

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ABUSES AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

HON. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I read with dismay this morning's story about the foolish waste of taxpayer dollars by staff at the Secretary of Energy's office to pay for consultative review of press coverage of the Secretary and her Department. It is but one more example of agency spending on image building and lobbying that I hope to address in legislation which Mr. CLINGER and I are now preparing. We cannot and should not tolerate such abuses any longer.

But if one is to legitimately call upon the President to ask for the Secretary's resignation over this, we should be prepared to ask that the entire Cabinet resign. Every department in one form or another, is equally guilty of abusive waste and inappropriate spending on image building, lobbying, and public relations efforts. All of which should be equally condemned and rendered illegal. Secretary O'Leary is entitled to no special favors on this.

Energy Secretary O'Leary's standing in our Government and the Cabinet should not be called into question on this incident. She should be judged and regarded by how successfully she conducts the proper affairs of the Department of Energy, and on that basis she has every right and duty to continue her service to the President and to our Nation.

Secretary O'Leary and every Cabinet official, however, need to instruct their collective staff to end this practice of public relations spending and inappropriate lobbying. If they are unable to do so, the Congress, I believe, is ready to make those practices illegal, as they are both dumb and inexcusable.

CONFRONTING THE MYTHS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, how about a dose of reality? The following article by Prof. Fran Quigley was published by the Nuvo Newsweekly in Indianapolis.

P.S. If the present welfare system as we mistakenly "know it" is so bad, ask yourself this question: Why did President Ronald Reagan sign it into law in 1988?

[From the Nuvo Newsweekly, Nov. 2-9, 1995]

CONFRONTING THE MYTHS—THE TRUTH ABOUT POVERTY AND WELFARE

(By Prof. Fran Quigley)

"Welfare as we know it" is coming to an end. True to the campaign promises of both President Clinton and the Republican Congress, our country's system of providing guarantees of federal income assistance to

poor families through the program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children is being dismantled. In its place will be state-run programs of assistance, including strict time limitations on the receipt of benefits, mandates that parents work outside the home and potentially a blanket denial of assistance to children of teenage mothers.

In Indiana, the changes to "welfare as we know it" are even more radical. In June of this year, most Indiana recipients of AFDC were notified that they would be subject to new rules that limit their lifetime enrollment on the program to two years and would be subject to a "family cap," where the state refuses to provide any additional benefits to families for new children conceived while the mother was enrolled in the AFDC program. In light of the conventional wisdom that has the Democratic party as the defender of the nation's poor, the irony of these stricter state provisions is that Democratic Governor Evan Bayh has sponsored and defended the two-year limitation and the family cap, while many Senate Republicans recently rejected these same provisions as too onerous for the poor.

All of these changes have come as a result of immense popular support for elected officials to change "welfare as we know it." But what exactly is welfare as we know it? It turns out that once the programs and the people enrolled in them are examined beyond rhetoric about "lazy deadbeats" and "welfare queens," that actual data show that many of the assumptions of the welfare debate are incorrect.

Some of these assumptions are so prevalent that they have taken on the status of myths. It is a dangerous situation when these myths have a place at the center of the welfare debate and now the dismantling of the family safety net. In order to take an informed position on the changes in our government's role in assisting the poor, these myths need to be confronted by the cold, hard, statistical truth:

MYTH NO. 1: IF POOR PEOPLE WOULD JUST GET JOBS, THEY WOULD NO LONGER BE POOR

Truth: In 1990s America, poverty is now a problem for working people and their families. In 1969, full-time employment at a minimum-wage job provided enough income to keep a family of three out of poverty. In 1992, full-time minimum-wage employment provided only 76 percent of the income needed to keep that same family above the federal government's estimate of the poverty level, and only 50 percent of the income estimated to be necessary for a three-person family to live a safe and healthy lifestyle in Indianapolis.

Implicit in this "get a job" myth and much of the anti-welfare rhetoric is the notion that poor people are poor because they are too lazy to work. However, noted welfare and poverty researcher Joel Handler describes empirical studies showing that poor people, including people receiving welfare, usually a well-developed work ethic and, in fact, most do work at jobs that simply do not pay enough salary to keep their families out of poverty.

Those who do not work outside the home usually are raising families, and the financial difficulties of maintaining employment, child care, transportation and health care are often responsible for forcing single parents out of the workplace. Also, any description of AFDC recipients as not "working" ig-

nores the reality that raising children is both difficult and important work: Anyone who has raised children must reject the "lazy" description for a single mother who is raising kids in an environment of sub-standard housing, violence and constant financial uncertainty.

MYTH NO. 2: ONCE A PERSON RECEIVES WELFARE BENEFITS, HIS FINANCIAL NEEDS WILL BE MET

Truth: Receipt of Aid to Families with Dependent Children in Indiana provides a family with less than one-third of the income needed to meet the federal government estimate of the poverty level. A disabled adult's Supplemental Security Income provides a little over 54 percent of the estimated income necessary to meet the poverty level for a two-person family. AFDC benefit levels vary among states, but the median state AFDC maximum monthly benefit level for a family of three was only \$366, which is barely more than a third of the federal poverty line. The grim implication of these figures is that our streets and shelters are full of families with children who are homeless and/or hungry, yet are receiving the maximum welfare benefits allowed.

MYTH NO. 3: WOMEN HAVE BABIES IN ORDER TO RECEIVE LARGER WELFARE CHECKS

Truth: Since Indiana's average AFDC monthly increase totals only \$65 per additional child, as contrasted with the federal government's quite modest estimate of a \$200-plus increased monthly cost of living per child Indiana's welfare recipients do not have any financial incentive to have babies. In fact, most welfare mothers do not have a large number of children: 73 percent of all AFDC recipients have only one or two children. AFDC recipients with more than three children constitute only 10 percent of the total number of families enrolled in the program.

MYTH NO. 4: MOST WELFARE RECIPIENTS ARE AFRICAN AMERICAN, LONGTIME DEPENDENTS AND TEENAGE PARENTS

Truth: All of these descriptive adjectives are incorrect as applied to AFDC recipients. African-Americans only make up 37 percent of all AFDC recipients (down from 45 percent in 1969), over half of all recipients leave the AFDC program within one year, and only 8 percent of recipients are under the age of 20.

MYTH NO. 5: PROGRAMS TO HELP THE POOR ARE TOO EXPENSIVE FOR STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BUDGETS

Truth: Don't blame the poor for budget deficits without looking in the mirror first: All the direct aid to the poor (AFDC, Medicaid, Food Stamps, and SSI) together does not equal three of the tax breaks benefiting the middle class and wealthy (deductions for retirement plans, home mortgage interest deductions, and exemptions for employer-paid health insurance premiums). Put another way, the AFDC program consumes only 1 percent of the federal budget and 2 percent of the average state budget.

Also, government investments in the well-being of our nation's poor, especially poor children, are cost-effective because of the programs' prevention of future social costs. For example, every dollar spent on Head Start programs is estimated to save \$4.75 in later special education, crime, welfare and other costs. Similar estimates have every dollar spent on childhood immunization or

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

drug treatment saving \$10 in later medical costs or social costs.

MYTH NO. 6: HOUSING ASSISTANCE IS WIDELY AVAILABLE TO POOR PEOPLE

Truth: There is often at least a two-year waiting list for public or subsidized housing in Marion County if the housing unit is even accepting applications, and these existing programs are at risk of reduction or elimination by the current Congress. Subsidized housing is vital to poor people because the federal government's recommendation that people pay 30 percent of their income on housing and utilities is an otherwise impossible goal for most AFDC recipients. For example, the 1993 fair market value for an Indianapolis two-bedroom apartment is \$523, which represents 156 percent of the monthly income of a three-person family receiving AFDC.

In fact, most poor people in Indianapolis pay over 50 percent of their income in housing costs. Some of the hypocrisy of the anti-welfare rhetoric based on allegations of budget-busting is demonstrated by the government's commitment to providing significant housing benefits for the decidedly non-poor. For every dollar spent by the federal government on low-income housing assistance, \$3 of housing assistance is provided to high-income persons (incomes in the top 20 percent) through homeowner tax deductions.

MYTH NO. 7: PRIVATE CHARITIES CAN REPLACE GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS TO HELP THE POOR

Truth: Private charitable programs currently spend only about 1 percent as much as state and federal governments on social services, and many of those private services are provided by agencies heavily dependent on government funds. The major charitable providers of social services, including Salvation Army, Catholic Charities USA and Feed the Children, have taken the position that government has a necessary role in helping the poor. Leaders of these organizations predict disastrous consequences for the poor if the government significantly reduces its role in providing a social safety net.

MYTH NO. 8: THE UNITED STATES PROVIDES THE OPPORTUNITY FOR PERSONS IN POVERTY TO SIMPLY PULL THEMSELVES UP INTO THE MIDDLE CLASS

Truth: For most poor people, 1995 America is not the land of opportunity. The gap between the rich and poor in our society is the largest of any industrialized nation, and the percentage of poor people who are able to move out of poverty has steadily decreased in the last several decades. Even though current efforts to solve the United States' poverty problem focus on reducing or eliminating government programs, it is the more generous and pervasive family benefit programs that are generally cited as the source of the greater amount of class mobility and lower amount of poverty in comparable countries.

Dire consequences are predicted as a result of changes to our current welfare system, with poverty experts and service providers predicting everything from widespread rioting to a future where children sleeping on sidewalk heating grates will be a common sight. The lesson to be taken from exposing the fallacy of the myths that motivated these changes is that the very survival of our country's poor families is put at risk based on misconceptions and prejudices, rather than clear-eyed examination of the effectiveness of the current welfare programs. While it may not yet be clear what the consequences of changing welfare will have for the poor and for the rest of us, it is clear that we have eliminated "welfare as we know it" when we did not really "know it" in the first place.

GREAT MILITARY FACILITIES IN FLORIDA

HON. TILLIE K. FOWLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I take great pride in all the fine military installations we have in Florida. That said, however, I must admit that I have a special place in my heart for the facilities in my own district and the surrounding communities. These facilities are all truly outstanding, and they just keep getting better.

I learned yesterday afternoon that both Naval Station Mayport and the Mayport-based Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair Jacksonville—SUPSHIP Jacksonville—have been selected as finalists for the President's Quality Award. This prestigious award is the Federal equivalent of the private sector's Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award for excellence in quality management.

While there are literally thousands of eligible candidates in the Federal Government, only 10 finalists are chosen for this award each year. This year, two of them are from my district—and this is Mayport's second year in a row as a finalist.

I think my colleagues will all agree with me that this is an extraordinary achievement. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Capt. Scott Cantfil, the CO of Mayport, and Capt. Richard T. Holmes, the CO of SUPSHIP Jacksonville, on their fine leadership. Even more importantly, though, I want to commend the men and women of Mayport and SUPSHIP—both military and civilian—who work so hard every day to achieve such a high standard of excellence. As a friend, a neighbor, and a longtime admirer, I am very, very proud of them all.

Mr. Speaker, these individuals do honor to the Navy, the U.S. Government, and the State of Florida, and it is my honor to represent them in the U.S. Congress.

U.S.S. "SANTEE" VETERANS

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gallant men of the U.S.S. *Santee* who served during World War II.

Between 1942–45, the U.S.S. *Santee* served in several war zones and took part in numerous combat missions. Operating in the most advanced areas, the U.S.S. *Santee* and her attached air squadron frequently struck enemy targets while themselves under prolonged air attack. During the historic battle for Leyte Gulf, the *Santee* and her crew withstood successively, the first suicide plane attack of the war and a torpedo hit in her side while continuing flight operations and manning her anti-aircraft guns.

The U.S.S. *Santee* and her crew served the people of the United States with valor and honor throughout World War II. The carrier and her courageous crew compiled an impressive combat record during her service in the battle theaters of the world. Their valiant ac-

tion against enemy forces was crucial in our victory over the tyrannical Axis forces.

Each of us is indebted to these gallant men for their extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty.

VETERANS DAY

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our country's veterans. On Saturday, November 11, we will celebrate yet another Armistice Day, or as it is more commonly called today Veterans Day. This is a day when every American should stand together in remembrance, reflection, and gratitude to the men and women who have fought for our freedom, a freedom which has endured only through the enormous sacrifice of the veterans we remember today.

More than 1 million veterans did not return to the freedom of America. Countless other millions returned wounded in body or in spirit. To those soldiers and their families, I pledge today, that we will never forget your mighty tribute to our country.

And on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month we will stand and salute the flag which our veterans carried with them to the wars, and which serves as a symbol of our national pride. At that moment, when the sirens sound, we must reflect on what kind of America we might live in today if not for the service of those who we honor each year on Armistice Day.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD.

VETERANS DAY, 1995

The threat to freedom and peace is no less sinister than in war. Our country's future must not go by default. The veteran must not fail the Nation's trust.—General Douglas MacArthur

Veterans Day marks the final day of the closing ceremonies of the 50th Anniversary of World War II. Although this day marks the conclusion of the official end of commemorations, we must never forget to honor the brave men and women who served in the war that changed our future forever.

Veterans Day provides us with an opportunity to remember and to acknowledge the sacrifice of men and women who have served their country in the Armed Forces of the United States. It is not a day of sadness, but is in the truest sense, a day of reflection; a day of commemoration; a day of honor; a day of celebration.

Veterans Day allows us to celebrate victory and the ultimate peace achieved on a myriad of battlefields around the world. Peace and victory have been earned with the blood of Americans who sacrificed their lives to preserve freedom and democracy. As terrible as that sacrifice is, nonetheless, it is the most divine of all human sentiments and the unconditional moral evolution of mankind.

Today, freedom enjoyed by us all is directly due to the sacrifice made by the American soldier, sailor, airman and Marine who was willing to fight and die for freedom.

He has engraved his imprint upon the souls of his countrymen. He has molded his statue in the hearts of all Americans. He has erected his monument in the memories of his comrades. His legacy has provided Americans with the highest example of patriotism.