

as a mayor, as a community activist. I want to do what is right for America, but let me tell you the system today does not work.

Over the past 30 years we have had two wars in America. We won one, that was the Cold War. We spent \$5 trillion on defense. Today the Berlin Wall is down. We have seen Communism fall and the investment we made worked.

The second war was the war on poverty. We lost that war and we spent about \$6 trillion on poverty programs that in inner city areas and in areas where I taught school and grew up actually created disincentives for people and actually took away self-pride, self-initiative and took away the ability of people who were poor to feel good about who they are.

We are trying to change that. We may not get it right the first time, but for someone to question our motives, like somehow we do not care about kids or somehow we do not care about what people eat is absolutely ridiculous. It is not just ridiculous, it is absolutely offensive.

As a Republican who has crossed the arty line on many times, to support family and medical leave, strike breaker legislation, efforts to deal with programs serving the working people of this country, environmental legislation, I take exception to the kind of characterization that is occurring on this House floor that says that Republicans do not care about people or people problems. That is not what we are about.

We have a series of programs in this country that are not working. Talking about school lunch. The largest school district in my district, Upper Darby Township, population 100,000, has opted out of the Federal school lunch program for almost a decade; even though they border west Philadelphia and even though they have 100,000 people in the school district, they have chosen voluntarily not to be a part of the school lunch program. Now maybe they know something that we do not know, at least our Democrat colleagues do not know down here about the school lunch program. For almost a decade they have opted out; they do not want any of our money; 100,000 people in an urban school district have chosen in my district not to partake of the school lunch program.

Where are the doom and gloom predictions that were supposed to have occurred in Upper Darby Township? How could a school district that serves a population of 100,000 people that chose not to be in this program have their children dying of hunger and starvation? Where are the answers from our liberal friends?

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this debate would be on factual information, and cut the rhetoric and the garbage coming out of Members on both sides of the aisle in terms of welfare reform.

CHILD NUTRITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to rise today to speak on the same topic of child nutrition and really again say that so much of what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, I can remember sitting on a picket line many years ago when I was a news reporter, and the company that was being picketed had said they were going to open their books to the striking workers, and I asked one of the grizzled old union fellows who was out there, I said, "You know we can go in there and take a look at those figures." This striker looked at me and said, "Well, you know, figures don't lie but liars sure know how to figure."

And let me say a lot of the rhetoric I have heard from the other side of the aisle would remind me you can shuffle figures any way you want to, but the bottom line is when you take a look at the proposal of child nutrition we have given a whole new meaning to the term women and children first. We are whacking women, we are whacking children, and we will see more children going hungry because of this welfare proposal that is being put forward by the majority side.

□ 2310

There is not any doubt about that.

You talk about increases, 4.5-percent increase, yes, there are increases. But they do not account for the fact that food prices are going to go up. They do not account for the fact that in most of our districts we are seeing an increase in the number of children coming into the schools. They do not account for the fact that is spots throughout this country, we currently, because the Federal Government has the ability to adjust when there are recessions in certain areas, when there is a high rate of unemployment in a certain area, to get that additional funding in there.

We are going to see under a block grant program for child nutrition far less money going in to provide the same level of food that we have today. Five million children across this country are going hungry today under the current system. You are right. The current system does not work. It needs to be tweaked, but not giving as much food, not accounting for inflation, not accounting for increased enrollment, not being able to move food where it is needed is certainly not the answer.

I was just at a school in my district on Monday with leader DICK GEPHARDT, who happened to be coming through our area. It happens to be in Aliquippa, PA; now, Beaver County, in which Aliquippa is located, is of those counties in what we commonly refer to now as the Rust Belt of our Nation, that saw a tremendous decrease in the number of jobs in the 1970's and 1980's. In fact, in 13 counties in southwestern Pennsylvania, we have seen a loss of 155,000 man-

ufacturing jobs, and it just so happens that Aliquippa is one of those towns that was hit the hardest. In one day in 1982 they lost 15,000 jobs in one small town when one steel mill went down, a 7½-mile-long steel mill along the Ohio River shut down in 1 day.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that causes a lot of problems. Those problems persist today. But through hard work we have begun to get some reinvestment back in that county. We are beginning to see some of those steel industries not adding 15,000 jobs at one whack, but adding a few hundred here, a few hundred there, and our industry is coming back.

At a time when there is a ray of hope, we are going to tell these children in Aliquippa, 80 percent of whom qualify for free or reduced meals, that we are going to change the rules on them now. Many of these kids who are eligible for free or reduced-cost breakfasts, and the teachers will tell you they cannot teach children that cannot eat, and they will tell you on Monday morning many of these children come in and they are famished. You can tell that they have not had adequate meals over the weekend, and the parents will tell you that they have children that they have to depend on the free and reduced meals, and that block-granting will not get it, that the ability to take 20 percent out of the block grant to pave roads, to build sewers, to lay water lines is not going to put food in the mouths of these children.

They will tell you that children do not vote, and there is going to be a temptation in 50 States across this Nation for some people to decide to take more of that money out of child nutrition and put it into projects where people do vote.

What are we going to have, Mr. Speaker? Are we going to have 50 different social laboratories across this Nation? Fifty different social laboratories where we attempt to see if we are able to do a better job than the Federal Government?

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there are people in States that are going to do a better job, but there are some that are going to do worse.

This is not something that we want to risk.

TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 23 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

THE WELFARE ISSUE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I just was going to talk tonight about term limits. I wanted to respond very briefly and share with the gentlewoman who is here from Washington State some views on the welfare issue.

I cannot help but respond on the question of the block grants that have

been talked about all evening by members of the Democrat Party and the minority, how they think that if we block-grant money for child nutrition and other welfare programs to the States, to let the local governments and the States decide how to spend this money in detail and specificity, that somehow all of this is going to mean something terribly harmful to children and to others. That is just nonsense.

Just like with the crime block grants, just like with any other block grant program, where we pass the money back to the States, it seems to me the Republican Party recognizes, and I think the American people who really think about it do, that government closest to the people governs best and knows best. Washington is not all wise. The Federal Government is not all wise.

But there have been people who were in power for 40 consecutive years in the United States House of Representatives who stand on the other side of the aisle and come to the well person after person tonight to talk about why Washington knows best and what great harm is going to occur because we let the money go back to the States and to the local governments to decide exactly how to use it, and within the framework of the parameters we give them, they have got to use it for child nutrition, in the child nutrition area, they have got to use it for certain specified reasons in welfare, for assistance to those who really are deserving of it.

Why should we in Washington be dictating all the minutiae, running the program, doing it in these old-fashioned ways with entitlements where we know lots of people on welfare today are abusing that system and will continue to abuse it?

The worst case of all, of course, is the situation of the illegitimate mother and welfare mother whom we have heard about many times over who gets on the system and stays on it for year after year after year.

And with that, just for a couple of minutes with the time we have got, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington. I think you have got a great illustration of Sally, I believe you call her.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. If it were not so sad, you know, Sally is a happy name. I have known Sallies who were happy, but the Sally I am going to talk about is not happy.

Sally is 18 years old, but you know, Sally is probably the reason we are in the welfare debate today, because America's people sent a group of us here and said, "Change welfare, change the system."

Sally, when she was 15, did what a lot of little girls do. They thought if they got out of their home and got a baby, got in their own place, that they would be happy, because they would be independent. And Sally saw a couple of other girls in the housing close to us do that, and she thought that looked good. She had not seen the misery yet.

But you know, once she got pregnant, and she did know how to get pregnant and how not to get pregnant, she got into that housing, and about when she was 16, and she got scared, and I think the interesting thing about Sally is you go visit Sally, is she was brave, and then scared, and she was still a little girl, and all I could think about was this little girl out on her own by herself under the name of compassion with this baby. If she had not been pregnant, we would have put this little girl in a foster home or group home, if she was unhappy at home, but because she was pregnant, we put her out in tenant housing.

You know, that tenant housing, that group housing, is not always the nicest place to be. It was not for Sally. You know, Sally got scared. Before I knew it, Sally had a guy shackled up with her. He was not young. He was in his twenties. Still Sally was still a kid.

But, you know, once they are out there, there is nobody to watch. She felt safer. You could not convince this little kid it was not going to be a good life, because she felt safe with him, and not too long, Sally had another baby, and Sally is 18, and this guy is gone.

Now, Sally, there are over 500,000 Sallies we have identified, and this bill is about Sallies. Sally is going to be on welfare over 10 years average. Actually many Sallies will be on most of their lives.

What is even worse is what is going to happen to her kids. Sally's little kids are only going to see, unless we can find some way to get her out of welfare and onto her feet, all they are going to see is her mom who goes to a post office and picks out a check and does not work for it. That is what we have to do with this welfare bill. That is why I like the welfare bill we are working on, because it would not have put Sally on the street. It would not have given her money.

It would have taken care of her and foster care, if she needed it. It would have encouraged her to stay home, but I bet Sally would not have gotten pregnant to begin with.

Now that Sally is there, we have to do something to help Sally, and this is a tough love for Sally. Sally is scared. She is going to stay there unless we figure out a way to say, "Sally, you are just going to stay here so long, and you are going to get off."

That is what I like about what we are doing. I like the child care supplement. I like the idea the health care going on so she can get off. Mostly I like the idea that says, "Sally, you have got 5 years total. You are going to work on it. You know, your kids get big enough, you're going to have to go to work. But there is an end."

And I think the best thing we can do for Sally now that we have trapped her on welfare by an unfeeling system is to help her off, and so I wanted to share Sally tonight with you, because I think what we have gotten into is numbers and rhetoric, and the people sent us

here to fix the system that they know has trapped people in welfare.

Do you know that most of them start as teenagers? Over 50 percent that are now on welfare are kids, and if we do not stop that level, then they grow up, and they stay on welfare, and they are on long-term welfare, not the safety net, but that safety net becomes a spider web, a trap that holds them and literally sucks the very lifeblood out of their life and destroys their children.

□ 2320

Mr. McCOLLUM. Well, now how does the Republican bill that we are offering out here, welfare reform, very briefly in your judgment change this for Sally?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Well, for right now, now that Sally is there, she probably wouldn't be there to begin with under this bill because we wouldn't give her cash assistance and put her in her own home.

We would tell the States, she is a kid. Treat her like a kid. She gets pregnant, help her. Help her at home. Do whatever. And if her parents are needy, make sure you supply medicaid, medical care for her, food, but don't put her out on her own.

But now that Sally is there, under this bill we get done amending it, she will have the ability to get child care to help her get back on her feet while she is starting to go to work. She will get health care ongoing. And Sally again will know for certain that she can't stay on forever.

One thing I found with these young girls, and I have worked with several, is they get out there and they lose all their self-esteem. They just believe after a few years there is nowhere to go. And it is awful hard each day to want to go out, but if they know they have to, that is going to make a lot of difference.

It will mean that they will see hope as they are pushed out a little bit, but we will carry them out and help them out the door of poverty. And that is what we will be doing for Sally, a compassionate hand up and a little push out as we bring her back into freedom from the poverty and slavery of welfare.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Well, far from being anything radical, the Republican proposal actually is a common-sense approach to trying to correct a very bad deficiency in the welfare system that has allowed the Sallies of this country to continue down a hopeless road, and a hopelessness not just for themselves but for the offspring that they produce who then become a part of the welfare system.

It seems for those who want to criticize this, they offer no real meaningful alternative. I cannot hear on the other side of the aisle in all the rhetoric tonight anything more than wails of, hey, you guys are bad guys. Somehow you are going to, by trying to correct this problem for Sally, do some gosh awful evil out there.

We are not about that. You are as compassionate a person as I have heard out there tonight, and I know you are.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. The American people know this makes sense. They know it makes sense. They sent us here for change.

With all you are doing on term limits, I feel they sent you here to continue to beat the drum for term limits in spite of the fact that you get beat up on it occasionally. You fought for it real hard. Tell us where are we at tonight and how did we get where we are and what is the hope for term limits?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I would like to do that a little bit. I would certainly be glad to share with the gentlewoman. I know you have had the experience in Washington State. I have had it in my State.

The history of term limits goes back a long way. The limited time tonight doesn't allow us to go all they way back into delving into it.

I would say rotation in office or term limits was something that way back in the days of England was conceptualized. And when our Founding Fathers began to look at our Constitution and our way of government, we had term limits for legislators. In the original kind of Congress that we had before the Constitution was adopted, there were limits on the length of time somebody could serve.

James Madison, who wrote a good deal of the Federalist papers we are familiar with, was a big believer in term limits. Somehow in the debates over the Constitution that got left out. And for quite a while in our country it didn't really make much difference, but the history shows that around the turn of this century we began to see careerism, professionalism creep into government, and we began to see Members serve long periods of time in the House, not just a couple of terms and then go home.

The length of time that somebody had to spend in a period of a given year for serving in Congress stretched as we began to reach the middle of this century much longer than anybody could have conceptualized.

We are now today virtually a year-around Congress. We have a very big government. We have a lot of things we have to do as an institution. Now, many of us, you and I, I guess, would like to shrink the size and scope of the Federal Government, and I believe over time that will occur, but it will never return to the days that our Founding Fathers envisioned where Members of Congress came perhaps here for a month or two at the most each year and then went back to their jobs, served maybe one or two terms in the House and went home again. We have long since passed that.

Today I think there are some very valid reasons which have been put forward why so many across this country, nearly 80 percent of the American public, have come to support term limits. They don't always recognize why, but I

would put them in about three categories. I don't know that these are necessarily in the order of importance. In fact, I am going to save the one, I think perhaps the most important one, to the end.

One of them is the fact that we have had power vested in the hands of a very few people who served as committee chairman for years and years and years, and that power emanates to the point that they decided what would come to the floor for votes, what came out of the Rules Committee. Just a handful of people determined a great deal about what happened in this government of ours.

Now, when we Republicans took over with our new majority and your freshman class came along, that ended in terms of the rules. We changed the rules of the House so that you can only serve for 6 years as a committee or subcommittee chairman.

But that is not permanent. Who knows what is going to happen next year or the year thereafter? The only way you can permanently end the kind of potential problems and abuse that comes from a handful of people holding power for years and years and years in this Congress through chairmanships of committees and leadership posts is by a constitutional amendment to limit the length of time somebody can serve in this House and Senate. That is one reason.

The second reason why I think the term limits has been a very important concept and grown in popularity is because of the fact that we have a need to reinvigorate this body with fresh faces regularly.

Yes, we had a big turnover this time. We have had it for a couple of times in a row in the House of Representatives, but that has not been the norm over the past century, and it probably won't be the norm over the long haul unless we limit terms so that we can bring new voices from the community in here.

And, yes, we will give up a few experienced people who we would like to have here, but I am confident, as I think most term limits supporters are, that there are literally thousands if not hundreds of thousands of Americans out there ready to take their place with creative new ideas that can give us a spark and more than make up for the absence of the experience we might lose with a few people who leave.

And then the third and perhaps the most important reason we really need to have term limits is to end this careerism I mentioned earlier. The fact of the matter is that only if we limit the length of time somebody can serve in the House and Senate will we take away what has become the compelling reason about this place for all too many of us, and that is to try to get re-elected, to spend time pleasing every interest group, every faction, as James Madison would call it, in order to be sure that the next time around we will get back to coming back to Washing-

ton again to serve and to stay here for that length of time. You cannot end it altogether, but we can mitigate it by term limits and only by term limits.

Now, I would like to relate this into the present situation in the very limited period we have. I am going to ask the gentlewoman a question or two about that in a minute, but in perspective from a Washington, DC, standpoint, I think it needs to be understood that just two congresses ago in the 102d Congress there were only 33 Members of the House of either party willing to openly embrace the idea of being a term limits supporter.

In the last Congress, in the 103d, the number grew to 107. In the eve of what is going to happen here next week, it is certainly monumental. We are going to have a vote, a debate and a vote on the Floor of the House of Representatives for the first time in the history of this Nation on a constitutional amendment to limit the terms of Members of the House and Senate, and I fully expect us to have well over 200 members voting for one term limits proposal or another.

Now, I think that is truly remarkable. Now, it takes 290 to get to the two-thirds required in order to send the constitutional amendment to the States for ratification. But it is remarkable whether we get to the 290 or not, A, that we are just having the debate and, B, that we are going to have the numbers probably double or better than double who announce support for term limits in the last Congress to this Congress.

A lot of that comes because of the State initiatives, like your State and mine, Washington State and Florida, we have, what, 22 States now, I believe, who have passed term limit initiatives.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, I think so.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Tell me briefly how has it gone in Washington State, your home State with regard to term limits.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Term limits was passed, and we were sued on the congressional portion, but the rest of it for the legislature is going on. And it is a 6 year for the House. And, let's see, what is it for the Senate? I think it is three terms for the Senate.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. For the State legislature?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Yes. Then it is for the Congress and the Federal also, I always say Congress and the Senate, the House and the Senate at the Federal level. You can tell I have been in the State level too long. That is a good reason for term limits at the State level.

□ 2330

But we passed term limits, and it became real important last year in our elections because the Speaker of this body that stood there for many years in the majority decided to sue the State of Washington over term limits, the people of the State of the Washington.

They didn't take it lightly. As you can see, he is no longer here. He was defeated.

We saw him as a rock. Nobody would ever move this man. But what he did is show the people the arrogance of this place by suing the Washington State people who had passed this initiative.

Now, we are still in court over the Federal portion, but he is out of office. And the people sent us with a very strong message Do not mess with what the people did.

So that is probably part of the mix here that is a little bit difficult for some of us. Anything that does not protect our State's rights gives us a little bit of a problem.

So tell us how are we going to overcome that hurdle.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. We are going to have several options out here on the floor next week. And while many of us are going to debate which one is the preferable one, a lot of us are going to conclude, I think rightfully so, that if we are ever going to get to 290 and do what the public wants and have a national constitutional amendment that limits the terms of the Members of the House and Senate, we are going to have to pull together on a common bond on whatever emerges out of the great debate that will take place.

Next week, we are going to have a rule that brings to the floor three hours of general debate where we can talk about it like this among ourselves like this. It is going to bring us an opportunity to vote for four different options.

There will be a base bill, which is something I have sponsored for a number of years. It will be known as House Joint Resolution 73. And that bill will propose that we have an amendment to the Constitution that limits the length of time Senators and House Members serve to 12 years in each body: Six 2-year terms in the House, two 6-year terms in the Senate.

And that they be permanent limits. That is, you cannot sit out a term and run again. Once you serve 12 years in one body or the other, that is it.

There is no retroactivity to this particular proposal, and there is no touching of the question of whether or not the States-passed initiatives are to be held inviolate or whether they are to be disturbed by this amendment.

Which means that the Supreme Court, which is now hearing the case involving Arkansas and may hear the Florida and Washington State cases eventually, when it makes its decision, it will make its decision.

According to former Attorney General Griffin Bell, who represents both the Arkansas State issue and the Washington State issue, it will make its determination under the McCollum amendment free of any burden. Whatever they decide will be the law of the land.

If they decide the States presently have the power to make the decisions

that they have been making and that is upheld as constitutional, then the State individual initiatives will still bind the term limit issue. But if they decide that the State initiatives are unconstitutional, then the 12-year limit that I would propose would be a national total limit across this country. That would be uniform.

Now, there will be three other options.

One of those options will be an option for a 6-year term in the House and 12 years in the Senate.

One of the options that will be offered out here will be to include a provision that allows specifically, regardless of the Supreme Court decision, that the States can decide under a 12-year cap for the House lesser limits, perhaps 6 years, eight years or whatever it might be, but ingrain that in the Constitution, something that is not there now, but that some Members really should be actually placed there regardless of what the court decides.

Then there will be an effort to try to establish retroactivity, that is to apply term limits, whenever they become effective, to Members now and say if you served however many years, bang, that is it.

Those will be the proposals.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Does this have any votes, that last one, the retroactivity?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I think there are probably some, but I think the biggest problem is it is going to be proposed by some Members of the other side of the aisle who really do not believe in term limits.

There is a good deal of cynicism out here, and the problem with that is that we have not really seen yet what all is going to come forward, but there are certain Members who really do not believe in term limits, and they are going to try to figure ways to be able to vote and have cover and hide behind that vote.

And I think retroactivity is probably a device to do that. It is one that many of the term limits organizations believe is that kind of a device. They are very worried, I think, because they do not want to be criticized for being opposed to them, but they are not willing to vote for whatever comes out at the end.

As you know from your experience in Washington State, no State initiative in the 22 States that have passed term limits has had the retroactive feature. And the one that did try it was your State of Washington, and the voters defeated that, and you came back with one that was not that way.

I would like to wrap up by pointing out something that I think is important, particularly to my proposal on 12 years.

I personally do not think that it is good and healthy to have the length of time the Senate serves and be limited to different from what the House serves. I think it will make the House

an inferior body. I think it will make it a weaker body vis-a-vis the Senate.

So I think whatever we determine, whether it is 12 years or 6 years or any other number of years, the Senate and the House should serve the same number of years. That is true because of conference committees and a lot of other reasons.

I also think that 6 years in particular is too short a period of time. We need people who are experienced in this body in order to serve as chairmen of committees, and we need people who can be in leadership who have had some experience here. Otherwise, you do fall into the trap the critics of term limits say, and that is that there will be staff who will dominate that place.

I think there is a call and a good reason to say when we have finally decided with a constitutional amendment that goes to the States that three-quarters have to ratify a constitutional amendment on it, that at that point in time we really should have uniformity. It should be the same throughout the country at that point in time.

Although my version of this amendment that is proposed out here today would still leave open the opportunity for the Supreme Court to decide that there could be a hodgepodge out there, it is unlikely in my judgment that that side will come out. If the proposal that is being offered that will give the States an absolute right to make that decision were to be adopted, then forever it would be ingrained in the Constitution that we would have a hodgepodge of some States having 6-year terms, some 8, some 12.

I personally believe, and I think a lot of people do, that it does not make good sense, and it is not good government. And it is the Federal Government's responsibility to make this kind of decision, just as we did with the 17th amendment when we decided direct election of U.S. Senators was preferable to the old system of electing those Senators through the State legislatures, even though there were those at that time who debated the issue who wanted the question of elections left to the State as a States' rights matter.

Ultimately, the States do decide any constitutional amendment. Three-quarters of the legislatures have to ratify. That is States' rights. Once that is there, once they have decided, it seems to me that the best bottom line is whatever they do decide.

The key thing, though, is we are going to get the first-time-in-history vote on term limits out here next week. All of us who support term limits, regardless of our view on the variations, ought to vote for the final passage, and we ought to encourage people to help get this movement going and pass the word that we are really going to have the vote and, by golly, whoever is for term limits ought to be here for the last word when the final version, whatever it is, is left standing at that point in time.