduced. There is no provision for an upward adjustment of the cap if the number of beneficiaries rises during a recession. Any effort under those circumstances to raise the cap, under the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act, would be virtually impossible, since it would require an offsetting tax increase, a cut in another entitlement, or an emergency designation. At exactly the time when poor people need help most, they will receive less food assistance. The working poor, those most likely to lose jobs during a recession, will not have food benefits adequate to feed their families a healthy diet.

Everyone can agree that we need additional budgetary controls on our federal budget. However, this is a most inhumane way to achieve such control. Hunger cannot be capped. We must allow the one program that provides a minimal safety net to keep hunger at bay to respond to recessionary times.

We must conclude that the majority's bill is a cost savings bill, nothing more. There is little welfare reform in this bill. For example, there are no job training requirements in this bill. The current requirement that states provide employment and training to food stamp families is deleted, and funding for these activities is eliminated. Instead, the same level of funding is provided to states that choose to operate a program requiring that families work in public service jobs in return for their food stamp benefits; but, only 6 states operate such programs, and none of them are statewide. We do not accept the majority's assumptions that there are plenty of jobs available, and if hungry people are denied food benefits they will get a job. People do not prefer poverty over self-sufficiency. If given adequate job training and employment counseling, and if jobs are available, people will work. This bill provides no such incentives.

This process has not produced true welfare reform. Merely cutting the Food Stamp Program at some arbitrary level is not reform and no one should mistake it as such. This bill simply goes too far in undermining our federal food assistance safety net and leaves our poor families vulnerable to hunger. In other areas, AFDC, WIC, school lunch, we are making radical reforms that when coupled with the changes in the food stamp provisions of H.R. 4 greatly compromise our federal food safety

net. Reason argues for leaving one program as the backstop in case reforms in the other programs falter or fail.

For those who have worked on far-reaching and comprehensive legislation in the past, the process of reforming welfare in this Congress has been most disturbing. The frantic pace at which we are required to move has assured that very little thoughtful consideration and deliberation can take place. The Committee on Agriculture, over Democratic objections, marked-up this bill without a CBO estimate. It is impossible to know the full implication of the bill's benefit reductions on the poor and hungry of this country without the CBO estimate. The majority many times during mark-up stated that the bill they presented for approval was believed to save \$16.5 billion over 5 years. We have now learned that CBO estimates that the reductions in food stamp benefits that will result from the food stamp title of H.R. 4 will equal over \$21 billion over 5 years.

The concerns of the minority over \$16.5 billion in benefit reductions are magnified several times when the reductions exceed \$21 billion. If these savings were the result of people moving from welfare into jobs, this bill would have the support of every member of Congress. However, H.R. 4 saves money simply by reducing benefits and kicking people off the program who can't find jobs on their own. This is no way to reform a program that is designed to keep our children from going hungry.

Finally, the minority is pleased that the committee approved a Sense of the Committee provision that the reduction in spending resulting from implementation of this bill must go toward deficit reduction. This policy must now be adopted for H.R. 4. There should be only two reasons to seek reductions in the Food Stamp Program—(1) to reduce the deficit, and (2) to reallocate resources in such a manner that allows the participants to achieve self-sufficiency (such as employment and training). Any attempt to use the savings to finance tax cuts must be roundly denounced. We cannot stand by and allow an erosion of food benefits for the poor to provide tax breaks for those who are far better off.

I urge my colleagues to commit themselves to true welfare reform, not to this bill that does little more than deny and reduce benefits to hungry families in the name of welfare reform.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, there is one man in the Congress who probably knows more about food stamps and has contributed more of his time and effort to food stamp reform and the problem of hunger and malnutrition in America than any other, and that gentleman is the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON]. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] has served with distinction on the Select Committee on Hunger and has served with distinction on the House Committee on Agriculture. He is the distinguished gentleman who has been the leader in food stamp reform and is the chairman of the appropriate subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

(Mr. EMERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1214, the Personal Responsibility Act. For the past decade this topic of reforming welfare has been an abiding interest of mine and I am guided and motivated by the words of Abraham Lincoln "The dogmas * * * of the * * * past are inadequate to the present. We must think anew and act anew."

The present welfare system cannot be defended. It is a disgrace. The people who receive the assistance do not like it; the people who run the system do not like it, and the taxpayers will not stand for continuation of the present welfare maintenance system.

There are welfare programs that provide public assistance directly to individual families through cash benefits for food coupons; programs providing work or training to get able-bodied people to work; programs that provide meals in schools and other institutional settings; programs that provide distribution of commodities to hungry people, and programs linking health and food. The actual number of programs available to needy families is in excess of 125, with 80 of these programs considered major programs with a cost in excess of \$300 billion per year in Federal, State, and local tax dollars. There are more programs now for providing public assistance to poor families than any time in the past, serving more people and costing more money. There must be a better way to help low-income people become taxpayers. We currently have a welfare maintenance system, not one designed to provide temporary assistance and help people reclaim or gain a life.

Most needy families coming in to seek public assistance need help in at least three categories: cash and the accompanying medical assistance, food, and housing. The rules and regulations for these programs are different and in many cases conflicting. It does not make sense for the Federal Government to set up programs for poor families and then establish different rules for eligibility. We need one program that provides a basic level of assistance for poor families; sets conditions for receipt of that assistance, including work, and then limits the amount of time families can receive public assistance.

Over the past 12 years I have served either as ranking Republican on the Nutrition Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee or the Select Committee on Hunger. I have looked at these welfare programs in depth; I have visited scores of welfare offices, soup kitchens, food banks; I have spoken to those administering the welfare programs and the people receiving the assistance.

I learned during my years serving on the Select Committee on Hunger that any one program does not comprehensively provide welfare for poor families; it takes two or more of the current programs to provide a basic level of help. When there are two or more

programs with different rules and regulations people fall through the cracks in the system and also take advantage of the system. This must stop. How anyone could defend the present structure and system is a puzzle to me; unless it is persons who benefit illicitly from the fractured welfare mess we find ourselves in today, be they welfare recipients who take advantage of the system or advocates who thrive on the power derived from establishing new programs. Advocates of the humane system, a cost-effective System, an efficient system, a system that helps people up, off and out could find little solace in the current system.

Over the past years I have come to the conclusion that an effective welfare system is one that encompasses what I refer to as one-stop-shopping. We need a lot of integration, consolidation, and automation and none of these "tools" is much a part of the system at this time. This concept takes the multiple welfare programs now in place and tries to bring some cohesion to them.

States have sought or are seeking waivers from the Federal rules and regulations to establish some type of reform of the present welfare system. Governors in particular recognize that the system is broken and needs to be fixed. Thirty States have sought or are seeking waivers from the Federal Government to reform all or a part of their respective State welfare systems.

It is amazing to me that this many States have sought to change the welfare system, thereby recognizing the failure of the present system, without any action on the part of Congress to change the system as well. There has also been a recalcitrant bureaucracy, and there is a turf program in the bureaucracy that probably exceeds the turf problem in Congress. How many more States might try to institute reforms but for the maze of bureaucracy they must go through to achieve waivers? What we have now is not a welfare system aimed at moving families off of welfare and onto the taxpayers rolls, but a maintenance system that thwarts State initiative and diversity and poorly helps poor families, exasperates the front line administrators running the programs, and is a frustration and burden to the people paying for this disastrous system.

I want to help reform the system; I want to change the way we deliver this help to poor families, and, I want to do it in an efficient, compassionate, and cost-effective manner, and I believe that with this legislation we are on that path.

The subcommittee that I chair held four hearings last month on the issue of reforming the present welfare system. We heard from the General Accounting Office on the multitude of programs that are now operating. We heard from a Governor who operates a welfare system that is dependent upon Federal bureaucrats for waivers; a former Governor who had to devise a

system to provide one-stop-shopping for participants, and State administrators who must deal with the day-to-day obstacles that are placed in their way by Federal rules and regulations. Witnesses traveled from all over the United States to tell the subcommittee of their experiences operating programs to help poor families. Two of the members of the welfare simplification and coordination advisory committee told us of the experiences deliberating the complexities of the present system. Others provided the subcommittee with their ideas on how to improve the system.

I believe the debate on reforming the welfare system has truly begun. In the past we were only dealing with reform at the margins. We have now started on the path to real reform.

This reform will not be accomplished in one sitting, with one bill. It is a process that will take from 3 to 5 years.

The Committee on Agriculture, with jurisdiction over the Food Stamp Program and Commodity Distribution Programs, is a part of that process. The committee, along with the Republican leadership, determined that the Food Stamp Program will remain a Federal program for the present time. It will serve as the safety net for needy people. Food is fundamental and we provide access to food for these families.

We consolidate four Food Distribution Programs into one and provide for a \$100 million annual increase in authorizations for the new program. Remember, food is fundamental. The food distribution programs, such as the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program or TEFAP, which I might add, at this juncture the administration would like to zero out, are the front line of defense against hunger for needy individuals and families. Food banks, soup kitchens, churches and community organizations are always there with food when it is needed. The Federal Government provides a portion of the food that is distributed through these programs. But it is an essential part and acts as seed money for food contributions from the private sector. If we did not have food distribution programs we would have to invent them. The committee bill consolidates these programs and increases the money to buy food so that these worthwhile organizations, most of which are made up of volunteers, can continue the fine work they now do.

We do reform the Food Stamp Program and it is in need of a lot of reform. The states are provided with an option to reconcile the differences between their new AFDC Programs with the Food Stamp Program for those people receiving help from both programs. This has been one of my goals and I believe that we are on the road to a one-stop-shopping welfare system. Complete welfare reform will come. This is the first step in the long road to reform.

States are encouraged to go forward with an electronic benefit transfer system. EBT is the preferred way to issue food stamp benefits. This bill provides States with the ability to implement the EBT system they deem appropriate and the problems with the notorious regulation E are eliminated. The committee views EBT as a means to effectively issue food stamp benefits and as a means to control and detect fraudulent activities in the program. I am especially gratified that EBT can become an integral part of the Food Stamp Program and other welfare programs.

The committee has taken steps to restore integrity to the Food Stamp Program by instituting criminal forfeiture authority so that criminals will pay a price for their illegal activities in food stamp trafficking. We double the penalties for recipient fraudulent activities and we give USDA the authority to better manage the food stores that are authorized to accept and redeem food stamps.

We include a tough work program. We say that if you are able-bodied and between 18 years and 50 years with no dependents, you can receive food stamps for 3 months. Following that you must be working in a regular job at least 20 hours a week—half-time work—or you will not receive food stamps. The American people cannot understand why people who can work do not do so. We say you will not receive food stamps forever if you do not work.

The committee determined that the unconstrained growth in the Food Stamp Program, due to the automatic increases built into the program and the changes made to the program over the past years, cannot continue. We restrain the growth in the program by limiting the indexing of food stamp income deductions and providing a 2-percent increase in food stamp benefits. We place a ceiling on the spending in the program. It will be up to Congress to determine whether increases above the limits placed on the program will take place. This is the appropriate way in which to manage this program. If a supplemental appropriation is needed, it will be Congress that decides whether to provide the additional money or institute reforms in the program to restrain the growth.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, with sound policy decisions incorporated. Remember, we have not ended the process of reforming welfare with the action we take today. We are beginning the process of real reform. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and take this first step along with me. We cannot continue as we are today with a welfare system that is despised by all involved. The status quo is unacceptable. Let us think anew and act anew.

□ 2030

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] and would point out to the Members and to all who are paying attention to this debate that the gentleman from Missouri has spent more time in regards to personally visiting feeding programs and soup kitchens. It is his amendment that consolidates many of the feeding programs and adds \$100 million to that effort.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 from the Republican Contract With America.

Among the most troubling provisions of the bill are those dealing with food and nutrition, deep cuts in food stamps and block grants for the School Lunch Program, and Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children. To add insult to injury, the money saved will fund tax cuts, not address the debt or deficit.

While keeping the entitlement nature of food stamps, the majority have placed a cap on the program and cut spending by \$23 billion over 5 years. The food purchasing power of millions of recipients will diminish over time, and fall below the amount needed to purchase the bare-bones minimum.

In my home State of Maine, history shows us that during down swings in the economy, the number of people turning to food stamps increases. The rigid cap on food stamp expenditures would allow for no adjustments for economic changes.

The majority would mandate that certain recipients work for their benefits, yet they provide no funds for the State to create jobs or to provide training.

All told, Maine would lose \$88 million over the next 5 years, nearly 20 percent from the budget of a program that serves 160,000 people monthly.

I spent time talking to parents and students at a school in Bangor ME, yesterday. They could not believe that Congress was going to cut the School Lunch Program to pay for tax breaks. It ruffled them to no end.

In Maine schools, more than 48,000 students a year gain a substantial share of their daily nutrition from free and reduced lunches. That is nearly a quarter of Maine's student population. In providing the School Lunch Program, Federal, State and local governments spent \$44 million in Maine last year.

This is not a welfare program this is an education program, a nutrition program. How many times have each of you heard, "A hungry child can't learn?"

Then there is WIC, a program that ensures adequate nutrition for pregnant women and nursing mothers. More than 70 studies have proven its effectiveness at preventing low-birth-weight babies and other complications. It saves money in the long run.

For \$17 million a year 44,000 women, infants, and children in Maine reap the benefits of the sustaining food provided by WIC funds.

Despite the obvious benefits of both programs, the Personal Responsibility Act creates block grants, rolls back nutritional standards, and generally fails

to give States enough money to do the job properly.

Titles 3 and 5 of the act, those covering WIC and school lunches, cap the block grants at less than the rate of inflation. Maine would lose \$37 million over the next 5 years.

Food programs are the ultimate safety net. The changes contained in the Contract With America would leave the net threadbare and unable to break the fall of those who most need it. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE], who has authored many strengthening amendments to the antifraud provisions of the food stamp reform package.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] for what I think is a very fine bill, a very fair bill, and a bill that I think is going to lead us in the right direction here. You know, I am one who strongly supports the idea that this is something that eventually should be turned over to the States to run. I think government closer to the people is a government that runs a better program. We have set up a mechanism to accomplish that in this legislation by setting up a method by which States that go to the electronic benefit transfer system can eventually qualify to have the program administered through a block grant system. I think that is the right direction to take.

In the meantime, measures need to be taken to tighten up this program, and I think this bill does just that.

Before I address those, I would like to first respond to those on the other side who claim that this bill lacks compassion. I think that is utter nonsense. Compassion is not measured by the size and complexity of the bureaucratic program that has been established over the years. Compassion is not measured by the billions upon billions of dollars that we keep throwing at this program without results, but instead, making more and more people dependent upon the program.

Compassion is measured by taking people by the hand and helping them where they need to be helped, but also setting them on their own and asking them to go ahead and take some responsibility for their own lives. That is what is ultimately the thing that will build back into peoples lives the dignity that is needed.

□ 2045

Mr. Chairman, those who suggest that the work requirements here are unfair I think are completely off track. We have a situation here where anyone who is between the ages of 18 and 50 is required to work 20 hours a week, not 40 hours a week, as many people strive to do, merely 20 hours a week. If they have a dependent child at home, and they are the primary care giver, they are not required to comply with that. I

think ultimately we are going to have to change that and require that.

Today most young American families, both members of the household work, and I think that ultimately we need to expect that everyone should contribute something for the benefits that they receive, and to suggest that we are the ones who are lacking in compassion when the President's plan would have gutted the ability of food programs, food banks all across this country, to assist people with basic needs, and this plan preserves that, again I think it is very misleading to suggest that somehow we are being lacking in our compassion.

The second problem we have with this program is that it has historically been beset by all manner of fraud. Food stamps are trafficked on the street, traded for drugs, used in a multitude of methods.

I point out that we have done that by requiring that State and local governments and the Department of Agriculture verify the existence of stores that are trading food stamps because we have had problems with them being traded through post office boxes and through the trunks of cars, and we have tightened up the requirements that, if somebody is found guilty of trafficking in food stamps, and it involves more than \$500, they can be barred from receiving food stamps.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. MCCARTHY].

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican welfare bill that we are debating has one clear result, save \$69 billion over 5 years by creating block grants to the States with fixed, capped funding.

The proposed legislation does little to assist individuals to become self-sufficient by helping them find work. It has no guarantees that it will reform the welfare system. Instead, this is a package geared toward reducing the deficit and guaranteeing that the affluent receive a capital gains cut, by cutting benefits and resources to our children.

On February 23, the National Governors' Association sent a letter to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee signed by the Governor of my State, Mel Carnahan, and Republican Governors Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin and John Engler of Michigan. The letter states: "The Governors view any block grant proposal as an opportunity for Congress and the President to provide needed flexibility for States, not as a primary means to reduce the Federal budget deficit." They continue in this four-page letter to list other objections they have with the bill in its current form, including provisions that limit State flexibility or

shift Federal costs to States. With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the full text of the letter appear in the RECORD after my remarks.

I understand the need to reform the welfare system. I do not understand, however, why we need to forge ahead with legislation that is so poorly thought out that it simply abdicates our legislative responsibility to the Senate, whom we hope will take the time necessary to craft a bill that truly reforms the welfare system. Those of us who have extensive understanding of State welfare programs feel we have not been given adequate opportunity to help shape the welfare debate going on today.

Because of the way this legislation has been rushed through this body and in light of the fact that the bill does not meet the fundamental principle of moving people from welfare to work, I cannot support H.R. 1214 in its current form.

The letter referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, February 23, 1995.

Hon. BILL ARCHER,

Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to express our views on the Personal Responsibility Act, as amended by the Subcommittee on Human Resources. The Governors appreciate the willingness of the subcommittee to grant states new flexibility in designing cash assistance and child welfare programs. We are concerned about a number of the bill's provisions, however, that limit state flexibility or shift federal costs to states.

The Governors believe Congress has at this moment an enormous opportunity to restructure the federal-state relationship. The Governors urge Congress to take advantage of this opportunity both to examine the allocation of responsibilities among the levels of government and to maximize state flexibility in areas of shared responsibility. We believe, however, that children must be protected throughout the structuring process. In addition, although federal budget cuts are needed, the Governors are concerned about the cumulative impact on the states of federal budgetary decisions. The Governors view any block grant proposal as an opportunity for Congress and the president to provide needed flexibility for states, not as a primary means to reduce the federal budget deficit.

The Governors have not yet reached consensus on whether cash and other entitlement assistance should remain available, as federal entitlements to needy families or whether it should be converted to state entitlement block grants. We do agree, however, that in either case states should have the flexibility to enact welfare reforms without having to request federal waivers.

FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR BLOCK GRANTS

If Congress chooses to pursue the block grant approach proposed by the Human Resources Subcommittee, the block grants should include a clear statement of purpose, including mutually agreed-upon goals for the block grant and the measures that will be used to judge the effectiveness of the block grant.

CASH ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANT

The Governors believe that a cash assistance block grant for families must recognize the nation's interest in: Services to children; moving recipients from welfare to work; and reducing out-of-wedlock births.

Although the Governors recognize the legitimate interest of the federal government in setting broad program goals in cooperation with states and territories, they also believe that states should be free from prescriptive federal standards.

We appreciate the flexibility given to states in the bill to design programs, to carry forward program savings, and to transfer funding between block grants. We must oppose, however, Title I's prohibitions on transitional cash assistance to particular families now eligible for help and ask instead that states be given the authority to make these eligibility decisions themselves. Some states may want to be more restrictive than the bill—by conditioning aid on work, for example, sooner than two years—while other states may decide it is appropriate to be less restrictive.

The federal interest should be limited to ensuring the block grant is used to aid low-income children and families. In the past federal restrictions on eligibility have served to contain federal costs given the open-ended entitlement nature of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program. Such restrictions have no place, however, in a capped entitlement block grant where the federal government's costs are fixed, regardless of the eligibility and benefit choices made by each state.

Similarly, while Governors agree that there is a national interest in refocusing the welfare system on the transition to work, we will object strongly to any efforts to prescribe narrow federal work standards for the block grant. The Governors believe that all Americans should be productive members of their community. There are various ways to achieve this goal. The preferred means is through private, unsubsidized work in the business or nonprofit sectors. If the federal government imposes rigid work standards on state programs, such standards could prove self-defeating by foreclosing some possibilities, such as volunteering in the community, that can be stepping stones to full-time, private sector jobs. A rigid federal work standard would also inevitably raise difficult issues about the cost and feasibility of creating a large number of public jobs, and the cost of providing child care for parents required to work a set number of hours a week in a particular type of job.

CHILD PROTECTION BLOCK GRANT

Governors view the child protection block grant as overly prescriptive and urge Congress to refocus it on achieving broad goals, such as preserving families, encouraging adoption and protecting health and safety of children. We also oppose the mandated creation of local citizen review panels. We believe that it is inappropriate for the federal government to dictate the mechanism by which Governors consult the citizens of their state on state policies.

BLOCK GRANT FUNDING

We appreciate the subcommittee's willingness to create block grants whose funding level is guaranteed over five years rather than being subject to annual appropriations. It is essential, however, that block grants include appropriate budget adjustments that recognize agreed-upon national priorities, inflation, and demand for services. The cash assistance block grant does not include any such adjustments for structural growth in the target populations. While some growth is built into funding for the child protection block grant, it is not clear whether it will be adequate especially given that states are likely to be required by the courts to honor existing adoption assistance contracts. Governors will continue to protect abused and

neglected children by intervening on their behalf and we believe that federal funding must continue to be available for these services.

Governors also ask that any block grants include funding adjustments to provide for significant changes in the cyclical economy and for major natural disasters. An additional amount should be set aside each year for automatic and timely distribution to states that experience a major disaster, higher-than-average unemployment, or other indicators of distress. While the bill does include a federal rainy day loan fund, we are concerned that this loan fund will prove to be an inadequate means of addressing sudden changes in the need for assistance. States experiencing fiscal problems will not be able to risk taking out federal loans that they may not be able to repay. Furthermore, one billion dollars over five years may not be sufficient if many states experience economic downturns or natural disasters at the same time, as was the case with the last recession or with the midwestern floods. Finally, an unemployment rate in excess of 6.5% may not be a sufficient proxy for identifying increases in need and should not be the sole trigger for increased aid.

We also urge the committee to change the funding base year and formula for the two block grants. We believe that initial allotments to states for the cash assistance and child protection block grants should be the higher of a state's actual funding under the consolidated programs in fiscal 1994 or a state's average funding during fiscal years 1992 through 1994. This change would help protect states with recent caseload growth from receiving initial allotments far below actual need.

ACCOUNTABILITY IN BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS

We believe that block grants should include a clear statement of purpose, including mutually agreed-upon goals for the block grant and the measures that will be used to judge the effectiveness of the block grant. We are concerned, however, that the reporting requirements in both the cash assistance and child protection block grant go far beyond what is necessary to monitor whether program goals are being achieved. We encourage the committee to restrict reporting requirements to outcome and performance data strictly related to the goals of the program, and hope that those reporting requirements can be mutually agreed upon by Congress, the administration, and ourselves.

We agree that states should be required to use the block grant funding to provide services for children and their families. We do have questions, though, about how broadly the bill's audit provisions would be applied. Would the audit process be used, for example, to determine whether the block grant goal of assisting needy children and families was being achieved? We would also suggest that rather than the federal government reclaiming audit exception funds, that these funds remain available to a state for allowable services to families and children.

IMPLEMENTATION

Governors also ask Congress to recognize that moving to a block grant structure raises many implementation issues. Almost every state is operating at least one welfare waiver project. We believe that states with waivers currently in effect should have express permission either to continue their waiver-based reforms, or to withdraw from the waivers, and be held harmless for any costs measured by waivers' cost neutrality provisions. Savings from individual state's waivers should be included in the state's base. Some states have negotiated a settlement to retain access, subject to state match, to an agreed upon dollar amount of

waiver savings. Legislative language converting AFDC to a block grant should not terminate these agreements and thereby preclude states from drawing down the balance of these previously negotiated amounts.

Implementation of block grants would also pose enormous difficulties for state information systems, and we are concerned that there may not be sufficient funding or lead time to allow states to update these systems as necessary to implement the legislation. While states that are ready should be able to implement any new block grants as soon as possible, other states should be allowed at least one year after enactment to implement the new programs. We also believe that a consultative process between Governors, Congress and the administration would be necessary to ensure that the transition to a block grant system is made in an orderly way and that children's needs continue to be met during the transition.

FEDERAL AID TO LEGAL NONCITIZENS AND FEDERAL DISABILITY BENEFITS

The Governors oppose the bill's elimination of most federal services to legal noncitizens. The elimination of federal benefits does not change any state's legal responsibilities to make services available to all legal immigrants. Policy adopted by the Governors clearly states that since the federal government has exclusive jurisdiction over our nation's immigration policy, all costs resulting from immigration policy should be paid by the federal government. This bill would move the federal government in the opposite direction, and would shift substantial costs to states.

The Governors also oppose the bill's changes to the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program. We recognize that the program is growing at an unacceptable rate, and that serious problems exist regarding the definition and diagnosis of disabilities. The changes in the bill go far beyond addressing those problems and represent a substantial and unacceptable cost shift to states. The Governors believe that Congress should wait for the report of the Commission on Childhood Disability before acting to change eligibility for disability to children. We also ask that Congress allow last year's amendments regarding the substance abuse population to be implemented before enacting new changes in that area. If changes in SSI are enacted that deny benefits to hundreds of thousands of families and children, the result may be a sharp increase in the need for aid from the new cash assistance block grant at a time when those funds would be capped.

Thank you for your consideration of our views on the first four titles of Chairman Shaw's bill. We are also reviewing the child support provisions and will be forwarding our comments on them to you separately.

Sincerely,

GOV. HOWARD DEAN,

Chair.

GOV. TOMMY G. THOMPSON,

Vice Chair.

GOV. TOM CARPER,

Co-Lead Governor on Welfare.

GOV. JOHN ENGLER,

Co-Lead Governor on Welfare.

GOV. MEL CARNAHAN,

Chair, Human Resources Committee.

GOV. ARNE H. CARLSON,

Vice Chair, Human Resources Committee.

There is one last point I would like to make. Last week my staff received an invitation to attend an all-expense-paid trip to visit Navy bases in the Pacific. Now Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many staffers are going to take this trip—I know mine isn't—and for all I know the Navy may need to have staff review their

operations in the Pacific. However, my question is this: If budgets are so tight that we have to cut school lunch programs for children and energy assistance programs for the elderly, then why do we continue to allow funding for these types of trips, which strike me as completely unnecessary? If we are going to cut the deficit, why don't we look to end these types of trips that are paid for by U.S. taxpayers.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, discussion about welfare reform is not new. This issue has been debated over the years. We have come a long way.

But, as we stand, prepared to vote on welfare reform legislation, I am struck by the feeling that, as far as we have come, we seem to be going a long way back.

A minister in my district tells the story of what school breakfast was like, before we had a Federal school program.

Scolded by her teacher, an embarrassed little girl discarded her breakfast. She had been eating it during class. The noise when the item landed in the wastebasket was revealing and disturbing. That little girl's school breakfast was a raw sweet potato. Without it, she would not eat.

That, Mr. Chairman, is where we have come from. I am worried, however, that we may be going back to that same place in time.

The majority has offered a welfare reform bill that cuts eligibility without work program funding, reduces spending and gives wide flexibility to the States.

My party will offer two substitute bills that offer less radical reform but provides for funding for work. I rise to encourage my colleagues to think America. This issue is not about party and politics. It is about people.

It is about sound bodies, strong minds and sturdy spirits. This issue is about moving forward in the future. It is not about wallowing backward to the past. We should shape a bill that is neither Republican nor Democrat, that hurts neither the rich nor the poor—a bill that joins us, not one that divides us.

We are not 50 States. We are the United States. We do not need fifty standards for nutrition in this Nation. We need one standard.

Regionalization and sectionalism hurts us. We fought a Civil War to bring this Nation together. The place of one's birth should not determine the quality of one's life. Every child in America should have a hearty breakfast and a healthy lunch. At the end of the first 100 days of this Congress, the current debate on welfare reform will be finished. But, where will America be on the 101st day?

Will there be more people with jobs? Will we show improvement in education? Will there be less crime in the streets?

More specifically, will there be more or fewer hungry children? Will infant mortality rates rise or fall? Will our seniors be better off at that time than they are now? What, if anything, is a young school girl have for breakfast?

Children are not driving the deficit. Senior citizens are not the cause of our economic problems. Programs for poor people do not amount to pork.

In fact, AFDC constitutes just 2 percent of all entitlement spending and 1 percent of all federal spending.

The average American taxpayer spends only about \$26 on AFDC. Child nutrition programs represent only one-half of 1 percent of total federal outlays. And, the average food stamp benefit is 75 cents per person, per meal. Only 75 cents.

That is why I am deeply troubled by the proposed cuts. Cuts have occurred, and more are proposed in the WIC Program, for example. WIC works.

It is a program that services low-income and at-risk women, infants, and children.

Pregnant women, infants 12 months and younger, and children from 1 to 5 years old, are the beneficiaries of the WIC Program.

For every dollar this Nation spends on WIC prenatal care, we save up to \$4.21 cents.

The budget cutting efforts we are experiencing are aimed at reducing the deficit. The deficit is being driven by rising health care costs. When we put money into WIC, we save money in Medicaid. The equation is simple.

Those who have a genuine interest in deficit reduction can help achieve that goal by investing in WIC and the other nutrition programs now targeted for cuts.

Mr. Chairman, the story is told of a rich man, while dining at his table of plenty, he noticed a ragged, poor, old woman, outside his window, begging for food. "Go", he said to his servant, "It saddens me to see that poor, old woman," he lamented. "Get her away from my window. Tell her to go away," he said.

As this debate goes on, many charts and numbers will be displayed. Republicans and Democrats will claim that theirs is the truth. Let's not forget the people.

When we conclude this week, we must each look in the mirror and ask ourselves, what have we told the poor, old women and men, and the pregnant women, and the infants and children, and the little school girls and little school boys?

Have we told them to get from our windows? Have we told them to go away? Or have we told them to come inside and join us at America's table of plenty?

The issues are clear. The choices are plain. I ask my colleagues. Where do you stand? The Personal Responsibility Act, as currently written, is mindless and senseless and should be rejected.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with those who over the years have been, and continue to be, truly concerned about the citizens of America who need us the most.

Currently H.R. 4 will substitute block grant funding for Federal nutrition programs. This block grant procedure would probably eliminate federally sponsored nutrition programs such as; (WIC) and the School Lunch and Breakfast programs among others, and substitute a single Federal payment to the States.

Based on Congressional Budget Office data, funding for the school nutrition block grant would be \$170 million less than the levels that would be provided under current law. The proposed block grants would end the entitlement status of the school lunch and breakfast programs. Thus, during recessions, States and school districts with rising unemployment could be forced to choose between denying free meals to newly poor children and raising taxes, or reducing other programs to secure more resources in the middle of a recession.

We need a bill that maintains nutrition programs for children and the elderly, including WIC and school lunch program. These programs have produced significant and measurable outcomes among children who participate in them. The block grant structure proposed by H.R. 4 can't respond when the economy changes and place children at risk by eliminating nutrition standards responsible for improved children's health.

We need a bill that has strong anti-fraud and abuse provisions for the Food Stamp program. We need a bill that has work requirements for able-bodied food stamp recipients, that also helps States provide work placement and job training for food stamp recipients. We need a simplified food stamp program, revising administrative rules and simplified determination of eligibility. We need a program that retains the annual inflation adjustments for the cost of food, a program that provides a basic benefit level. We do not need a bill, such as H.R. 4, that underfunds real welfare reform by cutting spending while giving States block grants which do not increase even if the State is in recession, or has a drastic increase in its poor population.

The Republican welfare reform bill talks about work but does little to achieve it. It does not have meaningful work requirements for moving people from welfare to work. It does not provide the necessary education and training to prepare people for work.

We need a bill that provides tough, meaningful work requirements for welfare recipients. Real welfare reform must be about replacing a welfare check with a paycheck. The Deal substitute provides work requirements for welfare recipients, requiring states to place 16% of recipients in work in the first year and 20% in the second year.

HR 4 does not reach the same work participation rate.

I am interested in the positive health effects that these nutrition programs have on our poor children, needy elderly, and handicapped in our country. I have heard testimony which clearly outlined the negative impact of block granting to the states of commodity distribution programs in lieu of the current nutrition program funding mechanisms.

In addition, a discretionary block grant would eliminate the entitlement status of nutrition programs and subject each year's nutrition program funding to the Congressional appropriations process. There is talk that compromises were made in H.R. 4 which allowed the Food Stamp program to remain an entitlement program but at the same time placing a cap on benefits for the Program. The compromises also provided that all other nutrition programs could be block granted to the states. I want to commend the leadership of the Agriculture Committee for this effort, but I believe that the block granting with limited funding goes too far.

In the Mississippi delta, in the coal fields of Appalachia, in the red clay hills of Georgia, 25 years ago one could see large numbers of stunted, apathetic children with swollen stomachs and the dull eyes and poorly healing wounds characteristic of malnutrition. Such children are not to be seen in such numbers today.

The need for nutrition assistance has not diminished. We must not give up the accomplishments our nutrition programs achieved in the past decades. We must find ways to improve our programs. We must have flexibility at the State level, reducing excessive administrative requirements, and encourage innovation in the delivery of services to the needy. Mr. Chairman, I reject H.R. 4 and support the Deal substitute for commonsense welfare reform.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, the American people want a welfare system which provides a hand up, not a hand out. The deal plan provides individuals with the assistance necessary to break the cycle of poverty and to ensure that welfare recipients are better off by working than by remaining on welfare.

But they also believe that no one in America should go hungry. That has been the American tradition, a bipartisan commitment to ensuring adequate nutrition for our citizens—especially our children and the elderly. The Republican welfare plan chops away at this tradition. Americans who care about their neighbors should be concerned.

Let me just explain what is at stake so we all understand the magnitude of what the Republicans are proposing and who will be sacrificed for the sake of lowering the capital gains tax rate.

The program always has been a safety net for the working poor who—despite working 40 hours or more a week, do not earn enough to feed their families. Food stamps help families who lose their jobs during economic bad times and the elderly who cannot stretch their fixed incomes to meet all their needs and wind up choosing between food and medicine. Finally, food stamps help the millions of innocent children who, through no fault of their own, are growing up in poverty.

Last year, food stamps helped feed more than 1 in 10 people in this country. Families with children receive 82 percent of food stamp benefits. Elderly and disabled households receive 13 percent of food stamp benefits. In 1992, more than half of households receiving food stamps—56 percent in fact—earned less than half of the government-established poverty level. For a family of three, this is \$6,150.

The food stamp proposal in the Republicans bill would lead to sharp reductions in food purchasing power.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that 2.2 million food stamp participants would become ineligible under the bill.

The Congressional Budget Office says that the bill would reduce the food stamp program by \$21.4 billion over the next 5 years. The savings do not come from reducing fraud or administrative costs, they come from taking food out of the mouths of children who desperately need it.

The Republican plan reduces basic food purchasing power. In a few years, food stamp benefits will fall below the amount needed to purchase the Thrifty Food Plan, the bare bones food plan that was developed under the Nixon and Ford administrations and has served as the basis for the food stamp program since 1975.

Instead of keeping pace with food prices, as food stamp benefits always have in the past, benefits could rise by only 2 percent a year. Even if food prices jumped 8 percent in a year, food stamp benefits would increase just 2 percent. Fact—food prices have risen about 3.4 percent a year, even in these periods of low inflation.

Under the Deal substitute, which I helped write, savings are made. However, we guarantee that benefits never drop below the cost of the thrifty food plan.

These savings in food stamp benefits, and several other provisions of the Deal substitute, were painful cuts to make. But we made them, in order to pay for education and training programs and deficit reduction. Republicans, in contrast, reduce benefits for the sole purpose of paying for tax breaks for people making more than \$100,000 a year.

The Republican bill also ends benefits after 90 days to able-bodied persons without children, unless these individuals are working at least half-time or are in a workfare or other employment or training program regardless of

whether jobs are available. More than one million people will be kicked off food stamps because of this provision.

This provision does not reflect the reality of downsizing and loss of work without warning. These realities are all too familiar in America.

What about Americans, who live in small towns all over the country, who are laid off from factory jobs. These people know it takes time to find a new job. If these individuals use most or all of what little cash income they can scrape together for food, some may not be able to afford to pay rent. Homelessness and hunger would be a likely consequence.

Many members of this group have strong attachments to the work force and turn to food stamps for temporary periods when they are out of work. Most leave the program within 6 months.

The Deal substitute addresses the fact that most of these people re-enter the job market within 6 months instead of denying benefits after just 90 days. Under the Deal substitute, to continue to receive benefits a recipient must work at least half-time, participate in a public service program, or participate in an employment and training program in order to qualify.

The strength of our nation depends on how we raise our children today. We must commit as a Nation to raising strong, healthy children who will grow up to realize their full potential. To do this, we cannot abandon our commitment to successful nutrition programs. We know they work.

□ 2100

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to support H.R. 938, the Individual Responsibility Act of 1995. I am proud to be a cosponsor and want to commend the coalition, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER], and others that worked so hard to put this legislation together.

We have a bill here that I think responsibly reforms the welfare system and, more importantly, coordinates the welfare system with food stamps and other aspects.

When it comes to welfare reform, I think we all agree that the system is broke and needs to be fixed. I think we all agree that in some respects we need to get tough. But we also need to reform the system with a package that makes sense. I think the Republican bill in some areas is too extreme and does not fix the problems. In fact, I think in some areas it actually probably causes some problems.

We have a bill that we have put together that makes work pay. The Deal substitute would ensure that welfare recipients will be better off economically by taking a job than by remaining on welfare. Our bill emphasizes work first. It has a definite end to benefits, time limits, and it gets tough on deadbeat dads and does a number of

things that we have been asking for for years.

I think one of the things that we are proud of in the coalition is that we have done a considerable amount of work in the food stamp area, and we want to commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] and others for the work they have done in this area. But I think we have done some things that are going to make the bill somewhat better.

Mr. Chairman, I, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BAESLER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], and the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN], have done considerable work on this bill, trying to coordinate the food stamp program with the changes that we have made in the AFDC program in the Deal bill. In fact, this bill includes 19 specific provisions to bring the food stamps and the AFDC programs together on applications, deductions, eligibilities, income, resources, and certification.

I heard earlier the Honorable chairman talk about the fact that their bill is going to give the States the opportunity to coordinate in these areas. We have a bill here where we have done the work, we have already coordinated it, and I think it makes the Deal bill a stronger bill. In the end, I think the Deal substitute is going to be very close to what happens in this Congress.

Our bill in the food stamp area we believe is also tougher than the Republican bill on fraud and abuse. We think we have done a better job to get at those issues. We recognize that there is a lot of good provisions in the Republican bill as well.

Mr. Chairman, I again strongly support the Deal substitute, and look forward to having a vote on that in the near future.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY], a valued member of the committee.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

We continue to hear about the people of America that will suffer under Republican leadership. We have debated a food stamp bill for over 13 hours in committee, discussing what is right and what is wrong about it. The other side can vote against this bill. They can continue to support over \$3 billion of waste in the Food Stamp Program. People buying crack cocaine, trading food stamps for prostitution, exchanging it for cash, buying liquor, cigarettes.

I felt so bad for the woman I followed in the store the other day who brought 100 dollars' worth of food stamps and bought microwave popcorn, ice cream, soda pop, pork rinds. I grew up in a home where my mother was working at an eye doctor's and my father was a high school coach. She used to get the powdered milk and mix it with a full

gallon of milk and stretch it to 2 gallons. We did not buy sodas at home.

The Food Stamp Program needs reform. What we are doing in this Congress is providing reform for a very, very valuable program, but one that in 1979 spent \$6.9 billion, this year \$26.5 billion. Is that something to be proud of? Have times gotten that tough from 1979 to 1995, that the program should have grown by that amount of money?

They say what happens if there are no jobs in the State. Well, in our bill if the Governor or State certifies that unemployment exceeds 10 percent and there are not enough jobs, that 90-days-and-you-are-off provision is waived. There are provisions to protect in extreme unemployment times. There are safety nets. I keep hearing the "safety net" term. I have to call this program a trampoline. People are jumping on it and they do not want to get off. They do not want to change their behavior. They do not want to change their way. People do not want to work. I spoke about this earlier this evening, not enough job training in the programs.

The food stamp program is growing rapidly out of control. I have to suggest that when we talk about the real changes in this program and the real reforms, they are in fact in this bill. And they are tough. We are curbing trafficking in fraud with increased penalties. We are going after people that use these food stamps illicitly and illegally and profit by their use. We are promoting real jobs with new incentives. We want people to work. We want America to work. But we do not want people waking up and growing up and these children we talk about in the abstract who are sitting at home while their parents sit at home watching Opra Winfrey or Jenny Jones or some other talk show, when they could be out in fact working, and inspiring their children to participate in the American dream.

I appreciate the chairman's leadership on this vital issue, and I believe when the American public sees what is in this bill, they will urge people on both sides of the aisle to support it in its entirety.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support welfare reform, but one thing we must not do is rush through changes that hurt children. It is not the kids who have the responsibility for the flaws in our present system; it must not be the kids that pay the most painful and lasting price for the welfare reforms we debate tonight. Unfortunately, it is the kids who bear the brunt of the impact of the Republican welfare reform proposals because of the deep, in fact devastating cuts, they direct at programs which provide for the nutritional needs of these children.

The reform bill does serious harm to child nutrition in two critical areas.

First, the present programs are capable of dealing with future events that impact costs. These include increases in grocery costs, higher school enrollments, or an influx in the food stamp program brought about rescission, which like the last recession can throw literally millions out of work and into a situation where they critically need food stamps for that family.

Capping programs and not sufficiently allowing for growth in enrollment and costs means that by the end of the decade, children will not have the nutrition available that they have had or that they have today. When it comes to feeding our children, under their plan we will be going backwards instead of forward.

Second, eliminating minimum nutrition standards for our states is terribly troubling. Now, I am all for State flexibility, State discretion. But for goodness sake, nutritional needs do not vary State by State. A kid in your State has the same nutritional requirements as a kid in my State. By eliminating national requirements and cutting available funds, we are setting in motion the inevitable deterioration of the nutritional values in our school lunch and breakfast programs. Good-bye milk and hello Koolaid for our kids in the years ahead.

The Republicans cry foul over these charges. They adamantly deny they are cutting anything. But the numbers speak the truth. A total of \$26 billion is cut from WIC, child nutrition and food stamps over the next 5 years, more than a third of the cuts in the entire Republican welfare reform package.

You do not come up with \$26 billion, Mr. Chairman, by reducing paperwork, eliminating waste, fraud and abuse. You get this much money only if you come directly at the meals our kids are presently receiving and reducing them dramatically in the future.

There seems to me something terribly hypocritical about this, because you can bet your bottom dollar as Members of Congress our diets will not suffer in the years ahead. If groceries go up, we will pay it, because we have the financial resources to do so.

But there are kids all over the country who depend on these programs for their basic nourishment, and they will not be able to keep up with rising costs in the future. Kids like the little Will boy I heard about in Grand Forks, ND, Friday. The person responsible for the School Lunch Program told me lots of kids depend on the school lunch and breakfast programs for their basic nourishment, and that in one little grade school in Grand Forks, the poorest section of town, you will find on any given Monday more than 100 kids in line waiting for the school breakfast, perhaps their first balanced meal since the Friday school lunch.

She heard a little boy one day jumping up and down saying, "That smells so good, that smells so good." The breakfast that morning was cold cereal and toast. Even toast to this little fel-

low smelled that good and caused that excitement. Now, this school district is going to have eliminate the School Breakfast Program if the cuts proposed by the Republican majority are enacted, and that little boy will not lose his breakfast; he will also lose his ability to listen and learn in class. Maybe even his edge in being able to fight off childhood illness. As a dietician told me this week, child nutrition is not welfare; it is health care.

Mr. Chairman, I owe it to that little fellow to vote against this harsh and unfair legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in rejecting these cuts for kids.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BAESLER].

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Deal and the coalition bill, the alternative to the Republican bill, for several reasons. First is because it does, as does the Republican bill, simplify the administration of all the programs. Second, it acknowledges that we want people to go to work, but to require them to go to work we have to have child care and in some cases case transportation. I think the Deal bill provides that, whereas I do not think the Republican bill does.

The third reason I support the Deal bill and the coalition bill is because it does acknowledge sometimes people need transition from welfare to work, and in that transition they might need a 2-year period until able to retain their Medicaid card, which I think is important.

The fourth reason is it specifically encourages local communities to get involved to complete the cycle of self-sufficiency. We talk about work, we talk about child care, we talk about other things, but very seldom do we talk about self-sufficiency, and I think that is what we need to be talking about, and the Deal bill provides for that very succinctly.

Regarding food stamps, the Deal bill and the coalition bill, thanks to the work of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CONDIT, and others, provides very strict penalties for those who, much more strict than even the bill proposed by Mr. EMERSON and our honorable chairman, which was very good at the time I thought, but ours is much more strict, particularly on the recipients and also on the violators, much more strict even than the Republican proposal.

The final reason I support the Deal bill is we all know that two words that are sort of underlying this discussion are responsibility and accountability.

□ 2115

I think the Deal bill destroyed the responsibility and accountability, and it does so I think in keeping with the contract with our own conscience here in America and not just with the Contract With America.

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], a valued member of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think the point needs to be made that welfare in this country is not working.

For 40 years, we have been trying to solve the problems of poverty. Politicians created many well-meaning programs designed to transfer wealth to the poor. Over this period the Government has borrowed \$5 trillion and spent \$5 trillion on welfare programs. And what has happened?

Illegitimate births have grown from 5 percent to 30 percent of births; single parent families have gone from 4 percent of all families to 29 percent; teenage pregnancy has doubled; and violent crime has arisen fivefold. We have shown that simply transferring taxpayers' money to poor people doesn't work.

H.R. 4 will reform traditional welfare programs that have robbed people of self-respect by giving them something for nothing. These handouts too often breed a complacency that prevents people from helping themselves. They create a culture of irresponsibility by subsidizing bad behavior.

The current welfare system pays unwed mothers to have babies. It tells women that if they bear an illegitimate child, the government will pay them a monthly allowance and give them a place to live. The resulting explosion in illegitimacy and the breakdown of the family shouldn't surprise us.

Let me read a few excerpts from the February 27th U.S. News and World Report to emphasize the importance of two-parent families:

More than virtually any other factor, a biological father's presence in the family will determine a child's success and happiness. Rich or poor, white or black, the children of divorce and those born outside marriage struggle through life at a measurable disadvantage. * * *

The absence of fathers is linked to most social nightmares—from boys with guns to girls with babies. No welfare reform plan can cut poverty as thoroughly as a two-parent family. * * *

Raising marriage rates will do far more to fight crime than building prisons or putting more cops on the streets. Studies show that most state prison inmates grew up in single-family households. A missing father is a better predictor of criminal activity than race or poverty.

H.R. 4 helps promote families. Too often, welfare discourages traditional families. Benefit formulas have discouraged marriage and encouraged women to have illegitimate children. Government can't create two-parent families, but we can stop encouraging one-parent families. I hope Congress has the determination to make needed changes by: (1) ending payments to teenage mothers who decide to have a baby without a husband; (2) requiring all welfare mothers to identify the fa-

ther; (3) making deadbeat parents live up to their child support obligations; and (4) in the next couple weeks, passing legislation to get rid of the marriage penalties in the tax code.

This bill H.R. 4 also makes needed changes in our food and nutrition programs. The food stamp program costs \$26.5 billion; the school lunch and other child nutrition programs cost \$7 billion; WIC costs about \$3.5 billion. H.R. 4 block grants the WIC and child nutrition programs to the states. The food stamp program, which is the most abused and wasteful program, is tentatively being kept at the federal level. We are making long-overdue changes to improve the program. We also need to stop food stamps from being used for candy, chewing gum, soda pop, and other junk food. If hard-working Americans are going to pay taxes for this program, it should be for nutritious food for individuals who might otherwise go hungry.

States should have the flexibility to modify the eligibility criteria for food stamps. Right now, national standards make a couple with four children eligible for food stamps if they earn less than \$26,692 a year. But \$26,000 goes a lot further in different areas of the country. We need to give states the authority to vary these eligibility requirements, making limited funds better serve their citizens.

H.R. 4 ends many welfare abuses. For too long, we have allowed alcoholics, drug addicts, and those with dubious "functional disabilities" to collect for disability payments. We need to end these abuses and this bill will help to do that.

H.R. 4 is not a perfect bill, but it is a good bill that starts to replace a failed system of despair with more compassionate solutions that encourage work, strengthen families, and offer hope for a brighter future.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for real welfare reform that puts people to work. The Deal substitute does that—it demands more responsibility of welfare recipients by requiring that they go to work after 2 years, and it provides more opportunity by making sure that work pays more than welfare. The Deal substitute is real welfare reform.

But the bill before us, the Personal Responsibility Act, is not welfare reform at all. This bill is more intent on punishing our children than in putting welfare recipients to work. This bill would destroy the School Lunch program and other federal nutrition programs in order to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. That is wrong, and we must defeat this bill.

The School Lunch program works to provide many of our children with the one balanced meal they eat all day. But this bill would cut \$2.3 billion from the School Lunch program over the next 5 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The Children's

Defense Fund estimates that 2 million children will be thrown out of this program—20,000 in my home state of Connecticut alone.

That is only the beginning of the assault on children. Altogether, this bill cuts \$7 billion from important federal child nutrition programs. And it immediately eliminates Social Security benefits for 250,000 low-income children who are severely disabled or blind.

Supporters of this bill have come up with all kinds of creative excuses to defend these cuts.

First, they claim they are cutting bureaucrats, not food for kids. But the entire administrative budget for all U.S. Department of Agriculture feeding programs is just \$106 million per year—just 1.5 percent of these programs' total budget. The Republican plan would cut eight times that amount—\$860 million—in child nutrition programs in 1996 alone. That's cutting kids, not bureaucrats.

Then supporters of this bill claim they are increasing funding for the School Lunch program by 4.5 percent annually. Even if that was true, this increase falls far short of keeping up with inflation, increased enrollment, or a downturn in the economy. This program grows 6.7 percent each year.

Therefore, we are 2 percent short, but the fact is, this promise of a 4.5-percent increase is just that—an empty promise. And the odds are, it is a promise that will never be kept. That is because this bill lumps the School Lunch program in a giant, underfunded block grant, with no guaranteed levels of funding for any specific program.

I intend to vote for real welfare reform that puts work first, but I cannot vote to punish children. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Personal Responsibility Act. Our children are our future—let's not abandon them.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a very valued member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD].

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I first want to congratulate the chairman of the sometimes powerful Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], who has done a magnificent job providing the leadership on this important bill and also to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] for his leadership.

I have a very limited amount of time. I have not met one Democrat or one Republican in all of this House that wants to gut or cut the School Lunch Program. I do not know of anybody who wants to gut or cut the School Lunch Program. For anyone to stand here in the House and proclaim that is just simply not true.

Our proposal will reform the School Lunch Program, will feed hungry children, will provide the nutrition necessary for hungry young people, but it will not gut or cut the program. So I

want that message to go out around the country. It is simply not true.

Our proposal will also reform the Food Stamp Program. Americans know that we have a lousy welfare system. It is fraught with abuse and fraud, and Americans want a change.

And we are going to carry out one of President Clinton's campaign promises. We are going to reform welfare as we know it, and we are going to do it by giving back to the people in local communities and States the responsibility and the financial resources to really deal with the problems. We are going to give back to them not only the responsibility but the resources to carry out these programs. Who knows better than people in local communities who the most needy are? Local people do. I ask support for this important legislation.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield 1½ minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, the current welfare system has created a culture of dependency. It is not working and needs to be changed. The system offers several incentives for welfare clients to shun independence and stay on the dole.

You might ask what could possibly be worse. The answer is the Republican bill before us tonight. It is a harsh, heartless, extremist proposal. It would worsen poverty and hunger for innocent children by making deep cuts in benefits that provide food and shelter. It is weak on work and long on punishment of children. It would cut back the very child care funding that would allow welfare recipients to go to work.

Simply saying no more welfare is not welfare reform. It is a recipe for disaster. A real reform plan would get welfare recipients to go to work. A real reform plan would provide child care and skills, training to move people off the dole and on a payroll.

Reason and compassion demand a "no" vote on the extreme Republican plan. Let us pass a bill that rewards work and protects our children: the Democratic substitute, the Deal plan.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM], a valued member of the committee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I am holding in my hands a 700-page document just released by the Clinton administration that purports to contract Federal EBT services and equipment through a little-known procurement process called IEI or Invitation for Expression of Interest. It is my understanding that only financial institutions, large banks are able to apply. It totally eliminates current electronic transfer companies from bidding.

I am deeply concerned that this document would create a Federal EBT system that will inhibit the individual

States from setting up their own EBT systems. As I understand it, 6 States have already set up EBT systems for themselves, and over 20 States are currently moving to do the same.

With all the efforts we have made to give more flexibility to the States, I am deeply concerned that the Clinton administration is moving to develop a new Federal bureaucracy to deliver benefits to recipients, and I wish to commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Department Operations and Nutrition, for including in the welfare reform package language that will prohibit the Federal Government from doing anything that would stand in the way of States creating and implementing their own EBT systems.

□ 2130

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that this IEI raises some very disturbing questions. With all the attention and action we have had this last few weeks in terms of sending block grants and returning responsibilities and accountability to the States, I am concerned that that document could well throw out the efforts that we have had in trying to return this and allow Federal bureaucrats to block and restrain individual States. I am concerned this will block our ability to allow States to develop programs for their own eligible citizens.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding of the intent contained in the legislation that we are talking about now is that the Federal Government is prohibited from doing anything that would stand in the way of States creating and implementing their own EBT systems. Section 556 of this bill states:

(B) Subject to paragraph (2), a State is authorized to procure and implement an online electronic benefit transfer system under the terms, conditions, and design that the State deems appropriate.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has been an extremely constructive member of the subcommittee throughout these deliberations. I want to thank him for his participation, and for raising the subject, as he has.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Oklahoma is correct in his understanding of the language and intent of section 556.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the bible says: "suffer the little children and forbid them

not." The word "suffer" here is used to mean to bear, to support, maintain, abide and sustain. This passage does not imply that we cause suffering on children, but that we are supposed to support them. Somehow, some way, too many of my Republican colleagues have got the real contract all wrong.

Yes, the system needs fixing, but what system? If this House passes this distorted and destructive legislation, it is not welfare that needs reforming, but Congress, and those who currently regard themselves as its leaders. This bill is flagrantly flawed and poignantly punitive. It falsely assumes that welfare recipients are some lazy, rip-off artists who don't want to work. The reality of course is that 70 percent of all recipients are children, our Nation's children, and the 30 percent adult population is largely made up of those who want to work. And yet, this bill does not guarantee work. No, this is no reform. This bill guarantees nothing, except that after 5 years of benefits, recipients must be cut off regardless of a lack of jobs. This bill does not guarantee job training and education resources. This bill only guarantees that there will be no guarantees. No more entitlements for AFDC, for foster care, for school lunches for WIC.

Twenty-five million of our children are recipients of school lunches. This program ain't broke and we don't need to fix it. The result of the Republicans block granting to the States is either that nutrition standards will suffer, or less children will be fed in times of economic downturn. This bill causes suffering to children of mothers under age 18. This bill does nothing to solve the problem of out of wedlock pregnancies. It does nothing to make welfare dependents whole and productive. This is the most mean-spirited, irresponsible attack on the poor and the youth that our house has ever seen. No matter how my colleagues try to move their contract forward and pay for a tax break for the rich on the backs of the children, there still remains a contract, a law of higher authority for which they will be held responsible. Remember suffer the little children, and forbid them not. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Personal Responsibility Act, and support the Deal substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, we heard many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle expressing their views and their concerns about this legislation. I share the same concerns about cutting fraud and cutting abuse, seeing that our monies are used efficiently for the purpose intended.

Beyond the rhetoric and beyond the policy and beyond the sound bites, beyond everything that we have heard here tonight, I would ask for Members

to come with me to every home across America: a little shanty, a little ramshackle farmhouse. In my area, we have some cardboard and tin-roofed places where the poor live.

I can assure the Members, and I challenge anyone to deny, that in some of those houses Members will find a hungry child that had no supper tonight. Members will find an elderly person that had no supper tonight. I challenge anyone to deny that. They cannot, because that is the fact. That is the purpose for what we use the food stamps.

All the other areas we can address, and we have. It pains me to hear Members using the political "40 years, 40 years." For 28 of those years, those 40 years, we had a Republican President, that Republican President that tried to cut some of the programs. How ironic.

I quote:

I cannot lend my support to the concept of turning back to the States all responsibility for achieving child nutrition goals. In short, we have a continuing obligation to ensure that the nutrition needs of our truly needy youngsters, wherever they may reside, are adequately met. This is and must remain a national priority goal.

Quoting the Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], who chairs one of our committees at this time. That is a quote from the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, to end the colloquy that was previously discussed, I yield 17.5 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the gentleman from Oklahoma is correct in his understanding of the language and intent of section 556.

Further, my colleague raises extremely important points in relation to the approach being taken by the administration's EBT IEI proposal. I look forward to digging deeper into this issue during the oversight hearings which we are going to hold on the subject.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, can we please end the class warfare argument or discussion or partisan exchange and get to food stamp reform? We have had a lot of discussion about school lunches, which is not even part of this debate, we are talking about food stamps. We have had a lot of talk about the food costs and how we cannot really match the food costs.

Only in Washington is a 2 percent increase considered a cut. If food prices go down, food stamps, benefits, will go up 2 percent. It happened in 1990. If the food costs go up, and nobody can predict that, other than the gentleman from Texas DICK ARMEY the self-declared Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in this body, but if food costs would go up we will appropriate the

money with a supplemental, so that deals with the problem of food costs.

Quality control, it is out of control. It is over 8.5 percent. The Panetta plan reduces it back in terms of quality control to 6 percent. That is in part how we control these costs.

Somebody mentioned the WIC program. We are not discussing WIC here. There is \$25 million sitting there in the account of WIC. It was cut \$25 million. We had \$50 million, it is down to \$25 million. They have to advertise on the radio to get more participants. It is a good program, by the way.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Dakota said that some school child in North Dakota was going to go hungry because of school lunches. The Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities has informed this Member \$1 million more next year than last year. We will cut the paperwork and the administration and we will give the money to that very hungry child.

Let us really talk about food stamp reform. In 1985, 19.9 million people were on food stamps. It went up to 20 million in 1990, 22.6 in 1991, 25.4 in 1992, and in 1993, 27.3. When the economy goes down, the food stamps, that expenditure goes up. When the economy goes up, food stamp expenditures go up. We simply want to control the growth of the program. We will address the needs, if in fact they are needed.

The opportunity of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL] is a deal but it is not the best deal. We should be supporting this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence, had come to no resolution thereon.

LET US HOPE REPUBLICANS GET THE MESSAGE

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the other side is crowing about the success of the Contract With America. Well, here is a poll that came out today. Headlines: "Public Growing Wary of GOP. More Now Trust Clinton To Help the Middle Class."

Here are some results of this poll: Most Americans think Republicans are going too far in cutting Federal programs that benefit children, the elderly, the poor, and the middle class. Fifty-nine percent of Americans think Republicans will go too far in aiding

the wealthy. Fifty-two percent of Americans agree the more they hear about what Republicans do in Congress, the less they like it. Fifty-one percent of Americans think Republicans in Congress were trying to do too much in too short a time. Fifty-three percent of Americans trust the President more than Republicans in Congress in protecting Social Security. And 52 percent of Americans trust the President more than Republicans in Congress in helping the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are sending this message to the Republicans on the Contract With America: "Hold it. Be careful. Do not rush it. You are overdoing it. There are some essential programs, cutting the middle class, cutting children, that are going too far."

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD that newspaper article, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 21, 1995]

PUBLIC GROWING WARY OF GOP CUTS

(By Richard Morin)

Most Americans believe that Republican lawmakers are going too far in cutting federal social programs that benefit children, the elderly, the poor and the middle class, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News survey.

As a result, the survey suggests, President Clinton may be slowly winning back some of the political ground he surrendered to Republicans immediately after the GOP landslide in last November's congressional elections.

Clinton also appears to be getting a sustained second look from many middle-class voters who deserted the Democratic Party last year. In a critical reversal of attitudes, people now say they trust Clinton more than Republicans in Congress to help middle-class Americans, the survey found. Barely a month ago, Republicans enjoyed a clear advantage over Clinton.

Yet these doubts about congressional Republicans have not yet appreciably helped Clinton's overall public standing. His personal job approval rating stood at 52 percent in the latest survey, essentially unchanged from last month. And Republicans remain more trusted than Clinton to deal with the "main problems the nation faces."

A total of 1,524 randomly selected adults were interviewed by telephone March 16-19. Margin of sampling error for the overall results is plus or minus 3 percentage points.

The survey suggests that the honeymoon may be over for the House Republican "Contract With America." While a majority of those interviewed still give approval in concept to the contract, 52 percent also agreed with the statement "the more I hear about what Republicans do in Congress, the less I like it." Forty-four percent expressed the opposite view.

Among the public's biggest worries: the the Republican majority in Congress will cut too deeply and too quickly into social programs to finance tax cuts and other benefits to wealthy Americans.

Nearly six out of 10 persons—59 percent—agreed with the statement that Republicans "will go too far in helping the rich and cutting needed government services that benefit average Americans as well as the poor." That's a 14-point increase since January in public concern with Republican initiatives.

Pluralities specifically said Republicans in Congress were trying to make too many cuts

in the nation's education programs and in the school lunch program. (Republican lawmakers argue that they would increase school lunch funding but slow its growth.)

The survey also found that many Americans are wondering if the GOP is moving too fast on other fronts to cut federal spending and programs. According to the survey, 51 percent said Republicans in Congress were trying to do too much in too short a time, while 18 percent said they were trying to do too little and 30 percent said they were doing "about the right amount."

In other ways, too, the survey results suggest people are questioning whether Republicans' zeal to cut federal spending and programs will end up hurting average Americans.

By 52 percent to 38 percent, those interviewed chose Clinton over Congress when asked who will do better in "helping the middle class." Barely two months ago, Republicans held a 49 percent to 41 percent advantage on this measure. And 55 percent said that Clinton understands the problems of "people like you," while an equally large majority said the Republicans in Congress do not.

Republicans retained their advantage over Clinton on such traditionally GOP issues as managing the economy. But even here, the president appears to be closing the gap. According to the poll, 47 percent of those interviewed trusted Republicans in Congress more to deal with the economy, down from 56 percent six weeks ago. At the same time, the proportion trusting Clinton more on economic matters increased from 34 percent to 43 percent.

The survey also suggests that congressional Democrats were successful in their efforts during the recent balanced budget amendment debate to raise doubts about the willingness of Republicans to spare Social Security entitlements from budget cuts.

By 53 percent to 34 percent, Clinton was trusted more than Republicans in Congress to protect Social Security. In early January, Republicans held a 7-point advantage over the president.

Overall, Clinton held the advantage over congressional Republicans when asked who would do the better job in helping the poor, protecting the environment and "protecting America's children," issues on which Democrats traditionally do well.

Republicans in Congress were trusted more than Clinton in reforming welfare, handling crime, cutting taxes and reducing the budget deficit, the survey found.

With the 1996 presidential election 20 months away, Senate Majority Leader Robert J. Dole (Kan.) emerged as the early front-runner for the GOP nomination, volunteered as the choice of 32 percent of those self-described Republicans interviewed. Every other Republican was supported by less than 10 percent of those interviewed.

Clinton was the volunteered choice of 55 percent of those Democrats interviewed, with every other Democrat finishing in single digits.

When matched in a hypothetical presidential election, Clinton and Dole finished in a tie, with each receiving 46 percent of the projected vote.

CLINTON AND THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

[Washington Post-ABC News Poll—March 19]

Do you approve or disapprove of the way Bill Clinton is handling his job as president since taking office in January 1993?

Approve 52 percent; disapprove, 45 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

Which of these two statements would you say represents the greatest danger for the country:

	Jan. 4 (per-cent)	March 19 (per-cent)
Republicans will go too far in helping the rich and cutting needed government services that benefit average Americans as well as the poor.	45	59
Democrats in Congress will go too far in keeping costly government services that are wasteful and out-of-date.	43	34

For each specific issue I name, please tell me who you trust to do a better job handling that issue.

Areas where President Clinton received more trust:

	Clinton (per-cent)	Republicans in Congress (per-cent)
Helping the poor.	61	27
Protecting the environment.	54	36
Protecting Social Security.	53	34
Helping the middle class.	52	38
Protecting America's children.	49	40
Areas where Republicans in Congress received more trust:		
Cutting taxes.	36	52
Reforming the welfare system.	38	51
Reducing the federal budget deficit.	36	50
Handling the crime problem.	41	48
Handling the nation's economy.	43	47
Handling the main problems the nation faces.	39	46
Areas where Clinton and Republicans are equally trusted:		
Upholding family values.	44	45

NOTE: Figures may not add to 100% because "no opinion" is not included. The most recent figures are from a Washington Post-ABC News national telephone poll of a random sample of 1,524 adults March 16-19. Other data are from Washington Post-ABC News polls of approximately the same sample size. Margin of sampling error for all polls is plus or minus 3 percentage points overall. Sampling error is, however, only one of many potential sources of error in this or any public opinion poll. Interviewing was conducted by Chilton Research of Radnor, Pa.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HONORING WILLIAM J. SHADE, A TRUE AMERICAN HERO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLDEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor a member of a World War II, B-17 bomber crew for an act of heroism that, until now, has gone unrecognized. His name is William J. Shade, of Fleetwood, PA, and he was a technical sergeant in World War II. He has been awarded three Oak Leaf Clusters and one Air Medical.

William Shade was a radio operator and gunner with the 545th Bomber Squadron, based in England during the war. He entered the service in November of 1942. He received his preliminary training in California, and was later trained as a radio operator in South Dakota, and took gunnery training at Tyndall Field, FL. He was promoted to sergeant before going overseas in 1943, and while overseas was promoted to staff sergeant and later technical sergeant.

The accounts of William Shade's heroic act are taken from crew members who were saved by his bravery. These men would not have survived the mis-

sion were it not for Mr. Shade's actions.

On March 3, 1994, the 545th Bomb Squadron of the 384th Bomb Group based at Grafton-Underwood in England was dispatched on a mission over Berlin.

The crew had been briefed to expect less than perfect weather over the target. However, the briefing officer believed that the crew could fly above the weather somewhere between 20 or 25 thousand feet. As the mission progressed it became apparent that the bomber was not going to find weather good enough to maintain formation and bomb their target.

Approximately, two thirds of the way to Berlin, the mission was recalled and the B-17 was told to return to England.

Shortly after the bomber had completed its turn to proceed to their base in England, Sergeant "Chick" Metz, the ball turret gunner, requested permission to leave his battle station for a short time.

At this time, the plane was still flying at 25,000 feet. A few seconds later the oxygen control officer, Lieutenant Betalotti checked to see if Sergeant Metz had returned to his battle station, but he did not answer.

After a few more seconds he was again called and still did not answer. One of the waist gunners, Sergeant Alfter, went to check on him.

Sergeant Alfter reported that Sergeant Metz was apparently unconscious and would need some help. About the same time Sergeant Alfter lost consciousness because of lack of oxygen. A third person, gunner, Sergeant Gatzman, proceeded to the access door of the ball turret to give Sergeant Metz and Sergeant Alfter aid, but he too passed out.

Then Sergeant William Shade, looked through the door of the radio room, saw and recognized the seriousness of the situation for the three unconscious gunners, and began to take immediate action.

With no regard for his own personal safety, Sergeant Shade disconnected his own oxygen, and made it to the location of a walk-around oxygen bottle, which was very small and had only a few minutes of oxygen left. He was able to connect the ball turret gunners normal oxygen supply and then was able to connect Sergeant Alfter's and Sergeant Gatzman's supply. All three gunners regained consciousness within a few moments and suffered no permanent mental effects. If it had not been for the Sergeant William Shade's quick action under pressure, the three crew member's would not have survived.

When the B-17 returned to the base, one of the crew members mentioned to the debriefing officer that Sergeant William Shade should receive a medal for his actions. The debriefing officer, said the least that could be done was to give him a promotion. The officer promoted William Shade to staff sergeant then and there.

Following this extraordinary mission, William Shade and the crew flew 12 more times until their 25th mission when their B-17 was shot down over France on April 13, 1944. Mr. Shade was then arrested and sent to Frankfurt, Germany. He was finally transported by cattle-car to Stalag 17B in Austria where he was a prisoner of war from April 13, 1944 to May 2, 1945.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have always answered the call of duty to defend our freedom. The history of our Nation is full of actions of individual heroism.

William Shade may not have received the medal he deserved, but three men have him to thank for saving their lives and it is never too late to recognize the bravery of those who have defended our freedom.

It is with great pride that I honor William Shade and ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this true American hero.

□ 2145

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PETE GEREN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

AN ALTERNATIVE TO WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New

York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today we have completed the first segment of the debate on the welfare reform legislation. This legislation is a key part of the Contract With America, or the Contract Against America. But I would like to place it in the context of the evolving budget development process. More important than the Contract With America or the Contract Against America, whatever you want to call it, is the budget process that is now under way which really establishes the priorities for both parties. It really indicates the vision of America and where America should be going for both parties and for others within the parties.

I would like to speak this evening as the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget task force. We are preparing an alternative budget to show a vision of America which will encompass all Americans, a vision of America which will speak for the caring majority in America, not just the people in need, but the people who have the good sense to understand that they have to respond to the need of the most unfortunate among us. The caring majority budget sponsored by the Congressional Black Caucus would be an alternative to the budget that will be produced by the majority of the House of Representatives. That majority of the House of Representatives really represents the ideas and the interests of an elite minority. The elite oppressive minority has determined they want to prepare a revolutionary budget, a budget with far-reaching consequences, and they have begun that process already.

Stage 1 in that process occurred last week when we passed the rescissions for 1995. It is an ugly word, rescission. Rescission means that for a year that is already in progress, a year that has begun already, a budget that has already begun, a budget that is a result of long deliberations, a budget that is the result of bills and laws passed in the authorizing committees, a budget that is a result of the actions of the last year's Appropriation Committee, Appropriation Committee of the 103d Congress, we went through a long process and a lot of man-hours went into the hearings and the preparation. Finally we voted on the floor the appropriations which went into the budget that began October 1, 1994. That budget was the product of long deliberations in the House and then, of course, the Senate had an equally deliberative process. Then we had to come together, the Senate and the House, long negotiations, a lot of man-hours of very talented people that went into the preparation of that budget. But now the new Committee on Appropriations recklessly come along and they reach into that budget that is in process now and they pull out more than \$17 billion in rescissions.

The pattern of the rescissions shows clearly where the budget process will be going when it begins for the next year's budget. The rescissions affect the budget that is in effect right now, the 1995 budget that started October 1 of 1994 and continues until September 30 of 1995. The new budget that will take effect October 1, 1995, this year, that budget process has just begun.

The way in which the rescissions budget was handled gives a key to what will happen in the budget development that will take place over the next 2 months for this budget year.

The snapshot of where the current majority in this House of Representatives wants to go, the preview of coming attractions that is indicated by the controlling party, the Republicans who now control the House, the people who represent the interests of the elite oppressive minority, their preview is not just startling, it is a devastating statement about where they intend to go. It is a dangerous course that they have laid out.

One cannot say that the oppressive elite minority that is in control, the people who are moving forward in the interest of a very small group of Americans, one cannot say that they are guilty of some kind of secret conspiracy. The conspiracy is not secret at all. It is right there in the open. You can see clearly where they are going. If you can see clearly, then the reaction for those of us who would be the victims has to be a more profound and a more energetic reaction in my opinion. I don't think we should sit still and throw figures and numbers around in a theoretical way.

What the rescissions budget did that was passed last week with the Republican votes—they have the majority and they voted the rescissions budget that they had the numbers to put in place. What that statement that it made with \$7 billion in cuts in HUD, housing programs, most of it aimed at low-income housing, most of it aimed clearly at low-income housing, \$7 billion, the largest hunk that came out of the existing budget was housing, housing for poor people. That is a clear message that was sent.

Did we have to, even if you wanted to reach a goal of \$17 billion, you wanted to cut the budget by \$17 billion, did you have to in such an overwhelming way take so much from one particular department or one particular function like housing? Did they have to do that?

And then there are cuts in education which amount to almost \$2 billion, almost \$2 billion from education, and most of the education programs that are cut are directed at the inner city poor, programs to help poor children.

Then you have cuts like the zeroing out, complete wiping out of the summer youth employment program. Zero. An indication that not only are we going to take the money out of this year's budget, but zero for next year.

Clearly the shotgun is aimed at the places where poor people live. Clearly

there is a demonization and there is a targeting of poor people to begin with. Then there is a more specific targeting of poor people who live in urban areas, people in the big cities who are the basic beneficiaries of public housing. People in the big cities are the basic beneficiaries of title I, which was cut. They are the basic beneficiaries of some of the other education programs like the drug-free schools program that was cut. It is aimed at the inner city poor. The more specifically large numbers of the people who are the beneficiaries are minorities. Large numbers more specific than that are people of African decent, black people.

It is no conspiracy that is in secret. It is clear for any student who knows basic arithmetic, it is clear who the target is, it is clear who the victims are already and who the victims will be in the bigger budget. It is quite clear.

One is reminded of what Shakespeare put in the mouth of King Lear at a time when King Lear's two daughters, two of his three daughters had betrayed him, and King Lear states, "Fool me not to bare it tamely. Touch me with noble anger."

That is Shakespeare's complicated way of saying, "It's time to get mad." Anger is very much appropriate at this time. Anger is the order of the day. If you are a leader of people of African descent, if you are a leader of poor people, if you are a leader of people who live in the big cities, it is time to get angry, it is time to react, because what is happening is revolutionary. These are very large cuts.

Public housing evolved over many years but in a few years it will be wiped out if we allow a \$7 billion cut to take place in the rescission process. Then there is talk of wiping the whole department out, and also at the same time, probably actions generated by some of the targeting of the elite oppressive minority has influenced the White House. The Secretary of HUD, Housing and Urban Development, made a statement yesterday in connection with his reorganization of HUD. They are getting on the bandwagon in too many ways. They are proposing to phase out public housing as we know it, not change it, not reform it, but phase it out. Eventually you will have a system at the end of their process where there will only be vouchers. People will be given vouchers to go out and look for your own housing.

□ 2200

The problem with the vouchers is every year you will probably have a cut in the amount of the vouchers. The problem with most of the programs being offered by the Republicans who are in control of the budget-making process is that everything they set forth and offer as a set amount of money available for a particular function is subject to being cut in the future by the same reckless Appropriations Committee. The same appropriations process will whittle down the vouchers just as it will whittle down

the School Lunch Programs and all the other block grant programs.

So my point is, however, it is clear who is the target. It is clear that the 60 years of social programs that have benefited many different types of people but the programs that now benefit a great proportion of people of African-American decent, those programs are the ones they are targeting, starting with the welfare reform.

The welfare reform, of course, I agree with you. You must have welfare reform. We must make adjustments and try to make the welfare program work for the people who are poor, the people who are the intended beneficiaries of the program, try to make it work and try to make it work with the least possible cost.

I agree with the process of reform. Let us go forward with reform. There is not a single function of government or a single department of government or process of government that can't stand some reform. That is our business. We are here to provide oversight for all of the activities of the government. We are here to deal with reform. So welfare reform is very much an appropriate activity.

The problem is that welfare has been under scrutiny for a long time. Welfare, as we call it, when we say welfare it is short for welfare for mothers and children, what in technical terms is called Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

People refer to that as welfare, but it is really Aid to Families with Dependent Children, a part of the whole Social Security Act, a part of what started with Franklin Roosevelt. Aid to Families with Dependent Children is just that. It is money directed to children who have needs. And the mothers of those children are just the overseers of their welfare, and they are the recipients technically. So mothers and children are the recipients of what we call welfare.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we should reform welfare, try to make it better, just as it is fitting and proper that we reform any other aspect of government, any other function of government, any other welfare that the government provides.

The government also provides other forms of welfare. Nobody ever calls it welfare, but when it is money being given to either victims, poor people who are victims of the economy and can't find jobs or victims of family breakdowns, many times as a result of the facts that the male can't find jobs, the family does break down.

Poor people are victims. Victims of hurricanes are recipients, also victims of floods, victims of earthquakes. They are all recipients of government help because they are victims.

Then there are other people who are recipients of government help who are not victims. They are recipients of government help because a system has been developed which has made them dependent. You know, welfare for the

farmers, for example. Farm welfare, welfare for rich farmers, is an atrocious mutilation of a program that started with the New Deal to help poor farmers.

Poor farmers were helped by the government in many ways. Agriculture is one of our most successful industries as a result of the government helping, but the whole thing has gotten out of hand, and for years now we have had welfare for the farmers which is as great as the legitimate welfare that goes to mothers and children.

I think the illegitimate swindle of welfare that goes to the farmers is what we should be also taking a close look at what we should be scrutinizing very carefully. But that has never happened. Welfare for the farmers is an un-touchable in the budget.

You may be interested in knowing that welfare for the farmers in the form of the price supports, just that one form of subsidy is about the same amount of money that is spent for welfare for mothers and children, \$16 billion—\$16 billion goes to farmers not to grow grain. It goes to farmers, and many of those farmers are very well off. A large proportion of them are not farmers at all in the sense of individuals who are farming. They are people who are on corporate boards of corporations that are agribusinesses.

Most of our farming is done these days by agribusiness. In case you didn't know it, only 2 percent, 2 percent of the population now is involved with farming, only 2 percent. So the \$16 billion that goes to the agribusinesses in the name of helping farmers is not going to help large numbers of individuals out there. It is going to help corporations. It is a check that they got. It is a socialist intervention into the farming industry. They are smothered with socialism.

The agricultural industry is probably the most successful industry in the history of America. As a result of government intervention years and years ago, it is successful. If it is so successful, why do we have to continue to provide a government welfare check to farmers or to agribusinesses? That \$16 billion there in the budget could go for something else. But they have not targeted, my point is they have not targeted agriculture subsidies.

In the \$17 billion rescission budget you won't see any large cuts of agricultural programs. They are not taking a heavy hit like housing or education for the poor or job programs for the poor, summer youth programs. You won't find anything zeroed out for agriculture in the rescission budget.

This is very important to take note of this. Why is it that an activity which involves only 2 percent of the population is an un-touchable activity? How is it that the farm welfare system go on and on? Nobody is talking about ending farm welfare as we know it? How is it that this happens?

The American people ought to take a very close look at the power of the farm lobbyists. We talked a lot about lobbying. We talked about special interests. You should take a close look at how it is done, how 2 percent of the population can go on and on, as long as they want to go, control a whole system of subsidies.

And I have only mentioned \$16 billion worth. The Washington Post told us last year that another aspect of the welfare program for farmers, called the Farmers Home Loan Mortgages, \$11.8 billion, billion, in loans to farmers was forgiven over a 5-year period. We are not discussing reform in that area.

That appeared on the front page of the Washington Post. There was some scurrying around for a while. There was talk of a committee dealing with that. It didn't happen in any significant way.

Then we know, of course, we failed to reform the savings and loans system. Instead of reforming the savings and loan system, we deregulated it. So the savings and loans program, which said that the government stood behind all of the people who have deposited their money in the savings and loans banks up to \$100,000, that collapsed completely, not completely, it collapsed overwhelmingly. And it is costing the American taxpayers as much as \$200 billion.

But we are not laboring to reform a program that has cost you \$200 billion. You can't even get a good report as to where it is right now. It is still going forward.

They are still trying to salvage the money that was lost via the savings and loan swindle. And there are still people running around who pocketed millions of dollars who have not been even called and interrogated, many others who have been interrogated who have never been prosecuted, and many others who have been prosecuted and they never paid a dime, many others who have spent some time, a few weeks in prison, but never paid a dime also. They come out and were millionaires still.

So if you want to reform a significant portion of the government, we should be looking at reform for the savings and loans program. We should be looking at reform for the agriculture welfare system.

That kind of reform is not on anybody's mind. They would prefer instead to target the programs that are serving the poorest people. And programs that are serving the poorest people, unfortunately, disproportionately large numbers of African-Americans are in those programs.

Now, if there is a 10th grader, a sophomore out there listening, the obvious question is why are so many African-Americans in these programs? Why are so many African-Americans poor? Why haven't African-Americans made it? Why are they vulnerable so that we can be targeted by people who are powerful and that we can become victims again?

African-Americans enjoyed prosperity for a very short period of time during the era of World War II and the 10 years following World War II, 20 years following World War II. There were jobs. Jobs were available in the big cities. That is why you have so many African-Americans in the big cities.

They weren't concentrated there before World War II. African-Americans were spread out all over the country, and most of them were in the South, not all of them, but most of them were in the South.

Why were they in the South? Because the South had the largest slave population. Why did they have the largest slave population? Because the South's primary commodity, its primary income crop, was cotton and a few other items that required a large amount of labor, cheap labor, and you had large concentrations of slaves in the South.

They left the South during World War II, and they came north. They found jobs. And if you look at history, examine the period when they had jobs, African-Americans in the big cities had jobs. You will find that there was a relatively small amount of family disintegration, of family destabilization. There were few families with only one parent. There was work available, and when work was available it was possible to maintain stabilized, good families, stable families, and go forward.

But that was only a brief period. The jobs that existed in Washington, DC, in New York, in Chicago, in all the big cities where African-Americans have accumulated, those jobs began to disappear as the economy was mismanaged more and more. And the people who were in charge of our economy gave away our economic base for manufacturing. They gave it away to Japan and to Germany and to Taiwan.

And you know the jobs that would be there for people normally, even without a war and without defense production, were all gone because the entrepreneurs and the investors and the people who own the plants found that they do make greater profits by using cheap labor somewhere else in the world. And that is a pattern that started then. It started 20 years after World War II. And it escalated, and now it is in full boom.

It is the way to go if you are going to produce a product. You don't invest in America and manufacture in America. You find the cheapest source of labor somewhere in the world, and you bring the product back to America. So for that reason the jobs are not there. You have large numbers of African-Americans along with other poor people in the big cities where they came because there were jobs, and they are trapped there.

And we have had an anticity policy. Part of the reason that the policy has been anticity is because there are large concentrations of African-Americans and Latinos, minorities who didn't have any political power, large numbers who could not fight for themselves

because they didn't have political action committees. They didn't have big contributors.

For many reasons, the kind of power you need in America is not present in the inner city communities of our big cities. So, steadily, from the time of Ronald Reagan's first year to the present, steadily there has been an assault on the big cities. Steadily, the Federal Government has taken away programs that benefited the cities.

The savings and loan money that built the shopping malls and the condominiums and all of the failed projects in the Midwest and the West, most of that money came out of our big cities, by the way, because even in the big cities, with millions of depositors, they accumulated large amounts of money in our banks.

□ 2215

The poorest banks are rich in our big cities because the numbers of people who are depositing are so great. Their deposits were taken out and invested across the country in failed projects, and the savings and loan drain that benefited Texas and California, a large part of the dollars came from the big cities. You had war being made on our big cities, and that war has wrecked the black families, has wrecked teenagers' lives, lives of teenagers, and that war continues.

Instead of the present oppressive elite minority trying to rebuild our cities, as they do across the world, most countries are proud of their cities, and they want to rebuild them, a decision has been made by the oppressive elite minority that they want to destroy our cities, that they are going to build an America where big cities do not count; the populations of big cities can be thrown overboard. There is a triage process that we will follow. After all, so many of them are black, so many are African-American.

And in case we do not complete the process with the budget, they have introduced affirmative action, an attack on that, assault on affirmative action to send the message even more clearly that we are targeting African Americans.

The big cities have large accumulations of African Americans, and I would like to get back to the point I was making. Why are they there? I just told you. They went there seeking jobs. The jobs were there. The jobs have been taken away now. So they are there. They are vulnerable. They are poor.

Why do they have to go to the big cities? Because the economy of the South where they were was even poorer. The wretchedness of black families was greater in the rural South before World War II than it is in any big city now. Starvation and hunger, exploitation, a state which was not too far removed from slavery existed for hundreds of thousands of African Americans, because slavery, getting back to

the topic that upsets so many people, slavery left a heritage.

Why are so many African-Americans poor? Because they are victims of a process that never had any mercy in it. They are victims of a process that never offered any real aid until the Great Society programs, the New Deal and the Great Society programs came along. There was no aid of any kind. You had millions of African-Americans who were set free by the 13th amendment to the Constitution. And the Emancipation Proclamation set some free before, and upon achieving that freedom, they were empty-handed. They had nothing.

If there are any sophomores still listening, remember that slavery existed for 200 years in America. Slavery existed for 400 years in this hemisphere. Slavery in South America and the Caribbean area started long before it started here. But slavery existed in American for 200 years, and some people who says slavery was an institution, slavery was an industry. Slavery was an industry, a vile industry, but an industry.

Slaves were recruited. Slaves were imported to make money. Slaves were brought and sold like property. They were bought and sold like machines for 200 years.

For 200 years slaves were handled in a way which reminded them at every point that they were property. In order to accomplish this, slaves had to be treated in ways which obliterated their humanity.

I used the word "obliterated"; an attempt was made. I take it back. They did not succeed fortunately. But an attempt was made to obliterate any sense of humanness in the slave in order to make him a more productive machine, a more productive beast of burden.

Their sense of humanity had to be wiped out. So slaves were bought and sold and deliberately families were not allowed to exist. You know, there might have been 1 or 2 percent of the slave owners who were kind enough to let families stay together or to respect the family unit, but basically, in the slave industry, it was counter-productive to have family attachments. So the slaves were for 200 years in a situation which discouraged any family. Any families which we have, any sense of family which we have, which is very strong in the black community, very strong in the African-Americans community, any sense of family is there despite all of the hardships. That sense of family is there because we the people of the African-Americans communities, the victims of slavery, held on to it, made it happen, and kept it happening. But for 200 years there was an attempt made to make us forget all about family ties, forget all about our humanity in every respect, religion, family, art, culture, everything.

If the sophomores are still listening, just try to imagine what it is like for

a Mexican person who is very poor, owns very little, who comes across the border from Mexico to California as an immigrant; imagine an immigrant in a whole new world, does not speak the language, is poor, and was poor back home, and try to imagine what I am saying when I say that that immigrant, that poor immigrant coming across the border from Mexico to California, is a millionaire compared to a slave being dumped on a wharf somewhere in America and taken to the auction block. Because that poor Mexican has a village, a family, a culture, associates, people to go back to or to remember, reminisce about, to communicate with even after he arrives here.

That poor Mexican probably has some friends or some associates or a community of people who might not know him individually but will receive him in California if he comes across the border.

They are rich compared to what the slave had. The slaves were deliberately cut off from their culture, from their sense of family, from their societies that had been built up over hundreds of years. They were deliberately cut off, and right away they were put on board ships, and they were arranged in ways to separate slaves who came from the same places, even the same tribe or the same languages, and not allow them to be together, because there was fear of mutiny. They did not want them to have any sense of commonality.

So the obliteration process for slaves started on the ship. It continued at the wharf when they were unloaded and sold. They were sold regardless, regardless of any attachments that they might have had. If a sister or brother happened to come together, then nobody would recognize that certainly on the wharf, and then it went on and on for 200 years.

The largest number of slaves that existed at any time in the history of slavery in this country, however, were not people who were brought across the sea. You know, millions were brought across the sea. But the largest number were born in this country. They were bred in this country. Slave-breeding was a basic part of the slave industry.

Why am I mentioning the ugly subject of slave-breeding? Why am I bothering to mention that? Because the history of the black family and the disintegration of the black family, the problems of the black family, are rooted in slavery.

An attempt was made to obliterate any sense of family, and when freedom came, no attempt was made to help in any way, economically, socially, culturally, no attempt was made. So when a sophomore asked the question, why so many black people are poor, why are they so vulnerable, why are they all gathered in the big cities? The answer is they are in the big cities because they came looking for jobs, and they found jobs, and they thrived for three or four decades.

But before that they were in the rural South where they were very poor and never had a chance, because nobody ever gave any help to the slaves after they were set free, and before that, of course, they were slaves, and instead of them being helped by anyone, an effort was made to obliterate, block out their humanity, destroy any sense of family, any sense of culture, any sense of religion.

You cannot suddenly, as a nation or a group of civilized people, say that 200 years does not matter. You cannot obliterate and say it did not exist. That is what the Communists used to try to do in Russia, just wipe out segments of history. It did exist.

After we were set free, the 13th amendment and the 14th amendment, 15th amendment, there was another hundred years of oppression, lynchings, denial of all rights.

So we are talking about 300 years before we had a situation where people could get up and leave the South, come to the big cities. There was nothing to fall back on. Nobody has a parent who gave them anything. They did not inherit any land. They did not inherit any bank accounts.

You know, why are they so poor? Why are African-Americans in such large proportions in the big cities poor? Because their ancestors were slaves, their ancestors were victimized. There was nothing to fall back on to build any economic base.

The miracle is that so many, that there are so many middle-class black families, there are so many people who have overcome all of this. There are so many who prosper no matter what.

The cruelest activity that you could perpetuate would be to target this vulnerable bunch, this vulnerable group of people who are the descendants of slaves. We are the victims. We are the descendants of victims, and now we have been targeted again.

Probably many of the people who are targeting the victims are the descendants of the oppressors, the slave-owners and the slave industry, people who participated in the slave industry in many different ways.

It is time to get angry when you see the policies of the Government of the United States being shaped by people who would cut the budget in ways which seek to wipe out the victims of the descendants of slaves. In this budget process that we are about to embark upon, we are told that there is a desire to save \$722 billion over a 7-year period. The call is for a balanced budget by the year 2002. They said the budget must be balanced, and that is a criteria that is set.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget would not be allowed on the floor. It will not have a chance of getting past the Committee on Rules unless we can show we can balance the budget by the year 2002. All other budgets, they say, must do the same thing. At least, you must show over a 5-year period that the budget that you are

proposing is on a glide path to a \$59 billion deficit in 5 years; \$722 billion in savings must be realized over 7 years; \$59 billion must be the deficit, no higher than \$59 billion in 5 years, and in order to get there, the kinds of cuts that were made last week, \$17 billion in the rescission process, will have to be magnified many times over.

They will have to make even more cuts in housing programs for poor people. They will make even more cuts in programs like the school lunch program, in programs like the summer youth employment program, in training programs for welfare mothers. The cuts will be humongous, monstrous, unless we turn aside from the revolution that is being promoted by the oppressive elite minority now in control of this Congress.

It is a very serious situation. Added to the cuts, as I said before, is the attack, the assault on affirmative action, which doubles the victimization.

We see a pattern in the welfare reform bill that will be repeated over and over in the welfare reform process.

In the bill that is being offered, the element of reform I support, as I said before. We all want to reform any Government program and make it work. The human animal is not an administering animal. We do not naturally know how to administer anything.

So any big activity, any complex activity needs to be reformed from time to time, needs to be revised, adjusted, and welfare is no exception. But we should also revise any other aspect of the Government in the same manner. We have no problem with the reform element.

Welfare is also, unfortunately, a vehicle for the demonization of African-Americans. Welfare is a vehicle for the demonization, first, of poor people. It is a vehicle for the demonization of pregnant teenagers, teenage mothers, and it is a vehicle for the demonization of African-Americans.

□ 2230

How does this happen? Because it has become a code word.

When people think of welfare, the media, the political leadership, have handled the problem and issue in ways which have led to an association of welfare with African-Americans, with black people. So it becomes a demonization.

If we want to really reform it, let us take out the demonization. Let us stop talking about welfare in terms that demonize people. Let us look at the problem. They are a set of victims like other victims the government helps, and let us go forward with reforming welfare in that spirit.

Let us talk about jobs and the need for jobs and job training without calling people lazy. "Lazy" is a ridiculous term to use with the victims of the descendants of slaves.

In slavery everybody had a job, and they had to do it. In slavery they worked people from dawn to dusk. In slavery they worked them every day,

except a few kind slave owners who gave Sundays off. But if there is anybody who knows what work is all about, it is the people who are the descendants of the victims of slavery.

So let us stop the demonization. People are not on welfare who are able-bodied because they are lazy.

In my district certainly, if you have the jobs, for every job you produce there will be 10 or 20 people in line to get the job. There are no jobs, and we have been looking for jobs for decades now.

We have to produce jobs in the Congressional Black Caucus budget, in our vision of what America should be like. We are going to have a job creation program, as we always have had in previous budgets. We are going to have job training. We are going to have job educational programs.

You know, if you give a bright welfare mother a 2-year college education, she can become a part of the middle class, or a degree in nursing, or x-ray technician, or blood work technicians, a number of different jobs that are available for people who have training. But you have to have the money and the budget to provide for that 2 years of training in order to allow this person to bridge the gap and get into the middle class.

When you are demonizing people that are making the assumption that they are lazy, making the charge, then you do not put money in the budget for training and for job creation. There is no money in the welfare program that has been offered by the Republican majority in the House. There is no money, there is no program, for job training. There is no program for job creation.

We started out talking about get off welfare and go to work, and the Democratic alternatives to the welfare program of the Republicans, you are going to find an effort to provide job training. There is money in there for—in the Deal substitute and certainly the Patsy Mink substitute. There is money to provide for training to allow people to get off of welfare, but it is too good a demonization technique and a demonization weapon for the Republicans to seriously deal with jobs and job training and seriously try to reform welfare.

You can have a good election issue if you continue to demonize the people who are on welfare because they are black, because they are teenagers, because they are pregnant. All of a sudden teenage girls become a threat to the moral fiber of the country. As I said before, they are not a threat to the moral fiber of the country. I would like to have fewer teenagers pregnant. I would like to see fewer unwed mothers. The number who are increasing, who are not African American, is great, which means that there is a situation of helplessness and hopelessness that is driving this situation, and we need to correct it before this disease spreads beyond the vulnerable poor populations of our cities and engulfs

other groups. We should reasonably examine it and determine that we are going to provide hope for teenagers regardless of their race or color.

We are going to provide hope, and one area you provide hope is through education, providing the best possible education. Next to the cuts in housing that were in the rescission budget last week, Mr. Speaker, the \$7 billion in cuts in housing programs for low income people, the cuts in education were the second most vicious groups of cuts because they are targeted to eliminate hope for large numbers of young people. The specific cut of the summer youth employment program and the specific cut of the drug-free schools program, those specific cuts are aimed at programs for young people, and they become, as my colleagues know, the most vicious, among the most vicious of all.

If we are going to continue and repeat those kinds of cuts, then we are going to wipe out hope for more and more young people and end up with more and more being caught up in the web of teenage pregnancies and other social ills. Teenage pregnancies are a problem we are going to resolve. Let us reasonably try to get that kind of hope restored to teenagers so that they will not drift into that kind of situation which hurts both the mother and the child. Babies should not be raising babies. Teenagers should not be raising babies. We do not want it, and we should rationally do everything possible to end it.

But do not demonize pregnant teenagers. Do not demonize them and use the code that there is something wrong with black pregnant teenagers, there is something wrong with black families, there is something wrong with the black community. Do not demonize and gain some kind of political advantage by appealing to the gut racism in certain people. Do not let the welfare reform process drift into that.

Teenagers are not a threat to the moral fiber of America. Teenage pregnancies—there was a time when teenage pregnancy was a threat to the moral fiber of America, and I said it before on this floor, and I repeat it to remind my colleagues that teenage pregnancy was a threat to the moral fiber of America, black teenage pregnancy—during the days of slavery, 200 years of slavery when teenage pregnancy was promoted and teenage pregnancy was a profit-making enterprise. Breeding slaves produced more slaves in America than importing slaves from Africa—breeding. Every teenage slave girl was expected to get pregnant as soon as she was old enough to get pregnant, forced to get pregnant. Terrible things could happen to her if she did not get pregnant, and she did not choose the man who made her pregnant. Part of the breeding process was to select the men who did the impregnation. So, that was a threat, that kind of activity which went on for 200 years

in America as a business, the slave business, the slave industry, that was a threat to the moral fiber of America. Like all other aspects of slavery, the moral fiber of America was challenged by the components of slavery.

Thank G-d for Abraham Lincoln. Thank G-d for all the people who lost their lives in the war to end slavery. America has had that burden taken off its shoulder, been able to go forward as a leader of the Free World as a result of that kind of moral threat being removed. So, when you see or hear people talk about teenage pregnancies, it is a serious matter of today, but is not a threat to the moral fiber of America. These people are not demons. The demons were the people who made an industry out of impregnating black teenagers in the slave system, and the breeding pens and the breeding farms. Those were the people who were the demons.

We have been targeted unfairly. I hope that the elite oppressive minority can hear some of these appeals. It is not too late to turn back and look at the process of delivering on the Contract With America, the process on demonstrating that you know how to run the government better than the Democrats. I hope the Republicans will turn aside the game plan that involves demonization and later on an appeal to make it racism.

Candidates who are announcing now for the presidential race in 1996 have placed great emphasis on the fact that they want to destroy affirmative action, affirmative action. When they add affirmative action and the assault on affirmative action to the game plan, as I said before, and my colleagues know that \$722 billion is going to have to be saved over 7 years, you can understand that the days ahead, in terms of decisionmaking about the budget and the targeting of programs that hurt minorities and the targeting of programs that hurt poor people has just begun. Between now and 1996 every candidate running for President will be trying to demonstrate, every candidate running for President for the Republican Party will be trying to demonstrate, that they can go after African-Americans in a more overwhelming fashion and a more targeted and precise fashion, in a more damaging fashion, than anybody else. That is going to be the Willie Horton of 1996.

It is time to come to grips with it right now. It is time that we on the floor of this House understood that we do not intend to sit idly by and allow this kind of demonization and appeal to racism to go on. We do not intend to allow the budget to be twisted and distorted in order to accomplish that purpose.

We want to show a vision of America that, I think, the majority of Americans want, and that is a vision where we apply the tremendous wealth of this country with the richest nation that ever existed on the face of the earth. There has never been anything like America. The wealth is not something

of the past. The wealth is escalating every day. Wall Street is not suffering. We are not on the verge of bankruptcy. We are getting rich faster and faster. Those who have money, the wealth of America is not absorbed by the fact that there is no frontier anymore. There is no frontier in terms of land.

But it seems we have a lot of wealth above us, the broadcast frequencies above us. The bands up there that are now being auctioned off have brought in close to \$9 billion. The people on the air—and we should stop and think about that resource that belongs to us. There are all kinds of ways in which this country can be protected from bankruptcy. There are many ways in which the deficit can be solved once and for all, and you do not have to increase taxes on individuals. We need a whole system of taxation which does not focus on individual income and throw one group of people against another.

In the Congressional Black Caucus budget we shall propose a commission to creatively look at new kinds of tax options, and we should propose some of those tax options to go forward as soon as possible. Why not? As my colleagues know, look at the air waves in a different way, and derive some income through user fees, and let it be known right away. Why not even halt the auctioning process and do some other form of ownership of the frequency bands up there which are going to be very lucrative? And one industry that we know will be very lucrative in the future is the telecommunications industry. One industry that will derive a great deal of profit and revenue will be telecommunications. The industry that the Japanese, and the Germans, and the Taiwanese, nobody in a foreign country can take away from us, is the telecommunications industry.

So, let us look forward to making use of the potential that is in the air above us in ways that benefit all Americans.

Nobody should buy the argument that you have to cut programs for poor people because we are bankrupt. Nobody should buy the argument that we have to cut HUD in order to save money, that is the only place we can save money. Nobody should buy the argument that the summer youth program, which is a relatively small amount of money, has had to cut down to zero in order to balance the budget or in order to save money. We should not buy those arguments. There are many, many ways to cut the budget and adjust the budget. There are many ways to look for new revenue.

All the industries that are based in America that have foreign operations have been let off very lightly in terms of they have taken the jobs away from the workers. The people who own the plants and investors, they reap great profits. There should be some way to get a greater share of those profits and pile them back into the country of origin. There are many, many ways which we should look to new sources of revenue in order to sustain the richest na-

tion that ever existed and to pay for the kind of services, and the programs and the projects that benefit all Americans.

□ 2245

The caring majority, which I think is the majority of Americans, will insist, I think, that everybody be given an opportunity for an education, everybody be given decent housing, everybody be given an opportunity to eat well, that children will have free lunches.

I think the caring majority is made up of people out there who need government help. The caring majority is made up of a majority of people who are not people who need government help. They are just people who are wise enough to know that if this society is going to hold together, if you are going to go forward with the maximum civility, go forward and build a society which promotes the common welfare, the prosperity for all, then we are going to have to care about people who do not have housing.

People in the caring majority do not necessarily want to live next to homeless people, have them come to their homes and eat, but they want them to have a home and want them to have food. People in the caring majority may not want their kids to go to school with poor children, but they want every child to have an opportunity to go to school. The people in the caring majority care about health care for everybody, and they do not think we are so poor that we cannot have health care systems which provide decent health care for everybody.

In the days ahead, as the Committee on the Budget moves to realize its \$722 billion in savings, we have to be on a glide path, they say, showing that the deficit is down to \$59 billion in 5 years. The horrible kinds of devastating cuts that they will propose must be resisted. We must show that an F-22 fighter plane that nobody needs will cost us \$12 billion over the next 5 years, and if we are really, truly worried about bankruptcy and becoming insolvent as a nation, why are we building an F-22 fighter plane, the most sophisticated fighter plane ever devised by the imagination of man. We have already a very sophisticated fighter plane. Put that on a list. Those Americans who think out there that somebody has to suffer, there has to be some cuts, that is the argument we hear, let us spread the pain.

We are not spreading the pain. Seven billion dollars comes out of HUD, housing for low-income people, and you are going to continue to build the F-22 at a cost of \$12 billion over the next 5 years,

and this is a scaled down version of what was proposed originally. If the whole plan was followed and we built all the F-22's that were originally conceived, it would cost us \$72 billion. Seventy-two billion dollars. But just over the next 5 years we are looking at \$12

billion, and nobody is scrutinizing that expenditure and saying we cannot afford it.

The CIA, \$28 billion is the estimate of CIA's budget. If you have to cut something, cut the CIA 10 percent every year for the next 5 years. You will not lose very much. Eldridge Ames and his kind will be taken care of in a less lucrative fashion, but you will not lose any ground in terms of America being secure and competitive. They do not contribute that much at this point. They would still have half of \$28 billion, which is \$14 billion.

Let us spread the pain where it hurts the least. Let us spread the pain by not building another *Seawolf* submarine, \$2.1 billion. If we must make cuts, if we are worried about the future, if you do not want to mortgage our children's future, then there are many ways and places that cuts can be made.

There are a whole list of corporate loopholes that we can start closing. The Committee on Ways and Means has produced a proposal for tax cuts, and one set of analysts has looked at it and spoken to me and told me there is \$1 trillion worth of tax cuts, \$1 trillion worth of giveaways, loopholes in that proposal. One trillion dollars.

Let us take a close look at that bill and those loopholes. Let us look at the tax expenditures as closely as we look at the other expenditures.

In other words, we are going to resist. The Congressional Black Caucus budget is just a tiny part of the resistance. We will not stand by and allow \$722 billion to be saved on the backs of the poorest people in the Nation. We will not allow people who consider themselves revolutionaries to wreck the civility of the Nation, to destroy 60 years of activity and programs. We will not let people go hungry, remain jobless, have less educational opportunity, without putting up the most stringent possible fight.

I appeal to the majority in this House, the people who represent the oppressive elite minority, to turn aside from their effort to create a budget and a game plan, a scheme, that envisages America only for a handful of people, only for a small class of people. We are looking at America for everybody, and we do not seek to throw overboard the most vulnerable. We will not continue to try to throw overboard the poor people in America. We will not continue to try to throw overboard the poor people in the cities. We will not continue to throw overboard the African-Americans among the poor people in the cities. We will not look at the most vulnerable population and attempt to demonize them and use them as a way of guaranteeing the next election.

There is a vicious set of activities in motion, and it is time for us to get angry and call them for what they are. We will challenge the oppressive elite minority, and in representation of the caring majority, we will prevail. The caring majority will counterattack in 1996, and those who are vicious, unyielding, uncivil, who refuse to try

to create an America that belongs to everybody, will find that this democracy cannot be hoodwinked, the people cannot be stampeded into voting against their own interest. The caring majority will stand behind the most vulnerable in our society.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-85) on the resolution (H. Res. 119) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MEANINGFUL WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, tonight with me are the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] in support of meaningful welfare reform that will help all of the people of the United States. We are here to speak out for a compassionate system which does not simply hand out cash and create a desperate cycle of dependence, but instead strengthens families, encourages work, and offers hope for the future.

As you can see from this diagram right here, the poverty paradox, the poverty rate and welfare spending. In the years of the Reagan administration, you will see we did not spend as much money on welfare, yet welfare went down. In the last 2 years, in the Clinton administration, more has been spent, and yet it has been a failed system of welfare.

We are offering an alternative here this week in the House of Representatives that we think is going to be meaningful for all families. We must bring an end to our current welfare system, which abuses its recipients. Nothing can be more cruel to children and families than the current failed policies.

Tonight my colleagues and I will discuss various sections of the Personal Responsibility Act which the House is considering this week. The bill addresses cash welfare, child protection, child care, family and school nutrition, alien eligibility, commodities and food stamps, SSI, and child support enforcement. Our bill, when it is passed, will allow millions of Americans to escape the cycle of poverty and learn the freedom, dignity, and responsibility that comes would work.

We need to evaluate the success of welfare, as the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. J.C. WATTS has said from our freshman class, not by how many people are on AFDC or on food stamps or in public housing, but how many people are no longer on AFDC, food stamps, and public housing.

In that spirit and with the help of our good colleague from Arizona, the esteemed Member of the House of Representatives, J.D. HAYWORTH, I would like to yield to you to discuss the important cash welfare block grant program, of which you have been a leader.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and really, Mr. Speaker, before we get into this discussion, I see our good friend uncharacteristically sitting to the left of me, the esteemed chairman of the Committee on Rules, the Honorable JERRY SOLOMON of upstate New York. You have something you would like to say now, at this juncture?

Mr. SOLOMON. I want to commend you for this special order, but I am still waiting for the papers to file on the rule that will take up exactly what you are talking about here tomorrow. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank you very much. We all wait with interest to see what is hot off the presses in the Committee on Rules, and we thank the gentleman from upstate New York for his valuable service as the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to see you in the chair tonight, as you represent so capably the good people of upstate South Carolina, and it is good to join my good friend from Pennsylvania standing in the well of the House, to address this topic.

It is not my intent to invoke any type of negativity in this debate tonight, Mr. Speaker, but I listened with great interest to the gentleman on the other side of the aisle who calls the State of New York his home, and listened to so much name calling, so much myth making, as we enter this great debate on welfare reform. And let there be no mistake, this will be a great debate.

But again, I would issue a challenge to our friends on the other side of the aisle to come forth with positive, positive welfare reform, because as my friend from Pennsylvania will attest, and indeed, since we are in our first term in the Congress, we have seen and certainly our friend who is the chairman of the Committee on Rules has been time and time again the phenomenon in this new 104th Congress of folks who I believe fairly could be referred to as the Yeah, buts. "Yeah, we need welfare reform, but, the positive plan for change being offered inflicts too much pain." Indeed, I listened with interest to my good friend the Democrat from New York just a moment ago talk about the civility of this society being threatened.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the civility of our society being threatened, but

our very fiscal integrity and our entire society and the survival of that society is being threatened by a system which threatens to bankrupt this, the grandest of all republics, and which threatens to change the very core of our existence.

Some history is in order. Despite the comments of my good friend from New York earlier, the fact is that government at all levels has spent in excess of \$5 trillion trying to eradicate poverty. And as the gentleman from Pennsylvania showed us, we have this poverty paradox, where the more we spend on poverty it seems, the numbers of the poor increase. It is an incredible paradox.

I see our friend the chairman of the Committee on Rules is prepared with a statement now. I would gladly yield time to the gentleman from upstate New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I think the appropriateness would be for the gentleman in the well to yield time.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. We both yield to you, our senior Committee on Rules chairman.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me commend both the gentlemen for taking this special order this evening. It is so terribly, terribly important. I could not help but listening to my associate from New York City speak before, and he used the word compassion, and that we have to spend money on people to be compassionate.

Well, I would just go back and say what I said the other day when we had the rescission package on the floor. What is compassionate about piling \$4.5 trillion in debt on our children and grandchildren? What is compassionate about President Clinton's new proposals that offer the next 5 years to add another \$1 trillion to that \$4.5 trillion debt, thereby increasing the amount of interest that we have to pay to just support that accumulated debt? What is compassionate about that? And what is compassionate about a welfare program that we have been on now for 20 years which breeds second and third and fourth year welfare recipients? Those people want to get off welfare, and they need to do it with what we are planning here today. That is why I am so proud of you two for taking this special order this evening. I wish you well.

In the meantime, I have got the rule which will bring the most significant comprehensive welfare reform that has ever been brought to this House, we will bring on this floor tomorrow.

I thank you two gentlemen, and the best of luck to you. I salute you.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Chairman SOLOMON, we look forward to lively debate tomorrow, moving on to welfare reform with your leadership. We appreciate what you have done to work overtime on this proposal.

I would now like to yield back to let my colleague and good friend from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] continue your discussion on the important reasons why welfare reform, meaningful wel-

fare reform, is so important to the American people.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], and indeed I thank the esteemed chairman of the Rules Committee for again outlining the Rules of this House and indeed our Speaker pro tempore tonight for enforcing those Rules.

It is important to remember that we are a society of laws in this body. We are a society that follows rules. And it is worth noting that the Rules of this House in this new majority are far more open than anything offered during the previous 40 years of one party rule by the new minority.

I mentioned earlier the tale of the numbers. Would that it were only a fairy tale. Would that these numbers were not reflected in cold, hard facts. But it is time for straight talk with the American people.

I refer to the fact that in the last 30 years we have spent at all levels of government in excess of \$5 trillion to try and eradicate poverty. We have failed miserably, and it is fair to ask the question why. Why have these programs, perhaps so noble in their intent, failed so abysmally?

No. In stark contrast to what the preceding gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] said, it is not a vendetta. It is not some demonization of one group of Americans. It is not our intent to set one group of Americans against another group of Americans. The gentleman himself said welfare reform is needed.

Well, as my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], will attest, Mr. Speaker, the debate in coming days the rest of this week will articulate how we are prepared to make changes.

Marvin Olasky has offered a new book, entitled "The Tragedy of American Compassion." And the Rules chairman referred to it just a moment ago when he talked about the true meaning of compassion.

What is compassionate about a system that leaves to our children and to generations yet unborn a debt of untold trillions that they will have to service, that they will have to pay off?

In the past, it was in grand American fashion, no matter if you hailed from the inner city or from rural America, that you would pay off the mortgage and leave a home for the children or leave a farm for the next generation. We have reversed the process under the guardians of the old order. We have basically enjoyed the fruits of the farm and the fruits of the homes and left the mortgage for our children to pay.

So your new majority in Congress, Mr. Speaker, has advanced some significant reforms. Let me delineate them for you right now.

Part of the problem has been that we continue to allow Federal programs to grow like topsy. We have programs that are duplicative, that are redundant and that, quite frankly, are not a

good way to spend the hard-earned money of the American taxpayers.

So what the GOP welfare bill does is, first, consolidate for cash welfare programs, including AFDC and the JOBS Program, into one block grant. The idea again being that people on the frontlines, in the city, States, and towns know best how to spend that money, know best how to attack those problems, lets in the redundancy and allows these great laboratories of democracy to do what they do best.

Indeed, we have seen pilot programs in Wisconsin and in Michigan and we see other States like my home State of Arizona and the great State of North Carolina working to enact workfare programs working on these problems on the frontline. That is where we are talking about. Consolidate these programs into one block grant and allow this battle to be fought more effectively at the State and local level.

Our new majority welfare bill also requires recipients to work with 2 years and leave the cash welfare rolls after 5 years. Again, it is this notion, Mr. Speaker, what is reasonable? Is it reasonable to expect in a free economy where we look day after day at classified advertisements in a variety of publications touting the facts that jobs are available, is it fair or reasonable to allow someone to become a prisoner of this failed system?

No, we need to offer a way out, and indeed we need to offer incentive to leave the welfare rolls and get involved in work. And that is what our plan does by requiring recipients to work within 2 years and to leave the cash welfare rolls after 5 years.

Our plan requires 50 percent of single adult welfare recipients to work no less than 35 hours by the year 2003, a gradual program, not draconian but establishing clear guidelines in a period of time, altogether modest to allow these reforms to take place.

It requires 90 percent of two-parent families to have one adult work no less than 35 hours a week by 1998. In a 3-year period, a chance to get that done.

And we define work as real, private-sector jobs with concurrent education and training permitted. In other words, it is not the role of our society or our government to provide make-work. We want to grow this economy and allow people to find work in the private sector.

Now, in jobless areas it is worth noting, areas plagued by chronic unemployment, indeed many of the areas that our friend from the other side of the aisle mentioned and championed, we allow work to be defined as subsidized work, community work or on-the-job training. So we do provide for those areas where there is chronic unemployment. We do provide every American with the opportunity, the dignity and responsibility of work.

We bar Federal cash to unwed parents. Let me repeat this: We bar Federal cash to unwed parents under 18.

Now, let us emphasize what will transpire here. Because lost in the debate, with so many members of the liberal media failing to articulate and emphasize this point, while we bar Federal cash payments to unwed parents under the age of 18, this plan will still allow for noncash benefits.

Indeed, I refer to Marvin Olasky's book, "The Tragedy of American Compassion," where he chronicles where our society has changed from a caring society to a caretaking society.

And I think it is so important to emphasize that, again, we do not seek to demonize or starve or deprive anyone who is truly needy. But what we believe, as we have taken a look at the failed system, that we ought to be able to provide in-kind benefits to those who deserve them, noncash benefits in the forms of staples and those materials vital for life itself to those, but we do cut out cash payments to youngsters. In other words, we don't have the Federal Government giving money to children who continue to have more children.

We would bar additional Federal cash for additional children born while the mother is on cash welfare. Why is that important? Again, because under this failed system what we have done in our society by any fair and objective measure is that we have subsidized illegitimacy to the point that one out of every three children is born out of wedlock.

My constituents of the Sixth District of Arizona and others I have talked to throughout this country point to illegitimacy as one of the factors, if not the key factor, that can totally undermine our society. So we move to change a failed policy that gives improper incentives to the increase in illegitimacy.

We would bar cash to unwed mothers who refuse to cooperate in establishing a child's paternity. Because we understand in our society that we have rights and we have responsibilities, and it is time for the fathers of this country to, if they are willing to father a child, to go through that biological action, to indeed take responsibility for the paternity of that child.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 4 the Personal Responsibility Act. I believe that this piece of legislation is fatally flawed, and, if enacted, would shatter the lives of millions of our Nation's poor.

I believe there is general consensus that the goal of welfare reform is to move individuals out of dependency and into self-sufficiency. However, in order to achieve this goal, it is vital that the enacted proposal be both cost effective and compassionate to the needs of our Nation's low-income individuals. In addition, the proposal must effectively address the issue of job training to get people off of welfare and into meaningful work. The Personal Responsibility Act thoroughly fails in these areas and is a cruel and callous attempt to eliminate the most basic income support for desperately needy children and their families.

There is no doubt that many of our Nation's poor will suffer under this proposal. Almost 70 percent of the individuals currently receiving benefits, or 9.7 million people, are children. According to the Department of Health and Human Services, it is estimated that more than 6 million children would lose their financial support under this proposal. It is both cowardly and unconscionable to hurt the most vulnerable people in our population. Yet this is the very consequence of this plan.

H.R. 4 jeopardizes the health and well-being of children by making devastating assaults on many of our Nation's existing food assistance programs. Programs such as WIC and the School Breakfast and Lunch Programs would be consolidated into a State block grant, dramatically decreasing the funding available to these programs. It is estimated that in only 5 years, in the year 2000, 2.2 million American children will lose the benefit of a school lunch. In the State of Ohio, an average of 856,514 children eat a school lunch each day. Under the Personal Responsibility Act, 85,600 of these children will be dropped from this program by the year 2000. In addition, this bill eliminates a national nutritional standard which could ultimately mean 50 different nutritional standards—a situation which would be chaotic.

As set forth in the Personal Responsibility Act, States would be allowed to cut off all AFDC benefits after 2 cumulative years of receiving AFDC if the parent had participated in a work program for 1 year. After 5 years, States would be required to terminate both financial assistance and the work program. It concerns me that this provision does not take into account those individuals who earnestly attempt, but are unable to find jobs. In addition, the plan makes very limited exemptions or waivers for the 20 percent of mothers on AFDC with a temporary disability, or the 8 percent who are caring for a disabled child.

In fact, this plan also slashes funding for child care services by \$1.7 billion over the next 5 years. Therefore, a person working to stay off of welfare would find themselves in the unenviable position of leaving their children home alone or in inadequate settings. Without the ability to pay for child care, low-income working families may find themselves returning to welfare.

H.R. 4 unfairly punishes children and their families simply because they are poor. In my community, we have a 20-percent poverty rate in a county of 1.4 million people. More than 228,000 people are recipients of food stamps and more than 137,000 rely on aid to families with dependent children. The average household of three on public assistance receives \$341 per month, or \$4,021 per year from the Government. This punitive measure will undoubtedly endanger their health and well-being.

Mr. Chairman, the pledge to end welfare as we now know it is not a mandate to act irresponsibly and without compassion and destroy the lives of people, who, through no fault of their own, are in need of assistance. On behalf of America's children and the poor, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 4.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the current welfare system is at odds with the core values Americans share: work, opportunity, family, and responsibility. And too many people who hate being on welfare are trying to escape it—

with too little success. It is time for a fundamental change.

Instead of strengthening families and instilling personal responsibility, the system penalizes two-parent families, and lets too many absent parents who owe child support off the hook.

Instead of promoting self-sufficiency, the culture of welfare offices creates an expectation of dependence.

Our society cannot—and should not—afford a social welfare system without obligations. Individuals—not the taxpayers—should be providing for their own families. It is long past time to "end welfare as we know it."

We need to move beyond political rhetoric, and offer a simple compact that provides people more opportunity in return for more responsibility.

I have a few commonsense criteria which any welfare plan must meet to get my vote: It must require all able-bodied recipients to work for their benefits; it must require teenage mothers to live at home or other supervised setting; it must create a child support enforcement system with teeth so that deadbeat parents support their children; it must establish a time limit so that welfare benefits are only a temporary means of support; it must be tough on those who have defrauded the system—but not on innocent children; and it must give States flexibility to shape their welfare system to their needs, while upholding the important national objectives I have just listed.

The Republican bill fails to meet these criteria. The Republican bill is weak on work. It requires only 4 percent participation in fiscal year 1996, far below the current rate established under the 1988 Family Support Act. It is outrageous that any new work requirement would fall below current law.

Moreover, under the Republican bill, States can count any kind of caseload reduction toward their work participation rate, whether those people are actually working or not. In no way does this practice make recipients responsible, or contribute to a change in their behavior.

The Republican bill denies benefits to children of mothers under 18.

We must make parents—all parents—responsible for taking care of their own children. But denying children support is not the best way to do that. Instead, teenagers should be required to demonstrate responsibility by living at home and staying in school in order to receive assistance.

In order for welfare to be truly reformed, it must send a clear message to all Americans: you should not become a parent until you are able to provide and care for your child. Having a child is an immense lifelong responsibility. Only those capable of and committed to shouldering the responsibility of parenthood should have children.

The Republican bill is tougher on children than it is on the deadbeat dads who leave them behind. The Republicans waited until the last moment to put child support enforcement provisions in their bill—and then removed the teeth that can bring in more than \$2.5 billion—over 10 years—for kids. The driver's and professional license revocation provision they deleted would save taxpayers \$146 million—over 5 years—while creating a better life for children.

Instead of attacking deadbeats, the Republican bill attacks children. It eliminates the

guarantee that every child in this country has at least one good meal a day. Despite rhetoric to the contrary, the Republican bill cuts spending for child nutrition programs \$7 billion below the funding that would be provided by current law. The Democratic deficit-reduction amendment was ruled out of order in committee so that kids' food money could be used for tax cuts for the rich.

The Republican bill also changes the child nutrition funding formula to redistribute resources away from relatively poorer States to relatively wealthier ones. Funding for the Women, Infants and Children Program is also reduced compared to current law—and provisions requiring competitive bidding on baby formula have been removed. That decision alone will take \$1 billion of food out of the mouths of children each year, and put the money in the pockets of big business.

This simply defies common sense. No one in America could possibly argue that this is reform.

Our foster care system, already overloaded, is also under siege. In committee, Mr. McCrery stated that, "If a woman just can't find or keep a job, she will have the option to give her children up for adoption, place them in a group setting or foster care." Adoption and foster care services are failing our children. At a time when the need for foster care, group homes, and adoption is likely to rise dramatically, the Republican welfare plan would cut Federal support for foster care and adoption by \$4 billion over 5 years.

We can do better. We must do better. This week, Democrats will offer NATHAN DEAL's bill as a substitute, which reinforces the family values all Americans share. It requires and rewards work over welfare. It makes the point that people should not have children until they are ready to support them. It gives people access to the skills they need, and expects work in return. It does not wage war on America's children. Most importantly, it is a common-sense approach, which gives back the dignity that comes with work, personal responsibility, and independence.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support honest and meaningful welfare reform that gives poor unemployed Americans a real opportunity to work and provide for themselves and their families. All welfare recipients should be given the opportunity to work; those who fail to seize that opportunity should not be rewarded with limitless governmental assistance.

Mr. Chairman, moving recipients off of the welfare rolls and onto a payroll means more than just handing them a copy of the help wanted pages from the local newspaper. Government, working with the private sector which has a real stake in expanding the pool of skilled labor, needs to provide education, job training and child care if we are to be successful in helping welfare recipients become productive gainfully employed citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with President Clinton and many of my colleagues in the majority that argue we must end welfare as we know it. We must reform a welfare system that has trapped millions in a cruel cycle of dependency and despair.

However, ending welfare as we know it does not mean we should completely dismantle the safety net programs that protect our Nation's most vulnerable population: our chil-

dren. Yet that is exactly what the majority's welfare reform plan would do. H.R. 4 would terminate current child welfare programs, including the child abuse prevention and treatment program, and the adoption assistance program, and replace them with a new State block grant at drastically reduced funding. The School Lunch Program would also be eliminated and replaced by a block grant. No longer would a hungry child be entitled to a nutritious school lunch, often the only decent meal they receive all day.

Unfortunately, under the Republican welfare plan, punishing our children for the unfortunate circumstances or unacceptable behavior of their parents goes much further than denying a child a hot meal or failing to protect them from abuse. H.R. 4 would deny benefits to children born out of wedlock to teenage mothers, and limit benefits to mothers who have additional children while receiving Federal assistance.

Illegitimacy is perhaps the most devastating social and moral dilemma confronting our Nation. Yet turning our backs on the real victims of this problem, the children, is a cruel and simplistic solution that seems to be based more on an effort to save money than to change behavior.

Mr. Chairman, we can require parents to act responsibly and become self-sufficient without abandoning our children. Sadly, H.R. 4 takes a radically different approach and will result in untold pain for our children while creating undesirable incentives for teenagers and mothers on welfare who become pregnant.

New York's Cardinal John O'Connor recently said the welfare plan proposed in the Republican Contract With America is immoral in its virtually inevitable consequences.

Mr. Chairman, children in poverty are not a burden on our society; they are the future of our Nation. We can end welfare as we know it, but we do not have to condemn poor children to do it. I urge my colleagues to defeat this legislation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican's welfare reform legislation, entitled, the "Personal Responsibility Act of 1995."

I don't support the status quo. I fully believe that our welfare system needs to be changed. But, the Republican proposal is not strong enough in terms of work.

Under the Republican bill, individuals can receive welfare benefits for 2 years without meeting any work requirements. I don't know about my Republican colleagues, but my voters didn't send me to Washington to write a blank check to anybody. But this Republican proposal does just that. It gives billions of dollars to States without requiring that any of that money be used to put more people back to work.

Meaningful welfare reform can not be achieved unless we move more people from welfare to work. Democratic proposals encourage people to take care of themselves immediately—not 2 years later. From the day one, AFDC recipients would have to prepare for work and aggressively look for a job. Anyone who turns down a job would be denied benefits. The Democratic proposals are tough on work, but promote self-sufficiency, not dependency.

I am opposed to the Republican welfare proposal because it is weak on work and responsibility and tough on children. Children

are the losers in this debate. Under the Republican proposal, 131,000 children in Massachusetts would lose Federal assistance. 400,000 children nationwide would lose child care assistance, and thousands more would no longer be guaranteed a nutritious meal. The Republican proposal punishes children and babies.

In order to make the transition from work to welfare a reality, we need to provide job training, affordable and safe child care, and most of all we need to create jobs. The Democratic alternatives give the American people what they want—an aggressive proposal that requires parents to work, but protects our Nation's children.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, the Personal Responsibility Act is a disheartening, empty charade. It does very little to foster personal economic independence and virtually nothing to reform a welfare system that is in serious need of repair. The Republican bill simply passes the buck to the States. We should call this legislation the Government Responsibility Abdication Act, because all this bill does is to drop the responsibilities of the Federal Government and to push poor people off a cliff. By drastically reducing some benefits and eliminating others, this legislation creates a gaping hole in the safety net we provide for our neediest citizens.

The Personal Responsibility Act misses the major point that any welfare reform should address—work. My Republican colleagues claim that they make people work under their bill. They claim that States are required to have 50 percent of one-parent welfare families and 90 percent of two-parent families in work programs by 1998. But what they do not tell us is that caseload reductions count toward this work requirement. So States can simply do nothing for 2 years, cut families off, and claim that they have put people to work. That is weak on work and tough on kids.

Perhaps the cruelest and most disappointing aspect of this legislation is that it actually punishes those children who, through no fault of their own, are born poor. The bill punishes a child—for his entire childhood—for the sin of being born to a family on welfare.

A child is also punished under this bill if he or she happens to be born to a young parent out-of-wedlock. Although I believe we should do everything reasonable to discourage teenagers from having out of wedlock children, this bill is not reasonable. It denies cash benefits to teenage mothers at a time when both the mother and child need support most. There is no evidence to suggest that teenagers get pregnant in order to collect welfare or that families on welfare have more children in order to collect more welfare benefits.

The most direct and sensible way to decrease out-of-wedlock pregnancies, and all unintended pregnancies, is to make sure that family planning services are available to all who want them. But the welfare bill does nothing to make voluntarily family planning more available or accessible.

Instead of offering our children a helping hand, this legislation introduces them to the harshest realities of life before they are able or prepared to cope. Reform of the welfare system should concentrate on healing families, not tearing them apart.

Without jobs, money, shelter or other assistance, dignity and hope is replaced with desperation and anger. This bill promotes a climate of social unrest and violence. The Personal Responsibility Act does what a responsible government should never do: it takes a difficult problem and makes it worse. There is no doubt that our current welfare system needs reform. But the Republican bill replaces a cruel system with a mean-spirited system. Welfare reform should not punish deserving residents and innocent children and must not take away the last vestiges of assistance that our Government provides.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, in their zeal to balance the Federal budget, the new majority will be forcing working Americans to make sacrifices to cut the deficit. Sacrifices for a debt they did not create. Sacrifices that will cut their hard-earned benefits. And sacrifices that will threaten their future standard of living and that of their children.

While these cuts focus on supposed government waste, one thing has been ignored; Government giveaways or the \$200 billion in corporate welfare we let big business and foreign multinationals pocket each year in the form of tax loopholes and shelters.

It strains belief that we can even start to talk about sacrifice to middle class Americans who have seen their earning power decrease, when industry is not doing its fair share towards reducing the deficit. We must do better.

Today, I am introducing the Corporate Welfare Reduction Act of 1995. The bill will close a number of loopholes that provide unfair tax breaks for multinationals and foreign corporations. For example, the bill would eliminate the following provisions that:

Allow multinationals to use excess foreign tax credits generated by foreign operations to offset U.S. income tax under the so-called "title passage rule".

Exempt foreign investors from paying U.S. tax on the interest they receive from U.S. borrowing.

Allow multinational oil and gas companies to claim foreign tax credits for some of the ordinary costs of doing business in foreign countries.

Enable multinationals to hide behind alleged restrictions in local law in order to avoid complying with transfer pricing rules.

Allow multinationals to profit from the exemption from U.S. tax of their employees' foreign earned income regardless of whether or not that income is subject to foreign tax.

Exempt foreign investors from paying capital gains tax from the sale of the stock in U.S. corporations.

The savings from these provisions will then be applied to reducing the deficit, with a small portion going to export promotion programs for small and medium-sized U.S. businesses.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this legislation and put an end to handouts for big business and foreign corporations.

□ 2310

We offer a funding bonus of up to 10 percent for States that reduce out-of-wedlock births. We provide level funding of \$15.4 billion a year for 5 years. We create a \$1 billion Federal rainy day borrowing fund for recessions or emergencies. In other words, we are not so dogmatic as to believe there will not be emergencies, we are not so dog-

matic as to believe there will not be rolling readjustments in our economy, part of a free society from time to time, people encounter tough times, and we are willing to understand and deal with that.

We allow States to set up their own rainy day funds and pocket any savings over 120 percent of their annual grant amount. We set aside \$100 million a year in a fund to ease pressures on States with rapid population growth. Indeed, the great State of Arizona and my own Sixth District is experiencing rapid population growth. This plan again accommodates those changes in our society. We will save untold billions of dollars over 5 years as opposed to the current system.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. There are questions the press has asked and I just thought there is a myth out there that possibly the gentleman could explain and frankly let people know it is incorrect.

There is a myth that your pro-family provisions that we have in our welfare reform proposal will be cruel to children. How do you answer that?

Mr. HAYWORTH. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows and as I am glad to articulate here on the floor of the U.S. House tonight, I think by any objective standard, even the standards set by our friends on the other side of the aisle, the yeah-buts, the people who say, "Yeah, we need welfare reform but," it is important to remember this. It is the current system that hurts children, because the current system encourages self-destructive behavior, it encourages dependency, it encourages out-of-wedlock births. Our bill does not end assistance to children. Let me repeat that for the mythmakers on the other side of the aisle who would try to gain unfair partisan advantage by wielding a campaign of fear unparalleled in our society, our bill does not, does not end assistance to children. It only terminates cash assistance.

No responsible parent would reward an irresponsible child with cash payments and an apartment. No responsible employer would give workers a raise simply because they have additional children. If people in the private sector, who care about the quality of work being done, who care about the future of their children, who seek to instill responsibility and responsible actions, if private businesses will not do those things, the taxpayers of this country who work from January 1 on through now almost 6 months of the year paying off their burdensome taxes, those taxpayers who work hard for their money should not be asked to do those things, either.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. What about this further myth that has been propagated about the fact that this bill is not strong enough on work requirements? What do you say to that?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think the record will show as the debate continues, our work requirements are very, very tough on work. We require States to

make cash welfare recipients go to work after 2 years. Some States will choose a more stringent requirement. I know the great Commonwealth of Virginia has taken an action to actually offer less time. But that is the option of the State and indeed is that not truly federalism in action?

After 5 years, recipients would face the ultimate work requirement and that would be the end of all cash welfare. We require States to have 50 percent of adults in one-parent welfare families, that is about 2.5 million families, working by the year 2003. We require States to have 90 percent of two-parent families working by 1998. We define real work with only a few limited exceptions as real private sector work for pay. States that do not meet these standards would lose part of their block grant. That is truly being tough on work. That is truly workfare and not welfare.

Mr. RIGGS. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman for his leadership in organizing this very important special order tonight as we prepare to enter day two of what I think is probably the single most important debate that will take place on the floor of this House in the 104th session of Congress. But before we leave the subject of children, I simply want to point out that since it seems like really the ammunition from our opponents is primarily focused on what our plan might do to children, so let me point out that cash benefits going for drugs, generation after generation of dependency, children having children and children killing children, nothing could be more cruel to our kids than the current failed welfare system. Some statistics to back up what I am saying here, 70 percent of juvenile delinquents in State reform institutions lived in single-parent homes or with someone other than their natural parents before being incarcerated. Here is the really staggering statistic. Children born out of wedlock are 3 times more likely to end up on welfare themselves when they grow up than children born to married parents.

Clearly the system that we have in place today has been a monumental failure and a very cruel, cruel, almost inhumane system in terms of how it treats the children entrapped in welfare dependency and entrapped in the poverty that welfare dependency and entrapped in the poverty that welfare dependency generates.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is absolutely right. Your point is well-taken and your leadership is appreciated in trying to move what is truly pro-people welfare reform in this House forward.

I would like to ask if I may another question back to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Repealing the entitlement to individuals has been said by those on the other side of the aisle will cause misery and a recession. How do you respond to that?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Again the current system, and this is the irony. As the gentleman from California mentioned and as indeed our good friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] mentions, the current system rewards States for having additional people on cash welfare. In other words, under this not only bankrupt system financially but I would call it a morally bankrupt system, we gauge its success by the numbers of people we can add to the rolls.

Now think about this. Under a block grant, States will have a built-in incentive to move people off the cash welfare rolls and into jobs. And block-granting will give them the flexibility to do so.

If you doubt it, I would commend, Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side and indeed all the American people to look to States like Wisconsin and Michigan where they are working hard to implement real change in the welfare system. So what we need is to unleash the creative power of States and localities to deal with this problem.

Additionally the bill creates, and this is worth noting for our friends who choose to deionize or mischaracterize our plans, let us repeat this. The bill creates a \$1 billion Federal rainy day borrowing fund for recessions or emergencies, and it allows States to set up their own rainy day funds and pocket any savings over 120 percent of their annual grant amount. That is a powerful incentive for those respective States to save up voluntarily for a rainy day, or given the current level of government spending if we do not curtail it, the inevitable recession that will result.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Let me ask this further question. Your State is growing and many other States are as well.

How would you make sure the block grants will adjust for shifts in population, because the ladies and gentlemen on the other side of the aisle would have the public believe a misconception that in fact the block grants that we are proposing will allow for such shifts?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think it is worth noting that our legislation creates a \$400 million fund to help ease pressures in States with high population growth. It permits States to save unlimited amounts of cash from their block grant in the State rainy day fund for recessions and emergencies, amounts in the rainy day fund in excess of 120 percent of the State's annual block grant amount can be shifted into that State's general fund. That is another incentive to move welfare recipients into jobs. Then again the bill also lets States borrow from a billion-dollar Federal

rainy day fund which they would have to repay with interest.

But finally the bill lets the States shift 30 percent of other block grants, and this is something the other side has chosen to demonize, when in fact it really goes to help children and it really goes to help families who are looking for a hand up and a helping hand instead of a handout, it offers 20 percent of the nutrition block grant into the block grant and vice versa. It really is the ultimate in flexibility.

Indeed, and that is the other side of the nutrition issue, if I could digress for a second, when the other side talks about block grants being inherently evil and how 20 percent of those grants could be moved to other areas, that 20 percent provision is custom-made for this opportunity, not to starve children but ensure that their families who may be encountering tough times have the economic wherewithal to survive those times.

□ 2320

We offer the ultimate in flexibility, and I might add nothing in any act we have proposed restricts States from offering more of their resources gained either through income tax in some States or other revenue-accruing mechanisms in those States from offering even more money for nutrition programs or for helping the truly needy in those respective States.

Mr. FOX. I want to underscore what the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] just said and what Congressman RIGGS has pointed out on the floor many times, and the fact is under our compassionate welfare reform we are actually going to serve more people with less administrative costs and more money for direct services, and I think that is the bottom line.

I would like to yield, if I could at this time, to Congressman RIGGS to discuss not only with the American people, with us in a colloquy, about the alien welfare eligibility program, the food stamp reform, the child care block grants, and the SSI reform.

I know that you have done a great deal of work on this area, and I know your constituents from California appreciate the fact that you have sensibly provided the leadership necessary to move this debate forward so we can help everybody.

Mr. RIGGS. Well, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

And, obviously, the whole issue of alien welfare is very important to Californians, particularly those who voted last November for proposition 187, which would have imposed a flat prohibition on the providing of social welfare services to illegal immigrants. And, unfortunately, the statewide ballot initiative is now tied up in the Federal courts pending some sort of adjudication.

But it is very clear, just talking to voters and looking at the election results in California, that California voters are saying we need to put our own citizens first.

It is equally clear that as we look at a streamlined welfare system, a welfare system that allows us to achieve real reform, a welfare system that allows us to help move people from welfare to work, a welfare system that, yes, through dramatic reform and overhaul will contribute to our overall goal of reducing the deficit and ultimately balancing the budget, that that welfare system cannot provide welfare benefits to aliens.

So what we have attempted to do in the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee on which I serve is come up with a provision that we think will reflect what Americans think and feel on the subject of welfare benefits for aliens, both legal and illegal.

So I want to take a moment because we are going to hear the argument, in fact, it came up today, that we on our side of the aisle are engaged in punitive, almost un-American activities in that we do want to restrict benefits for, particularly for illegal aliens and that we are engaged in a not-so-subtle form of immigrant bashing.

I want to respond to that. I said earlier today on the floor that we are not bashing immigrants. We are giving strength to the longstanding Federal policy that welfare should not be some sort of magnet for immigrants, legal or illegal. We should be putting out the welcome mat for those who want to enter our country legally, who want to go through the process of establishing residency and ultimately achieving citizenship.

But, on the same hand, we should not be encouraging through some sort of perverse incentive in the welfare system the hordes of illegal immigration that those of us who hail from and represent border States such as myself and the gentleman from Arizona have been seeing firsthand for several years.

Again, that is what really prompted the overwhelming response by California voters when they approved Prop 187 in California by a vote of nearly two-thirds to one-third.

So what we are trying to do to eliminate the magnet for immigrants is take four simple steps to reform welfare in this whole area. One, we prohibit legal aliens from participation in the big five magnet programs. And they are cash welfare that the gentleman from Arizona was talking about just a moment ago, food stamps that we are going to talk about in just a few minutes, Medicaid, Title 20, and the SSI program.

And, frankly, the SSI program has been one of the areas that has been most egregiously abused by any number of welfare recipients from legal aliens to children.

I also should point out that we talked a moment ago about AFDC, cash welfare payments, and we have not done a good job to date in bringing out in this debate that citizen children or so-called citizen children, children

□ 2330

of illegal immigrants who are born here in this country and who thereby immediately become American citizens, are the fastest growing group of AFDC recipients in America today.

So what we want to do is go back to the idea of sponsorship. We want to make the alien's sponsor financially responsible for the support of that alien.

We would require an affidavit of financial support that would be legally binding and in fact would be enforceable in court proceedings. We apply, this is an interesting fact. We apply the existing deeming rule to all Federal means-tested programs so that in these programs the income of an alien sponsor is deemed to be the alien's income when determining welfare eligibility.

And, lastly, we authorize Federal and State authorities for the first time in history to go after deadbeat sponsors.

Thus, if you look carefully at our welfare reform proposal in the area of welfare benefits for aliens, we are actually strengthening our current immigration policy, and we are not bashing anyone. That is not our intent.

Now, there are also those who say, well, if you cut off welfare benefits entirely to illegal immigrants, we will have children, the children of those illegal immigrants or the children in those families, literally dying on our streets. And nothing could be further from the truth. We allow both legal and illegal aliens access to noncash, in-kind emergency services.

That is, in effect, the case today in our emergency rooms around the country. So they will have access to emergency medical services at the State and Federal levels. And no alien, legal or illegal, will go without such humanitarian services as a result of our bill.

So as we have attempted to do throughout our welfare reform package, we are imposing stringent measures. We are sending a signal to those who would desire to aspire to emigrate to our country that they have to come through the door legally.

You know, just an anecdote from last fall's election campaign.

I was out actually precinct walking one day in my congressional district, and this was right at the peak of the controversy and the furor over proposition 187. I was walking down the street. I heard over my shoulder a gentleman calling out to me in broken English with an obvious Hispanic accent. And I turned around, and he came running down the street.

And he was very excited, actually, to meet me. And so we got into a nice conversation. And as I had a chance to probe a little bit, he was very excited that a political candidate had just come to his door because he was in his fifth and final year of qualifying for American citizenship, and he was overjoyed at the prospect that he would be able to exercise his franchise as an American citizen and vote in the election.

So I took that opportunity to ask him his feelings on proposition 187, and he looked me right in the eye and said that he was very much in favor of proposition 187. He was in favor of cutting off social welfare benefits for illegal immigrants, because he expected them to do it the right way, the legal way, the hard way, just as he had in qualifying for American citizenship.

So that is the message that we are sending here, and we are clearly stating to our fellow citizens that we really are going to put the rights and the needs of American citizens first.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I just think it is very important to take to heart the real-life experience of our friend from California and say that it is shared by so many immigrants who came in our open door, came into this country in a legal, orderly fashion, and it is not our intent to harm those who would immigrate to these shores legally but those who would come in through surreptitious means, those who would come here to enjoy the fruits of the labor of American taxpayers without being involved in the system in stark contrast to the fine example so many legal aliens set for us, whether they are immigrants from immediately south of our border who come here legally or so many folks who have immigrated here from Asia and from Europe, so many people from throughout this world who have come here legally seeking a better life and true freedom for their families. No one denies those who would come here legally an opportunity. But yet as the gentleman from California mentions, we must take action that is reasonable to stop the flow of those who would reach these shores illegally to take advantage of a system which we have proven tonight has failed miserably and lacks the very compassion the champions of that failed system so claim extravagantly in their rhetoric.

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania would yield on one more point related to, again, the provisions in our package dealing with alien welfare eligibility, I should also point out that we had considerable discussion and even some controversy within the ranks of House Republicans as to whether to deny legal aliens federally subsidized or Federal taxpayer-paid welfare benefits. And what we decided to do, and the proposal that will be before the House tomorrow open for amendment allows legal aliens to draw certain limited welfare benefits, but only if they have served honorably in the U.S. military, that is to say, they are an honorably discharged veteran of the U.S. military, or they are a naturalized citizen, and they have begun again the process of obtaining American citizenship.

I wanted to point out we do make a distinction between legal aliens who fit one or the other of those criteria and those again who break the law by entering our country illegally and who

have put a tremendous drain on the Treasury of border States and, in the broadest sense, the Treasury of the Federal Government through again these waves of illegal immigration that have been invading our shores.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I believe that, based on what I heard from the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], it seems clear to me what you have reached in your committee is a compassionate balance between those who are in fact legally here and deserve to have certain benefits and those who are illegal and who frankly the restrictions are appropriate and fair.

Mr. RIGGS. That is exactly the case, and we are again making a very blunt statement here, make no mistake about it. This action in this legislation puts the House of Representatives firmly on record in two respects. One, we obviously, by denying any welfare benefits at all to illegal immigrants, set a strict policy and a very clear standard for our country. We are, in fact, drawing a line.

And, secondly, we are sending a message that Federal immigration policy needs to be revisited and reformed, and the reason that I am so strongly in favor of these revised and stringent alien welfare eligibility standards is that with respect to legal immigration we are putting responsibility back where it belongs. We are putting the responsibility back on the shoulders of sponsors. We are telling the people who sponsor those legal immigrants into our country that they will bear a financial responsibility, and that is as it should be rather than substituting the Federal taxpayer for those sponsors.

So this is a good balanced compromise, and I believe it is one that is deserving of the support of our colleagues, and I would hope and expect that this particular part of the welfare reform package will receive strong bipartisan support from the House over the next few days.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I believe that it will, and I would ask that, if we could, for the purposes of making sure the Members of the House are aware of the further reforms, could we talk about how the food stamp reform proposal is actually going to make sure more benefits get to those in need and we eliminate some of the abuses and the fraud that have existed prior to now?

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield, I think perhaps I should point out to my colleagues, and certainly for those viewers who are joining us now, that we do have a series of charts that show the principal elements of our welfare reform bill, and what I have put up here are the highlights of reform to the Federal food stamp program.

Now, many of our fellow Americans know that this particular area of the Federal law is overdue. It is overdue, but it is also overdue for

reform. What we are doing here is obviously we are preserving food stamps as an entitlement, a direct Federal entitlement, as a part of the Federal safety net for the poor, and we do anticipate and make provisions for participation in the program in the overall rolls, the overall number of food stamp recipients to grow in a recession. We do require able-bodied recipients, age 18 to 50, without dependents, to work, again, as part of our overall workfare approach to reforming the welfare system.

We let States deny food stamps to cash welfare recipients who refuse to work. The message is if you are able-bodied but unwilling to work or get job training or some form of vocational skills, then you will be denied benefits altogether.

Another keypoint, we allow States to convert food stamps to cash wage supplement for persons who agree to work. So what we are doing there is allowing food stamps to augment the basic welfare grant or the cash welfare grant for people who agree to work.

We allow States to engage in electronic transfers in lieu of a cash block grant.

There are stories that are renowned and quite legion about food stamp recipients exchanging their food stamps for all sorts of different items—

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Drugs.

Mr. RIGGS. Liquor or drugs, obviously items that go far beyond the basic food supplies or foodstuffs that the food stamps are intended to provide. We limit cost-of-living adjustments to 2 percent-per-year, and as a result of reform in this area, again, since what we are attempting to do here now is through welfare reform and discretionary spending cuts, domestic discretionary spending cuts in the Federal budget, is making a significant down payment on deficit reduction that will, before the 1996 fiscal year is out, start our country on the path of balancing the Federal budget by the year 2002, and the reform to the food stamp program will contribute \$18.2 billion over 5 years again as part of our overall deficit reduction effort.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I know that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] and I are, on the Government Reform Committee, often talk about the problems that you have discussed in your committee, Education and Labor, dealing with the abuses in the system, where most of the people who receive the benefits of the program are in need and it is justified and applying for food stamps and compassion of the country does what it can.

What have we done in the system to intercede, to make sure that the problems you outline with illegal drugs and using the food stamp money for alcohol or other nonnecessities of life, what have we introduced into the system to make sure that those kinds of abuses do not continue?

□ 2340

Mr. RIGGS. Well, one of the primary reforms is the one I talked about where States can set up an electronic transfer system. That is to say where food stamp recipients can get credit at a grocery store or, you know, at a location where they would be buying food stamps, but it would be done again on a more of an electronic transfer basis, or almost like a credit card, in lieu of food stamps that could be converted for cash or converted for items that again would not be essential foodstuffs. That is one of the principal reforms that we have acquired here.

Another obvious reform is requiring able-bodied recipients, again ages 18 through 50 without children, to work in exchange for their food stamps, and then again allowing States to deny food stamps altogether to those aged 18 through 50 who do again not have dependent children, but who refuse to work.

So, there are again stringent standards in the food stamp reform area to cut down on the rampant abuse that we have experienced with this program and has been well documented back here in Washington for many years.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and listened with great interest to our friend from California outline many of the reforms.

One other reform that I think is so vital, because again, despite the propaganda and the labels of mean spiritedness about our proposal that the defenders of the tired old system continue to propagate, I think it is important also to note that this legislation would harmonize the aid to families with dependent children and the food stamp program, allowing States to use one set of rules for families applying for food stamps and AFDC, and, by providing that one-stop service, would actually make the entire process more recipient friendly, and it would make the programs more taxpayer friendly by eliminating red tape, and indeed, when you strip away all the hyperbole from the arguments and ask, I believe, a fairer question of the other side, why this constant defense of the status quo, we come to understand that in fact the minority party, many of the liberals in that party are in fact championing the continuation and the growth of the bureaucracy. They are championing the duplicative type of problems we have had.

That is all I can really draw from their arguments and their opposition, and we are trying to change that, not out of mean spiritedness, but out of public spiritedness, the idea being that even those recipients are entitled to more efficient service, though truly needy in our society should benefit from a program that will treat them with some dignity, not only inspiring those able-bodied folks to work, and to

look for work, and to really be involved in our great, free market economy, but also on the governmental side to downsize, and I think much of the hue and cry comes from those who quite candidly would rather work in the public sector, would rather have these programs duplicated instead of appealing to what is—makes preeminent common sense from my viewpoint and what is just reasonable, and that is to combine these programs to serve the needy recipients and, again, to cut out excessive governmental waste, and I think that reform is vital to be mentioned.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, Congressman HAYWORTH, I think you are right on target with the message. I think part of what is important is what the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] spoke about moments ago, goes to the work requirement, but it also carries with it job counseling, job training and job placement, and, where necessary, even day care to make sure that those who really want to work have the opportunity to do work, and, after all, everyone wants the right and the opportunity to be all they can be.

I would like to turn back, if I could, to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] to explain the kinds of abuses we have had with SSI and where the program that the Republican majority has presented tomorrow will help to solve the problem.

Mr. RIGGS. Well, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for yielding because the SSI, the Supplemental Security Income Program, has been just rife with abuse for years.

I am a little bit embarrassed to admit that one particular abuse, disability payments to drug addicts and alcoholics who refuse to get any kind of treatment or rehabilitation, that particular abuse was highlighted through a 60 Minutes segment that focused in on actually a local tavern in Eureka, CA, in Humboldt County, the largest county in my congressional district, where the friendly bartender or tavern keeper was actually cashing these checks for the local residents who had qualified for SSI.

So, we are focusing in on ending these glaring abuses, ending disability payments to drug addicts and alcoholics again who refuse to undergo any kind of treatment or rehabilitation program, who refuse to acknowledge that they have a problem and need help, which is the first step on the road to recovery.

We end cash payments for children made eligible through individualized functional assessments, IFAs, another growing abuse of SSI and the overall Federal welfare system. It has become almost common knowledge that one way to scam the system for families on welfare with children is to take them through this process wherein again they are diagnosed as individually—as individually impaired or functionally impaired and thereby enable the children to collect SSI benefits. We make

only children with severe medical disabilities eligible for disability benefits. We provide more SSI medical and nonmedical services to severely disabled children. We require States to conduct continuing disability reviews every 3 years for most children involved in the program, and we set aside \$400 million for additional drug treatment and research to again help those who want help with their problem and who, in effect, should be eligible for SSI at least during the duration of their treatment and rehabilitation program.

We are not cutting SSI for kids. What we are doing, again, is trying to provide more funding for severely disabled children while protecting taxpayers against the growing abuse of the SSI program that has been well documented, again, in evidence presented to the Congress.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. What of the child care block grant program? Is that your next proposal?

Mr. RIGGS. Well, we have touched on that at some considerable length, the job care block grant program, and it is quite likely that we will see an amendment here on the floor. The child care block grant is obviously very important to helping people move from welfare to work. Now we recognize that many single mothers struggle against heroic odds, and if we, in fact, are going to assist them in making that transition, we need to help them with adequate quality child care and health care benefits.

So what we have done in the child care block grant is consolidate eight child care and development programs into a single block grant. We actually enable States to direct more funds to child care services even while providing level funding, and I believe that that funding will be increased through an amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON]. We preserve parental choice provisions in the current child care development block grant. We require States to have and meet their own safety and health laws for day care providers, and again we propose initially level funding of 1.9 billion a year for 5 years, although I believe the gentlewoman's amendment would increase that in the neighborhood of \$750 million more, again recognizing that quality child care is paramount to helping people make that transition from welfare to work.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I just want to thank our good friend from California for delineating so many provisions in our Welfare Reform Act that we will talk about tomorrow, and certainly many more provisions remain, and we invite, Mr. Speaker, all the American people to be involved in this debate in this new partnership, and I think it is fair to mention that people at home are saying, "Well, what does this mean for me, for the taxpayers of America, for those who are working to provide

for their families and who are providing through charitable sources, and also through their tax dollars, for the truly needy?"

What we are saying is it is time to change the system. And for those who find themselves entrapped in this system that would lead to a growing cycle of dependency, we are saying take heart. Benefits will remain for the truly needy, but we offer you an opportunity to truly become involved in this system, to understand and enjoy the dignity of work and the fruits of your labor and to really become involved in this grand experiment we know as the last best hope of mankind.

□ 2350

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Our current system is so perverse to people, if they have savings, you cannot be on welfare. If you want to own property, you cannot be on welfare. It actually discourages the child's mother to marry the father because she will lose welfare. So what we have tried with these Republican proposals is frankly to give a better system to trim the fat from the budget, but to give the benefits where they belong, to those who really are in need, and not those who abuse the system that was outlined by the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. I would like to sum up. Again, as I said earlier today, several hours ago now on this very floor, it is time to get real. We all know the system is broken. We know that today's welfare system destroys families and the work ethic and that it traps people in the cycle of Government dependency and promotes intergenerational dependency on welfare. So what we are even deferring to do now in this historic debate is replace a failed system of despair with reforms based on the dignity of work and strength of families that move solutions closer to home and offer hope for the future.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. With that final statement from the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], I want to thank also the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership [Mr. HAYWORTH], in trying to move this Congress forward in meaningful welfare reform that is compassionate and cares for people and will respect the rights of all individuals in the United States. I want to thank the gentleman for participating in this special hour on behalf of the House of Representatives. I want to thank the Speaker for his leadership and assistance in this regard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WALKER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOLDEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOLDEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LATHAM) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. SEASTRAND, for 5 minutes, on March 22.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOLDEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.
Ms. PELOSI.
Mr. BEVILL.
Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Ms. WOOLSEY in three instances.
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mr. MANTON.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. DURBIN.
Mr. MINETA.
Mr. TORRES in two instances.
Mr. EVANS.
Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.
Mr. EDWARDS in two instances.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. PICKETT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LATHAM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.
Mr. COBURN.
Mr. MCHUGH.
Mr. MCDADE.
Mr. BLILEY.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. BATEMAN.
Mr. GOODLATTE.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1. An act to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and State, local and tribal governments; to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 22, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

560. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of March 1, 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 104-49); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

561. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the People's Republic of China, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

562. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Germany (Transmittal No. DTC-31-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

563. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, African Development Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the African Development Foundation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on International Relations.

564. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing appropriations for the Peace Corps; to the Committee on International Relations.

565. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Certification of the Fiscal Year 1996 General Fund Revenue Estimates and a Recertification of the Fiscal Year 1995 Revenue Estimates in Support of the Mayor's Budgets for Fiscal Years 1995 and 1996," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

566. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

567. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting GAO's monthly listing of new investigations, audits, and evaluations; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

568. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

569. A letter from the General Council, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

570. A letter from the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting GSA's report entitled, "Audit of the Thomas Jefferson Commemoration Commission"; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

571. A letter from the Freedom of Information Act Officer, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico; transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

572. A letter from the Executive Director, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting the 1994 annual report in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1998, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

573. A letter from the Chairman, Cost Accounting Standards Board, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the fifth annual report of the Cost Accounting Stand-

ards Board, pursuant to Public Law 100-679, section 5(a) (102 Stat. 4062); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

574. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report entitled, "Managing Federal Information Resources: Twelfth Annual Report Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980," pursuant to 44 U.S.C.; 3514(a); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

575. A letter from the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Act of 1984, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the American family and create jobs (Rept. 104-84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 119. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence (Rept. 104-85). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia):

H.R. 1267. A bill to reconnect families to the world of work, make work pay strengthen families, require personal responsibility, and support State flexibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Judiciary, Commerce, National Security, Banking and Financial Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1268. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a comprehensive program for conserving and managing wetlands in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BONO, and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1269. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1974, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe by regulation the representation of "Woodsy Owl"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CANADY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BONO, and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1270. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for the registration

and protection of trademarks used in commerce, in order to carry out provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORN (for himself, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BASS, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FOX, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. TATE):

H.R. 1271. A bill to provide protection for family privacy; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 1272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for the payment of postsecondary education expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1273. A bill to amend the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 relating to the payment of wages to employees who use employer-owned vehicles; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 1274. A bill to limit assistance for Turkey under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act until that country complies with certain human rights standards; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1275. A bill to ensure the competitive availability of consumer electronics devices affording access to telecommunications system services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CONDIT:

H.R. 1276. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to provide for private servicing of rural housing loans made under section 502 of such act; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 1277. A bill to improve procedures for determining when a taking of private property has occurred and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to report to Congress with respect to takings under progress at the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 1278. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce tax benefits for foreign corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 1279. A bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself and Mr. TORKILDSEN):

H.R. 1280. A bill to establish guidelines for the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 1281. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, and the National Security Act of 1947 to require disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act of information regarding certain individuals who participated in Nazi war crimes during the period in which the United States was involved in World War II; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1282. A bill to provide employment opportunities to unemployed individuals in high unemployment areas in programs to repair and renovate essential community facilities; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 1283. A bill to provide grants in cities to establish teen resource and education centers to provide education, employment, recreation, social, and cultural awareness assistance to at-risk youth; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 1284. A bill to establish a program to provide grants to improve the quality and availability of comprehensive education, health and social services for at-risk youth and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1285. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide a specific definition of the requirement that a purchaser of real property make all appropriate inquiry into the previous ownership and uses of the real property in order to qualify for the innocent landowner defenses; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONO, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BROWBACK, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BURR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COX, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CREMEANS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART,

Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRISA, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MARTINI, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MICA, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. NEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. POMBO, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TATE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THORNBERY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. VOLKMER):

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution regarding the appropriate congressional response in the event of the reduction or elimination of the commissary and exchange networks of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Firefighter Challenge; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONIOR:

H.R. 1286. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Gibraltar*; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MINETA:

H.R. 1287. A bill for the relief of Nguyen Quy An and Nguyen Ngoc Kim Quy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 44: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HORN, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 70: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 78: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 118: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 123: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. PARKER, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 127: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 142: Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 159: Mr. NEY and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 240: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. FOX.

H.R. 250: Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SABO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 297: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 328: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 339: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 341: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 389: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 390: Mr. WARD, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PAS-TOR, and Mr. CHRYSLER.

H.R. 394: Mr. GOSS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 436: Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 447: Mr. FILNER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. FARR, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 483: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 491: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 516: Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 526: Mr. POSHARD, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 527: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 530: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 556: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 557: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 580: Mr. WILSON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 656: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 662: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 698: Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 700: Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. POSHARD, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. STUMP, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Ms. DUNN of Washington, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 708: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 713: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PARKER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 746: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 773: Mr. QUINN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 785: Mrs. FOWLER and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 789: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 803: Mr. THOMAS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 858: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. POMBO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 860: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 881: Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 899: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PAXON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. FORBES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 932: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. COOLEY.

H.R. 939: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 957: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BONO, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 959: Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 982: Mr. PARKER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 985: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FROST, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 991: Mr. KLUG, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STARK, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MINGE, Mr.

VENTO, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 1002: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1003: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1005: Mr. NEY, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 1023: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 1045: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1047: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1055: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1061: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1103: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 1119: Mr. HOKE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1120: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. PRYCE, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1124: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1150: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1160: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1200: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1202: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WYNN, Mr. REED, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1208: Mr. GOSS, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. METCALF, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.J. Res. 16: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. BISHOP.

H.J. Res. 70: Mr. MASCARA, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. NEY, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.J. Res. 76: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. BOEHNER.

H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. BACHUS.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETRI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MINETA, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FROST, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. YATES, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. KING, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BUNN, of Oregon, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. FOX, Ms. LOWEY, and Mr. ROYCE.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. BONIOR.

H. Res. 39: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WARD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MORELLA, and Ms. LOWEY.

H. Res. 98: Mr. THORNTON, Mr. FOX, Mr. FILNER, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HOYER, and Ms. LOWEY.