



# Congressional Record

United States  
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **104<sup>th</sup>** CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1995

No. 36

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.

February 27, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable MICHAEL D. CRAPO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and the minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for 5 minutes.

### PROTECT CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to come to the floor to talk about children. As you know, I used to chair the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, and I just returned from Denver where people are really very troubled by what is happening to children in this new talk about block granting school lunches, money for WIC, and money for non-school child care.

I am very, very proud that in my State we have what is called the Colo-

rado Children's Campaign. A year ago they started something that has been carried on here, this year, by people advocating for these programs.

What they did was dress dolls and then tied a story of a real Colorado child around that doll's neck, to talk about how these programs really do affect children.

For example, here is one that was made by a Coloradan. This young child's name is Wayne. He is 6 months old. He has a big sister. His mother does not want him. So therefore let me tell you what happened to Wayne. Wayne went to grandma. Grandma decided she did not want this little boy. He is now in foster care. This is a child who is going to be dependent upon nutrition services or he is going to not be well raised. I think that is very, very important.

They also brought this little girl. This little girl's name is Susan. Her dad left her mom. Her mom went on welfare. Her mom got job training, finally found a job, and Susan is now in child care. But that child care center receives food from the U.S. Agriculture Department, and that is part of the food that we are talking about block granting.

Now, many of my constituents were trying to move these around the Hill last week and felt very intimidated. People were telling them these dolls were not welcomed in committees, they were not welcomed in the Halls of Congress, because people wanted to be able to cut these programs and not realize what they were really doing.

We talk about numbers, but behind every one of these numbers is a child who is not fortunate enough to be able to pick its parents. Therefore, they are in real trouble if this country backs down on the commitment we have made for the last 50 years to nutrition and making sure that every American child gets a good start.

You know, James Baldwin said it better than any of us. He said these are all our children, and we will all either profit by or pay for whatever they become.

I think that was the motto that started this whole area of child nutrition programs. We know Harry Truman started it in 1946 after they were horrified by the level of malnutrition they saw of young men applying to fight during World War II. So as a consequence, it has grown and grown.

We now have some very disturbing statistics from the Department of Agriculture about what will happen if this Congress moves to implement the block grants that we are talking about. If we implement those block grants, we know that the WIC Program would immediately cut out 275,000 recipients today. If you compared it to what is in the President's budget, it would be over 400,000 recipients. These are low-income women that are getting food to try and make sure that their child is born safely.

Now, that is very important, because in my State of Colorado we have more babies born too small to be healthy this year than any other year since 1976. So our hope had been they would be expanding this program. We know that nutrition during pregnancy is a critical, critical problem, and if we do not feed them, then we end up with all sorts of developmental problems later on.

If you look at the school lunch program, in my city of Denver there is about 70 percent of the kids, 70 percent of the kids in Denver, CO, qualifying for subsidized lunch programs. That is because so many of the middle class kids have left.

Well, if this goes into effect, many children are going to be pushed out or there will be no national nutritional standards. Instead you are going to have 50 different States doing whatever

□ 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

H2227

they want to do, with no monitoring and being able to spend the money however they want.

I think Americans have been proud of the school lunch program. It has been a program that works, it has been a program that has been efficient, it has had national standards, and we have seen the results through our military recruitment. I would hope this body reconsiders what happens and try to undo some of the damage we have seen by the block grants that are coming forward.

#### REPORT ON UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS IN HAITI

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, it is day 162 of the occupation of Haiti by United States troops. The costs are about \$850 million, heading to \$1 billion, but every American can feel safe and secure that the Haitian military is not going to invade us.

Congress put itself back into the Haiti policy loop last year, after some of the concerns we had about the way it was being handled by the White House, by requiring reports. I have the report from February 1 submitted by the White House to Congress. The report, a bit self-congratulatory, documents the success of operations in Haiti to date. Indeed, it does that. It is a short report.

What it does not do is document the problems we are facing and the risks we are facing and the costs we are obligating our taxpayers to at all, and that is something that needs to be done.

I read from the report. It says the purpose of our mission down there was to use all necessary means to secure the departure of the coup leaders. Many will remember they have left, and I think we have primarily former President Carter, General Colin Powell, and Senator SAM NUNN to thank for that. Certainly the threat of the force of our U.S. military was part of that. But the fact is, maybe we did not need to send 21,000 of our assault troops to that friendly, neighboring country to accomplish the removal of those coup leaders.

But let us go on to the next point, restoring the legitimate, democratically elected Government of Haiti to power. The administration is claiming great success for that. Well, they have not restored the Government of Haiti to power. They have restored President Aristide to power in his White House, but we no longer have a Parliament in Haiti, which is an essential part of government, and we certainly do not have much of a judiciary system. Any student of the Constitution in this country will understand that a functioning democracy has to have those three branches of government, which they do not have in Haiti.

You also have to say that in Haiti that the Haitians are not the power. The Government of Haiti is certainly not the power. It is the U.S. military that is the power down there now. To say that it has been restored to the Haitian people is a further mistruth, because it is only to select Haitian people.

If you go to Haiti today and say how do you feel about the United States troops, you will get a number of answers, depending on who you talk to. The people who are pro-Aristide will say we are very friendly. The people who are not pro-Aristide, which is about 30 percent of the country or so, will say we think everything the U.S. Government is doing is backing Aristide, and it is very pro-Lavalas, and we are being identified with one man's power, one man's presidency in that country, and that is a dangerous place for our foreign policy to be.

But moving forward from those points, when we talk about whether or not the Haitians can run Haiti yet, it is clear they cannot, and even though we and the United Nations have declared that it is a secure and stable environment, we saw just last week that they had a massacre as soon as our troops left one of the enforcement areas, the police station up in a town called Limbe. Our troops left, the mob went in, grabbed the people out of the station, beat them to death, burned them, and at least had the decency to bury them after that.

That is an isolated incident, I agree. But I suspect as our forces leave, we need to be on guard. To say things are secure and stable may be stretching the point just a little bit the way things are in Haiti today.

That police force is supposed to provide some of the stability. Some observers now are saying they are being politicized, deliberately politicized by President Aristide; he is bypassing passing some of the screening process put in to build a professional police force. This is a serious problem and we need to know a lot more about it.

I think that the report that we are talking about, restarting the Haitian economy, which is very important, signals something very curious for us as American taxpayers. We have about \$1.6 billion pledged for our military support, and another \$1 billion pledged for some type of aid support over the next year or so, I think would be a fair statement, and yet it is all at the top. It is not down at the bottom. We are not getting the money and the expertise down at the working level on the front lines of commerce.

Talking to businessman after businessman after businessman, our program there is misdirected, and that is something we have to refocus very quickly, especially for that kind of money.

We are paying a very heavy price in Haiti as taxpayers, as I said. What are we spending money on? We are buying troops from other countries. We are paying foreign soldiers, paying them at

the rate of about \$1,000 a month to foreign governments, who are taking a handling fee to put their troops into Haiti as part of a joint task force. Our troops down there are being used right now for things like garbage collecting, writing speeding tickets, making traffic flow work, that kind of thing.

In this report, interestingly enough, the White House says we must have to cover a \$2.6 billion shortfall in our defense spending because without it the net effect will be a significant decrease in overall military readiness.

In other words, our military readiness is at threat because our troops are picking up the garbage in Haiti. We need a fuller report from the White House.

#### SSI EXTENSION TO GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to correct the fundamental flaw in the Republicans' welfare reform proposal contained in the Contract With America. Their proposal would substantially undermine the public assistance program by sending block grants to the States, limiting the Federal spending, and dropping millions of children and adults from the rolls, thus jeopardizing them to a future of poverty, joblessness, and hopelessness.

The Republican proposal to restructure the welfare system is fraught with provisions to exclude noncitizens from receiving many public assistance programs. For instance, they would be ineligible for Medicaid, SSI, and a variety of food, housing, and health care programs. The denial of these services to low-income children and families is cruel and would only exacerbate their poverty and dim their hopes for a better future.

While there should be strong and vigorous debate on the inclusion of noncitizens, perhaps it is not clearly known that not all U.S. citizens are included in the benefits. Let me repeat this: Not all U.S. citizens are eligible for SSI.

I am concerned about a major omission in the majority's welfare reform bill, which fails to address the need for Supplemental Security Income coverage for the territories. Since the implementation of the SSI Program in 1974, the citizens of the insular areas have been excluded from participating in this program. The Republican bill continues to deny SSI benefits to the U.S. citizens living in these offshore areas. The bill I am introducing today would extend the SSI Program to Guam and the Virgin Islands, and I understand that the extension of SSI to American Samoa and Puerto Rico will be addressed in separate legislation.