

□ 2310

And if we do, we care about children.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the time. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank him for his participation.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the welfare provisions contained in the Contract With America, and to express the fears my constituents have communicated to me about cuts to nutrition assistance programs. I would also like to thank Congresswoman CLAYTON for organizing this debate.

The Contract With America would transfer control over Federal programs which provide a safety net to poor children to the States, while at the same time transferring only a portion of the money needed to provide these vital services. Many programs would suffer under this proposal, including those which provide protective services to abused children, those which provide child care assistance to the working poor, and those which provide nutrition assistance to the undernourished.

Approximately 13 percent of the children in Minnesota live below the poverty line, and it is estimated that 160,000 children go hungry as a result. Children who do not receive nutritious meals suffer from poor health and diminished performance in school. I have fought to support successful programs like the National School Lunch Program and the Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children [WIC] which were created to combat childhood hunger and give young people the opportunity to succeed.

One woman living in Minneapolis recently wrote me that the National School Lunch Program has served as a last line of defense for her family against hunger. Since her husband left, she has had difficulty making ends meet. Nevertheless, she can be confident that her two young daughters will receive at least one carton of milk and one nutritious meal a day when we cannot afford to purchase these items.

This family's experience demonstrates the need for a reliable safety net. Nutrition assistance programs like these have represented our nation's acceptance of the basic responsibility we have to care for our children.

The welfare provisions contained in the Contract With America represent a fundamental shift in our Nation's policy toward young people. The contract asserts that we, as a nation, should abdicate responsibility for providing basic protective services, basic support services, and basic nutrition to children in need.

Those who support the contract would have us believe these proposals were crafted in the name of reducing bureaucracy. I am not deceived by such rhetoric. One Federal bureaucracy would be replaced by 50 State bureaucracies. The only thing that would really be reduced is a child's access to a healthy meal.

My home State, Minnesota, is expected to lose \$18 million in Federal nutrition funding under the welfare provisions included in the Contract With America. This is a daunting sum of money for a State which already faces a hunger problem. Currently, 1 in every 16 Minnesotans seeks help from food shelves, receiving an annual total of 4 million pounds of food. For example, Minnesota FoodShare, an organization which provides food to needy families throughout the State, would have to

dramatically increase their efforts. They would have to generate 17.6 million more pounds of food, or six times the amount of current contributions, to compensate for these lost Federal funds. Clearly, Minnesotans would suffer if these welfare provisions are adopted.

True welfare reform does not destroy a child's safety net. Rather, it makes it possible for families to become self-sufficient. Full-time workers should be able to provide food, shelter, and the basic necessities for their families without being forced to turn to the Federal Government. I have proposed raising the minimum wage by 50 percent to \$6.50 an hour. Individuals can only move away from public assistance programs once they are empowered to help themselves. I believe increasing the minimum wage is a key element of any welfare reform.

I strongly urge my colleagues to reject the welfare provisions contained in the Contract With America.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the Republican proposal to end the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, better known as WIC.

Since its inception, WIC has been a model nutrition and food program. For infants, WIC reduces low-birth weights and lowers infant mortality rates by 25–66 percent among Medicaid beneficiaries. For children, WIC increases readiness to learn, improves diets and increases rates of immunization against childhood disease. For women, it significantly increases access to adequate prenatal care and improves their dietary intake.

Study after study has proven that WIC is not only successful in achieving its goals of good nutrition and health for children, but is also cost-effective. Every dollar spent on pregnant women in WIC saves up to \$4 in Medicaid for newborns and their mothers. For every very low birthweight prevented, Medicaid costs were reduced on average from \$12,000 to \$15,000. The only problem WIC has faced over the years is that it has always been underfunded. Doesn't it make more sense to invest in preventive programs to keep women and their kids healthy than to spend thousands later to keep a premature baby alive because it lacked the care it needed early on?

If WIC is block granted, my own State stands to lose \$2.7 million in Federal funding for WIC—which translates into approximately 5,200 women and children being denied WIC services. This will mean local WIC programs will be forced to turn away nutritionally at-risk children and postpartum women. More children will be denied food and health care so that our wealthiest Americans can get a tax break. It's becoming clearer to me who the Republicans made their contract with and where their priorities are.

In my own district, I know first hand how successful WIC has been and how it has helped countless families stay healthy. I know of a young mother of five in Taunton, MA, named Dorothy who is not on welfare, receives WIC so that she can feed her family. If this small investment is denied, she and her family will suffer immeasurably.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the need to get our Nation's finances in order and I intend to work with our new leadership to try to achieve this noble goal. But, I would respectfully suggest that keeping our kids and young mothers well fed and healthy is an infinitely

wiser investment for our country than this star wars weapons fantasy—which unfortunately seems to be making an expensive comeback.

I would urge my colleagues to show a little forethought and little heart, as we decide the fate of our country's most precious resource—our children.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There is no objection.

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

[Mr. MOAKLEY 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 gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. Kaptur] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### THE REPUBLICAN NUTRITION PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I have with me today, tonight, my colleague from the 10th District of Georgia, Mr. NORWOOD, and also my distinguished colleague from the First District of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman. You know, it is too bad, after listening to all the last hour, the people of America had to listen to, and I am sure no one is watching C-SPAN right now, and we cannot respond. I also will point out to the viewers back home that we had a room full of Democrats in here about 30 minutes ago, now they are all gone, now that we have some floor time to talk about some of their ridiculous and absurd bellyaching about protecting bureaucrats.

All we know is that we are going to cut programs to cut out bureaucracy, and all the whining and gnashing of teeth over here to protect bureaucracies, and you know, as you listen to it, everything works. Every program is a good one, and everyone is efficient, and it is saving America, and it is doing this, it is doing that. Why, if we

did not have these programs that, you know, America would just cease to exist. It is funny.

Because there are thousands and thousands of programs in America, and I'll be doggoned if the Democrat side of the aisle cannot defend every single one of them.

You two are new up here. You came for change. You came because of the failed promises of more government, more taxes, more regulations did not work.

And is that the message? I would ask of maybe our friend from the 10th District, from the Augusta area, is that what the folks in the 10th District want, more government?

Mr. NORWOOD. I thank the gentleman. I know we gathered here tonight because we were going to talk a little bit about our first 57 days in Congress, and, of course, we have to change what we were going to talk about because we realize everybody on C-SPAN that has been watching for the last hour has been inundated with a great deal of information.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I can promise you nobody was watching that for an hour. They have gone on back down. We have got to win back some people.

Mr. NORWOOD. Presuming there are one or two, I have to tell you, I wondered tonight, as I listened, has any country, any nation on Earth ever, ever spent more money for the poor than the United States of America? And in doing that, what we basically do is we take money from one human being and give it to another which there is nothing in our Constitution that suggests that we have to do that. We do that because, I think, we all do care about those that are less fortunate.

Now, let me just make one other comment about the information. One of the things we could do in Congress that would really help us is that we could get factual information, or perhaps make the Members be responsible for what they say and make sure that what they say is the truth.

But so much of the information that we have heard tonight comes from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and their report that they have put out on the nutritional programs is a report put out by a lot of people who know that they are going to be out of work.

Mr. KINGSTON. Absolutely. If the gentleman would yield, and those, many of those appointees, are Clinton administration big government bureaucrats, political appointees, who are making \$70,000-\$80,000 a year, and your committees are cutting that out. The USDA, everybody complains about the USDA. They are one of the biggest misinformation bureaus I have ever seen on this school lunch thing. It is absolutely irresponsible what they are doing. You have got a School Lunch Program that is going to go up 4½ percent each year. It is going to cut out bureaucrats. It is going to consolidate

programs. It is going to streamline the system so you can feed more hungry children.

And who but the Government would complain about that?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. You know, a revolution occurred in this country November 8, 1994, and the reason that revolution occurred is because the American people are sick and tired of the bureaucrats in Washington running their lives on a daily basis from a personal and a business standpoint.

You know, I am somewhat appalled that the folks on the other side of the aisle who spent the last, and it was not an hour, gentlemen, it was an hour and a half, that we had to listen to this berating of starving children and starving mothers, which is simply misinformation that is being put out from the other side. But those folks represented a total, if I counted correctly, somewhere between 15 and 20 States.

You know, what we, as Republicans, are trying to do is we promised the American people that if you elect a majority of Republicans to the House of Representatives on November 8, 1994, we are going to return your government back to you, and that is exactly what we are doing. We are doing that with this program. We are taking the bureaucrats from Washington out of the picture, and we are returning the program to the States.

I have the confidence in the States that were represented here tonight. I have the confidence in the counties that were represented here tonight on the other side of the aisle that those folks are much more capable of determining what is best for North Carolina, for California, and in our case, for Georgia. They know what is best in their local States and their local counties than the bureaucrats in Washington do.

I was interested, in coming up here on Monday of this week, and looking at the Atlanta Constitution. Our Governor of the State of Georgia, who is a Democrat, came out in wholehearted support of our plan to modernize the School Lunch Program.

Mr. KINGSTON. And he has said that, "Give me the money. I will do a better job than those bureaucrats in Washington."

Mr. NORWOOD. Because he knows he will. Our school superintendent realized that there are 110 Federal employees sitting in Atlanta, GA, directing the food program in Georgia, the lunch program, and she realizes full well that if we will block grant this money back to the States, we are going to cut some bureaucrats out of that group.

Let me mention to the gentlemen, you were talking about earlier, a lot of countries call what was going on as propaganda. It is spreading misinformation. For example, when they were talking about, they keep saying that we are going to cut the money that goes to feed the children as if this is a contest over who is most compassionate, who cares most about the WIC

Program, who cares most about the School Lunch Program. But, you know, we are spending \$5.9 billion this year on our food programs, not including, not including food stamps, and it is going to rise next year. It is going to rise to \$6.1 billion. It is rising 4.5 percent.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I would like you to reemphasize that, because as I recall, the School Lunch Program came through your committee, did it not?

Mr. NORWOOD. It did.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. We listened to an hour and a half discussion from folks on the other side of the aisle tonight, and anybody who watched that would remember, I hope, that not one single dollar figure was mentioned. They never mentioned how much money was being spent. All they talked about was cuts. Would you just talk about again what you said about the money that is being spent this year and the amount of money that is going to be spent next year on the very program they are complaining about?

Mr. NORWOOD. I will be very happy to. I want to make it very clear we are going to spend in 1995 \$5.9 billion. We are going to increase that spending next year to \$6.1 billion, and we have also made absolutely sure that 80 percent of this money goes to feed low-income families.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I also found it ironic, serving on the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittee that oversees USDA, not one of the people, not one of the speakers who was whining about some of these cuts have appeared to our committee to protest it where the work was being done. Now, there were television cameras on. I think that I have got to say that, but where the work was being done, not one of them showed up to the committee and came up with an alternative. But suddenly, you know, after the fact, they are jumping up there.

I also wanted to point out to you guys, because you talked about some things, campaign promises that you made and so forth; it is interesting to note of the previous speakers, I just pulled a list of who voted for the balanced budget amendment. It just so happened that nine of the speakers over here, the last ones, and I do not remember all the speakers, not one of them voted for a balanced budget amendment, and, you now, you can say what you want, but I think that basically tells a major philosophical difference here.

Mr. NORWOOD. Well, probably the big difference is that we care more about the WIC Program than they do, because the greatest threat in the world to the WIC Program is this country going bankrupt. I mean, I have wondered for a long time why we have not been able to balance our budget, and you cannot really tell that from C-SPAN. But sitting on this floor tonight, I see why in the last 25 years the party in control of the budget who

writes the checks, the Democratic Party, has not balanced the budget one time, and I can clearly see tonight why they will not. That is all we are trying to do so we can save the WIC Program.

Mr. KINGSTON. How many kids are you going to feed when you are bankrupt?

Mr. NORWOOD. I do not think any.

Mr. KINGSTON. You cannot do that. That is why we always have to bail out Somalia, Rwanda, and all the other countries in the world, because they mismanaged their resources. America has managed it. We have some food.

□ 2320

America has managed it, and we have some food. You are talking about cutting, you are talking about spending the cutting. One of the things that is amazing to me is, out of the thousands of programs, they are all efficient, they are all critical, and every one of those programs has a defender in the U.S. Congress, and, yes, it is bipartisan, it is Republicans and Democrats. But the thing that we have got to do is say no.

Now today, as my colleagues all know, the U.S. Senate voted down the balanced budget amendment. I believe it is a very sad day for America, because of that, because if we cannot say yes to the balanced budget amendment, I can promise my colleagues they cannot say no to voluntary fiscal restraint.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Exactly right, Mr. KINGSTON, and I could not help while listening to this looking at these photographs of those children that they were parading up here for the sole purpose of trying to arouse the emotion of the people that they are trying to appeal to, but really those pictures were very appropriate to be here. We should have had pictures of children here because it is the children of this country that we need to look out for, and, if we continue to spend money the way we have spent it for the last 25 years, we are going to leave a bankrupt country for our children and our grandchildren.

That is what the balanced budget amendment is all about. That is what we kept hearing during the course of our campaign over the last 2 years. The people in this country are simply tired of the bureaucrats in Washington spending their money unwisely, and that is what we have got to stop.

And I agree with the gentleman. One of the greatest moments I have ever lived was on January 25 in this very Chamber, and I believe it was about this time of night when we watched the 300 votes add up on the wall over here that voted for the balanced budget amendment. That was a great victory for the American people. Today it was a very sad day when the Senate failed to vote for the balanced budget amendment, and I certainly hope that we are going to get that amendment called back up on the Senate side and a very much of a wrong rectified there.

Mr. NORWOOD. Even if they do not call it back up, it is going to tell the

American people who to vote out of the Senate in 1996.

I mean I know the message sent to me was that we want to stop the spending. The American people know we owe \$5 trillion. They know we are borrowing over \$250 billion every year, and they know that math does not work.

These children in the pictures are in trouble all right, but it is not because we are not funding WIC, and it is not because they are not going to get their school lunch program. It is because in 20 years they are not going to have a way to make a living because we are broke.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, it is amazing to me that people who say, "I don't want to monkey with the Constitution"; the Constitution is so sacred that to them it seems to preempt the fact that the country is going bankrupt, and that does not make sense because that kind of thinking will not work.

Now the balanced budget amendment, welfare reform, is part of the Contract With America. The other thing which I know both of my colleagues have been leaders on is deregulation of business because, if we really want to help the economically disadvantaged, we are going to create an atmosphere for entrepreneurs because the businessowners create the jobs, the small mom and pops, and I know my colleagues have been leaders in getting business deregulation, and we passed that bill last week.

Can the gentleman tell us something?

Mr. NORWOOD. That is in my Committee on Commerce, and I want make very clear that when we hear some Members here talking, talking about business, they are talking about Amoco, and they are talking about G.M. When I talk about business, I am talking about the mom and pops, the 5 employees, the 3 employees or 10 employees. The small business people are the ones that have been killed with the rules and regulations that just continue to grow.

I mean I think the stack now is about 14 feet tall with all the rules and regulations, and what we are basically doing is we are saying to Federal Government, "No longer can you run roughshod over us with people not elected to office, meaning bureaucrats," and they are going to have to do a risk analysis, and they are going to have to do a cost-benefit analysis on each rule and regulation before they pass them down to us.

But, Mr. KINGSTON, the really exciting part about that is that people will now have a way to voice their concern with this Government because there will be a process of petition, there will be a process of peer review, where we can say, "Wait a minute, that rule makes no sense, that rule is not smart, and it ruins my business," and if they do not listen to that, then we will have legal standing, and I am excited about that because we are going to get this

crowd of bureaucrats inside the Beltway to listen to us unless we do have—

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] on the subject of Government regulations and Government knows best. I know that as a dentist he practices dentistry, and I asked my dentist the last time I was there how many rubber gloves his office used today. One hundred, and he said they never did a cost-benefit analysis on it.

Mr. NORWOOD. That is a hundred for each hand.

Mr. KINGSTON. But he says, "You know, we would not deny that it's good, but there's never been a proven case of a dentist giving somebody a disease from the hand."

Mr. NORWOOD. Of course, thanks to the Federal Government, we cannot ask anybody if they have AIDS. If the gentleman can make sense out of that, tell me after the program. But I will tell the gentleman the dentists in this country are paying now somewhere in the neighborhood of \$30,000 a year in extra costs thanks to OSHA.

Mr. KINGSTON. And the dentists have to pass on to their consumers.

I know the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS] is a small businessman in Moultrie, GA, and I know, running a small business as he does down there, the Government is all over him even though he is not a Fortune 500 that I know of.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. There is no question about it. I happen to be part owner of a motel in Moultrie, GA, and unfortunately my motel has to comply with exactly the same rules and regulations as General Motors does. We are not nearly as equipped to do that as General Motors, but OSHA demands the same from us that they demand from General Motors.

As the gentleman knows, one thing about my district is it is primarily rural, primarily agricultural, and there is no group of individuals in this country or no segment of the business of this country that is more overregulated than our farmers. Those guys have to spend more time in ASCS offices today complying with rules and regulations that come down from Washington than they do on their tractors, and unfortunately they are not allowed to do what they do best for the most part, and that is produce the world's finest crops and agricultural products.

So we have got to put some common sense back into regulations that are issued out of Washington, and that is exactly what we did last week and this week. We have been dealing with regulatory reform, and we are putting common sense back into the daily lives of folks from a regulatory standpoint.

Mr. NORWOOD. I am afraid—I do not want us to miss a couple of more details about the nutritional programs before we get off that. But one of the things that will make this work is that the amount of increase is 4.5 percent a

year for the next 5 years which gives the school lunch program more money to work with, but the administrative costs will come down. In fact we capped them at 2 percent. That is all of that money that they can spend for administrative costs, and what we really truly believe is that we are going to have more food for the children and their lunch programs, and that is what it is all about, that is what the whole purpose of the program is, not to pay bureaucrats.

And I want to talk about WIC one more time because I have had a visit with a lot of people in my hometown who worked within the WIC programs, and they are absolutely excited about the possibility of them deciding a little bit how their program might work best, but, as my colleagues know, there were about 80 programs in this country for nutrition, and we have block granted them and brought them down, and the WIC program, the money that we have got for the family nutrition block grant, we have guaranteed that 80 percent of that goes to WIC.

And I think the gentleman told me just today that WIC is not using all the money we are sending them now. Did I hear the gentleman say that?

Mr. KINGSTON. That is correct. What actually is happening on WIC, there is \$25 million in the budget that is a carryover. They are not using that. It is money left over. It represents 2 percent.

Now we got a deficit of over \$200 billion. Each year we spend \$200 billion more than we bring in. Under the President's recently introduced budget just 3 weeks ago that deficit goes on for 5 years and increases the debt another \$1 trillion, and our national debt is about \$4.8 trillion right now.

□ 2330

So here is a 2-percent cut in a program on money that they are not using, and you would think that the sky is falling.

Mr. NORWOOD. Are we being bad because we are cutting money that they cannot spend because they have got so much they are spending it all up? What is going on with that?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Isn't that what November 8 was all about? Didn't the American people tell us on November 8 that we want you doing a better job of spending our tax money? Make cuts where cuts are necessary; where cuts aren't necessary, don't make the cuts. But please do a better job of spending our tax money wisely. I think that is a classic example.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask you this. You are both freshmen, closer to the people than people that have been here a long time.

Mr. NORWOOD. I have been working with the people for the last 30 years. I am a lot closer.

Mr. KINGSTON. You already made the statement one of your surprises was the propaganda you get, and we have to admit it comes from both sides

of the aisle. Do you feel that way too, Mr. CHAMBLISS?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Absolutely. I will tell you about one other interesting fact that occurred to me shortly after I got here, and it was somewhat of a surprise. I was somewhat idealistic when I came here. I thought coming in with 72 other freshmen Republicans, that we would be able to have a real impact upon what is done in this very Chamber. And I think we are having an impact. But the problem that I saw very quickly is that the bureaucracy in Washington is layer after layer after layer of bureaucracy. And exactly what we are doing by block granting money back to the States is doing away with that bureaucracy. That is the way you cut spending. That is way you cut Government intervention. And we are making those inroads in cutting that bureaucracy.

Mr. NORWOOD. It is called cutting bureaucrats and cutting paperwork and spending our money on what we are trying to do, which is to feed children.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think the gentleman raises a good point. Let me ask you this: Balanced budget amendment, you both support it; line item veto, you both support it; strengthening America's military, and a very difficult decision on cutting the military budget some, you both support it. We are going to have a tax bill coming up today, another \$17 billion cut. It will have to be probably passed on the backs of freshmen like you because we will not get any support from the more liberal Members who want to defend every program.

That is going to be hard on you, because you are going to have your constituents coming up and saying don't cut this or that. Are you ready for it? Is that what you heard that your mission is from the people back home?

Mr. NORWOOD. It is going to be a lot harder on us if we don't. I know they told me in that election that they want this budget balanced, they want us to deal with this debt, and they want it done by cutting spending. The important thing I believe is that we do it fairly. You have to take a little bit from everywhere across the board. Yes, you are right we do gets visits, you know that, every 15 minutes all day long, with somebody saying you got to balance that budget, but leave my program alone.

Well, that will not work, and everybody knows that will not work. But we must do this very, very fairly and intelligently and across the board. Again, I point out in the nutritional programs, feeding the children, we didn't cut. We increased it 4.5 percent.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. The gentleman makes a very good point, that everybody who comes to talk to us about their program has a good program. There are a lot of good programs up here. But those same people will also tell you that we understand you got to balance the budget, and we want you to treat us fairly.

That is the message that we were given on November 8, the message being that look, we know there are good programs out there. We know you have got to continue spending in some of those programs. But we know also that unless wholesale cuts are made, and those cuts go to reduce the deficit, we are never going to balance the budget in this country, and we are never going to get rid of that \$4.5 trillion. What we have been assigned to do by the people of this country is to not single out any segment of the country or industry or any segment of people. We have got to be equal in our cuts, we have got to treat everybody fairly, and, most importantly, the cuts that we make have got to go toward reduction of the deficit and not toward funding other social programs out there.

Mr. NORWOOD. Earlier today when we were listening to this litany of half-truths, one of the statements that kept coming up is that well, we want a capital gains tax so we can give it to our rich friends, and that will keep us from funding the nutritional programs. Well, first, I think we have already decided that we are funding the nutritional programs.

But I think it is pretty important to understand that a cut in capital gains very well will help reduce the deficit, not add to the deficit. But our friends from the other side who have been there so long, I think 40 years or so, they have been there so long they do not realize that a cut in capital gains tax is not for the rich, it is for many, many average Americans.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think it is important to point out that the last round of serious tax cuts took place in the early 1980's under the Reagan administration. As a result of that, 18 million new jobs were created, we had the longest peacetime prosperity that America has ever had, and revenues doubled from 1980 to 1990. Now, unfortunately, revenues were outpaced by spending.

Mr. NORWOOD. By a Democratic Congress who had control of the checkbook.

Mr. KINGSTON. The Democrats did have the Congress, but the Republicans had the Senate for a while and the Republicans had the White House. So I think that we can take the blame equally. Both parties are to be blamed. But the fact is if we know it is going to happen, shame on us to let it happen again. We know we are going to get increased tax revenues because of capital gains tax, because less regulations on business will create more jobs, but it will also create more revenues. Shame on us for not holding the line on spending.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. The gentleman makes a very good point, that every time we have had a tax cut in this country, tax revenues have gone up. That is what tax cuts are all about. When we make tax cuts, we give tax incentives to the business community to expand their businesses. And when

they expand their businesses, they create jobs. When they create jobs, they add taxpayers to the roles. Those taxpayers are new sources of revenue for this country that we have never had before. And when we increase those revenues, that more than offsets the tax cuts that are given out there.

Mr. NORWOOD. You would sort of think that the other side, after 40 years, would catch on that you sort of got to take care of the goose that lays the golden egg, and the goose is free enterprise, people that work out there using their own money, not sending it up here to Washington.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask you something now. I know both of you guys started out your morning at least at 9 o'clock, because that is when I saw you at your first meeting, although you probably had three more by then. Many mornings by 9 o'clock we have been to two or three different meetings. It is now 11:30 and we need to wrap it up. We have folks still waiting to talk.

Was one of your surprises the long hours, how many hours you work? Speaking as newcomers, what have been your surprises? Then I think we better say good-night before we get run out of here.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I was used to working long hours practicing law in south Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. He ain't going to tell the truth. I got a lawyer and doctor telling me how hard they work.

Mr. NORWOOD. One of the things I have been thinking about doing, Mr. KINGSTON, is see if you drop a bill to get us paid by the hour up here.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Minimum wage.

Mr. NORWOOD. I start my day everyday at 6:30, and generally it ends at midnight. I think that is wonderful, because I was sent here to do a job, and I was sent here to win, and there is just not too many hours in the day I am not willing to give to it, particularly as long as we are winning. I have never seen Americans with as big a smile as on their faces as I have in the last 6 weeks going home.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Absolutely. Let me just say, Mr. KINGSTON, I started my morning at the prayer breakfast on the House side, and you weren't there. We missed you this morning.

Mr. NORWOOD. We prayed for you.

Mr. KINGSTON. You prayed for me. I appreciate it.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I just want to echo what my good colleague, Dr. NORWOOD, says there, that the people in my district are really excited about what is going on up here right now. We took an unprecedented step on September 27, 1994, when we signed the Contract With America. Never before had a political party promised in writing what it was going to deliver to the American people.

We have lived up to what we said we were going to do in that contract. The people in my district are excited about what is going on up here. They are telling me every time I go home "keep it

up. Keep doing what you are doing." That is what we are going to do. We are going to do what we said we were going to do in that contract, and we are going to do it within that 100 days.

Mr. NORWOOD. I think we are going to do what we were told to do. The Contract With America is not NEWT GINGRICH's contract, it is a contract taken from the people of this country when they told us last summer what they wanted to do. We are going to do it, too.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think you are right, I think this is not about NEWT GINGRICH, it is not even about the Contract With America, or the Republican majority. It is about a change and challenge in the status quo.

We, the American people, want less Government, less regulations, more personal freedom. We want a Government that works. I think that has a momentum all by itself right now.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed being with the gentleman.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I enjoyed this colloquy, Mr. Speaker.

#### LOOKING FORWARD TO A SOCIETY WHERE ALL CARRY THEIR OWN WEIGHT

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

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when we as Members of Congress are not debating the virtues or faults of block grants and entitlements for food and nutrition programs, housing, or child care programs. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when people and their families and/or their extended families are carrying their own weight totally.

I look forward to living in a society, Mr. Speaker, where no one receives something that they have not earned, a society where people work for money and people support their children. I think our Founding Fathers would be amazed that we would be discussing concepts so basic for able-bodied men and women. For most Americans, if we do not work, we do not get paid.

The Bible says "You will reap what you sow." The Bible also says "God helps those that help themselves." However, thanks to our current welfare system, these statements are not true.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day that if one is given something without working or paying for it, it would be deemed as a loan that would be paid back, not a bottomless pit of money distributed with no strings attached.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that everyone hits bumps in the road, and there should be ways to assist people at such times. However, when this happens, people should be willing or forced to take a job, work for the State temporarily, or get a welfare loan that would be paid back or worked off.

Block grants or entitlements, people should be merely entitled to an opportunity to succeed. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when the word "welfare" is used as frequently as the word "dinosaur."

#### 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. WISE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. PASTOR, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mrs. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MASCARA, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. HILLIARD, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. OLVER, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MOAKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BONILLA) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, on March 3.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WISE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.  
Mr. POMEROY.  
Mr. BARCIA.  
Mr. BONIOR.  
Mr. ACKERMAN.  
Mr. MONTGOMERY.  
Ms. MCCARTHY.  
Mr. VISCLOSKEY.  
Mr. SCHUMER.  
Mr. HAMILTON.  
Mr. NADLER.