Representative E. Clay Shaw Jr., Republican of Florida, said the comparison was ''an absolute outrage.''

The Congressional Budget Office said this week that the Republican bill would cut $69 billion, or 6 percent, from projected spending of $1.1 trillion on welfare, food assistance, child care, Medicaid and other programs over the next five years. The cuts appear larger—about 11 percent of projected spending. If Medicaid is omitted from the calculations, as Democrats say it should be. The bill makes only minor changes in Medicaid, the health program for low-income people.

The outlook for the bill in the Senate is murky. Senators of both parties have expressed doubts about the House Republican plan to give each state a lump sum of Federal money to help the poor, with few Federal standards or guarantees. Many senators say the Federal Government must retain more responsibility for the use of revenue raised through Federal taxing power.

Representative Harold L. Volkmer, Democrat of Missouri, attacked the Republican bill as ''very mean-spirited, very radical.'' Much of the money saved by cutting aid to the poor would be used to finance tax cuts for the wealthy, he said.

The welfare bill, a cornerstone of the Republicans' Contract With America, would replace several programs, like Aid to Families With Dependent Children and the school lunch program, which guarantee benefits to anyone who meets the eligibility criteria, with direct cash payments to states. The states could then use the money in any way they chose to assist low-income people.

Republicans are still wrestling with the concerns of anti-abortion groups and some Republican lawmakers who say that provisions of the bill would encourage abortions. Those provisions would prohibit use of Federal money to provide cash assistance to children born to unmarried women under 18 or to women of any age already receiving welfare.

House Republican leaders said the ban on cash assistance for those children would probably remain in the House bill. But they said they might accept amendments allowing such families to receive assistance in the form of vouchers, which could be used to buy diapers and clothing for the children.

Representative Bill Goodling, Republican of Pennsylvania, said current welfare programs had ''enslaved'' the poor. And Representative Gerald B. H. Solomon, Republican of upstate New York, asked, ''What is compassionate about welfare programs that encourage dependency for two, three or four generations?'' Democrats said they were not defending the current welfare system.

In its report on the bill, the Congressional Budget Office made these points: The proposed work requirements for welfare recipients are unrealistic. The bill says that half of single parents and 90 percent of two-parent families on welfare must work. Based on experience with work programs in the past, the office predicted that no states would meet those requirements.

The Federal Government would save more than $5 billion a year by making legal aliens ineligible for Government benefits that they now receive. The budget office said 1.7 million aliens would lose Medicaid coverage, while 1.1 million would be denied food stamps.

The bill would cut $20 billion, or 14 percent, from projected spending on food stamps over the next five years. About 800,000 of the 27 million people now on the rolls would lose their benefits because of work requirements, which stipulate that able-bodied people 18 to 50 with no dependents must work at least 20 hours a week.

Of the 5 million families now receiving Aid to Families With Dependent Children, 2.8 million would lose some or all of their benefits. The number of disabled children receiving cash benefits under the Supplemental Security Income program would be reduced to 538,000 from 900,000.

Representative Sander M. Levin, Democrat of Michigan, told the Republicans, ''You use a meat ax against handicapped children and their parents.''

WORK REQUIREMENTS—TEMPORARY FAMILY ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANT

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, we do need to reform the welfare system. I rise in support of the Deal substitute and wanted to raise one issue to my colleagues.

Yesterday during this debate the Utah demonstration, welfare demonstration, was raised by one of my colleagues on the Republican side as an example of work requirements which work, which H.R. 4 was patterned after. I would like to just share a memorandum from the State of Utah Department of Human Services and let me quote:

We do need to alert you to the impact which one key element, prescriptive work requirements, will have on our own very successful welfare reform demonstration program. Our understanding is that the work requirements were modeled after Utah's program. The following is meant to clarify that the prescriptive work requirements of title I are not congruent with our policy.

They go on to say that the act, as drafted, would prohibit this approach, the act, as drafted, would require dramatic changes in how SPED is operated in Utah. I would urge my colleagues to support the only bill which does follow the Utah work requirements approach, the Deal substitute.

[The letter referred to follows:]

STATE OF UTAH, DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SALT LAKE CITY, UT.

To: Laurales Sorensen, Legislative Analyst, Governor's Office, Washington, D.C.

From: Robin Arnond-Williams D.S.W., Deputy Director.

Date: March 9, 1995.

Re: Work Requirements—Temporary Family Assistance Block Grant.

It has come to our attention that the House Ways and Means Committee has now completed its mark-up of welfare reform including Title I. Temporary Family Assistance Block Grant. On behalf of the Department of Human Services, I want to express our appreciation to you and Joanne for allowing us maximum opportunity to provide input into this process. While we believe the final product embodies the core tenets of welfare reform and will strengthen efforts to move individuals off assistance and out of poverty, we do need to alert you to the impact which one key element—prescriptive work requirements—will have on our own very successful welfare reform demonstration program. Our understanding is that the work requirements were ''modeled'' after Utah's program. The following is meant to clarify that while the concept of requiring participation and work are integral to both Utah's single parent Demonstration Program (SPED) and our Working Towards Employment Program (formerly EWP), the prescriptive requirements of Title I are not congruent with out policy. To summarize our requirements:

SPED requires universal participation in self-sufficiency related activities by all single parent recipients of cash assistance—no exemptions are provided. 90% of recipients actively participate, those who choose not to participate are sanctioned $100 per month.

Two-parent families are served under the Working Towards Employment Program. Universal participation of 40 hours per week for one parent and 20 hours per week for the second parent is required. Cash assistance is received only after completion of these participation requirements. Of the hours required, at least 8 hours must be in job search, the remaining hours can be any combination of employment, education, or training.

While most adults in SPED participate in job search or work prior to education or training, this is not appropriate in all cases. Often, we involve participants simultaneously in employment/job search and education/training activities under the philosophy that employment and education go together.

Twenty-five percent of SPED recipients are working in unsubsidized employment which strongly show Utah's commitment to employment (this compares with a national rate of approximately 10%). About 27% of recipients are involved in education activities ranging from basic education to GED to short-term skills training to college. Over half of these recipients are also involved in employment, job search, or mental health counseling. For the remaining recipients, two issues are paramount:

First, for those in GED, short-term training or English as a Second Language educational activities, our experience has shown that the best course is for them to concentrate their full-time efforts on completing these educational paths and then moving into employment that will eventually move them off the system. The act as drafted would prohibit this approach. If we expect a recipient without basic education, specific skills or a work history to immediately go into job search and employment there is a danger of setting them up for failure, producing only short term results, and encouraging the ''revolving door'' approach to receipt of public assistance.

Second, some individuals cannot work 20–30 hours a week as well as attend school, particularly persons with other barriers such as mental health problems, a disabled child, or transportation problems. This will be particularly detrimental to our rural SPED sites where geographical distances may add as many as 2–3 hours of driving time as a recipient goes from home to child care to place of employment to school to child care to home is a given day. The act as drafted would require dramatic changes in how SPED is operated in our rural areas.

Under SPED. we often push adults to complete education and training as soon as possible. Often we require 40 hours of participation with no time off for summer etc. This significantly reduces their stay on assistance. We expect that the language restricting participation in education and training, could double the length of time some participants are actually involved in education or training and therefore, remain on assistance.

Finally, we need to once again express our concern regarding this level of prescriptive statutory language. In order to effectively meet the goals of welfare reform, states

must have maximum flexibility. Public welfare programs must be designed to allow states to respond to rapidly changing environments. The reason we are struggling with AFDC today is that the prescriptive statute has not kept pace with changes in public attitudes, economics, social conditions. etc.

Once again, we appreciate the opportunity to provide input. Thanks for all that you are doing on this important issue.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

TERM LIMITS DEBATE

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, assuming, for argument's sake, that term limits really will have the beneficial effect on the Congress that their proponents claim, why should we pass a term limits amendment that does not apply with full force to current members?

Do current members possess some special virtue which immunizes them from the hazards of extended incumbency? My good friend Rep. MCCOLLUM has said that ''those of us who believe in term limits * * * need to stay longer'' to make sure that a term limits amendment is passed.

Do I sense a contradiction here? By the same reasoning, we should encourage the alcoholic to continue drinking, so that he will be able to keep his goal of quitting one day.

But the McCollum resolution doesn't just buy the alcoholic a drink; it gives him an open tab at the bar.

Were the McCollum resolution to be ratified by the states and become part of the constitution immediately following next year's elections, Mr. MCCOLLUM himself would still be eligible to serve in the Congress until 2008. By the time he retired, he would have been in Congress for 28 years.

Twenty-eight years.

Of course, the states can take up to seven years to ratify the term limits amendment. If the states do so, then Mr. MCCOLLUM—who has already served for 14 years—will have 19 more years to talk about our need for ''citizen legislators'' while he waits for his term limit to take effect. Under this scenario, when Mr. MCCOLLUM's term limits amendment finally forces him out of this body, he will have served for 33 years.

It's a tough situation for Rep. MCCOLLUM. As he himself has noted, ''The worst thing that anybody could do who supports term limits as a sitting member of Congress is to step aside right now.'' (Press Conference on Term Limits, 5/4/92)

Every once in a while Members of this House are called upon to cast a truly difficult vote, one that affects their own lives directly. Such is the constitutional amendment mandating retroactive term limits, of which I am an original sponsor. Members who have already served six terms when the amendment passes will be ineligible to run again. This amendment will give Members who really believe in term limits a chance to vote for a term limits amendment with teeth.

But while we're waiting for term limits to pass, there's something else we can do to clean up Congress, to make elections something more than the ''mockery'' which our Speaker has said they often are, to reduce the overpowering advantages of incumbency in the American political system.

I am talking about campaign finance reform.

I've noticed that the Contract With America is completely silent on the issue of campaign finance reform.

Yet the rhetoric about term limits grows louder by the day. Whether you are on this floor, in your car listening to the radio, or at home watching your television, it's everywhere these days.

Yes, it's true, we have too many Members of Congress who have been working here so long that they now feel that they are entitled to be Members of Congress.

And we have too many lobbyists, too many ''public relations'' specialists in this town, and they certainly have a lot more influence over the legislation that is produced by this body than the average working man or woman does.

But this problem does not exist because people are serving in Congress too long; many of our greatest statesmen have had unusually long Congressional careers.

This problem exists because of the way elections are paid for.

To hear them talk, you would think my Republican friends are boldly leading the way into the era of Citizen Legislator, and that term limits are the definitive answer to the problem of the professionalization of politics.

But all the while, my Republican friends are completely ignoring the legislation that will do more than anything else to release the Congress from its bondage to the lobbyists and the special interests—campaign finance reform.

The McCollum term limits resolution is really nothing more than an incumbency protection resolution. This is why more than 30 Members who have already been in Congress for 12 years or more support it so enthusiastically.

Instead of following such an uncertain and indirect path to reform, wouldn't it be much simpler to pass real campaign finance reform, and take away the money and influence that allow people to stay in this body for year after year by drowning their opponents in a sea of money?

Wouldn't it be much simpler to stop talking about phony term limits resolutions and instead do something to seriously limit the influence of big money campaign donors on our political system?

But the Contract With America is silent on this issue.

It's time to stop posturing on this issue and do the right thing.

If you are for term limits—really for term limits—support the real thing, support retroactive term limits.

But even more importantly, let's reform the campaign finance laws and restore equity to the electoral process.

Whether you are in your first term or your twentieth, let's try to create a political system in which the citizens rule, and in which the dollar is no longer king.

QUOTABLE QUOTES ON TERM LIMITS

''This is a tool that I think will do for Congress exactly what I did with a pitchfork for my dad's stable.''—Dick Armey (first elected, 1984) (Seelye, N.Y. Times. 1/12/95)

''I have served here now in my 13th year. I am not ready to walk away from here until Teddy Kennedy and you guys want to voluntarily walk away. Those of us who believe in term limits and those of us who want to see things change around here need to stay longer, unfortunately, because the system is the way it is, in order to have the influence it takes when you get a few years in here.''—Bill McCollum (Testimony before Subcmte. on Civil and Constitutional Rights, 11/18/93)

''If the Republicans can straighten out the House, I think Americans will find their enthusiasm for term limits waning quite a bit''.—Dick Armey, after Nov, '94 elections (AP, 12/6/94).

''Term limits are essential for a healthy and open political system.''—Dick Armey, one week later (AP, 12/6/94).

''I am for them [term limits] myself, but the retroactive feature is not a fair feature. It's not the way the Florida statute reads.* * * I think that's unconstitutional.''—Bill McCollum, CNN's *Crossfire*, 11/29/94.

''***I think systematically the balance of power in favor of professional politicians as incumbents is so great that in fact it may—in many places it has made a mockery of the process of open elections.''—Newt Gingrich (Press Conference on Term Limits, 1/11/95).

SUPPORTERS OF NON-RETROACTIVE TERM LIMITS WHO WOULD BE FORCED TO STEP DOWN UNDER RETROACTIVE 12-YEAR LIMITS

Dornan (1976), Solomon (1978), Roth (1978), Packard (1982), Stump (1976), Crane (1969), Fields (1980), McCollum (1980), Hansen (1980), Bereuter (1978), Gekas (1982), Gunderson (1980), Leach (1976), Saxton (1982), Schaefer (1983), Shaw (1980), Wilson (1972), Goodling (1974), Gingrich (1978).

SUPPORT TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I have just heard the gentleman from Illinois say it to everybody out there that, gee, MCCOLLUM must not really believe in term limits because he does not believe in the particular version that the gentleman prefers, with retroactivity in it. I hope every Member on that side of the aisle who wants to support their version will do the same thing I am going to do, and that is make a pledge