

military construction budget with more to come in future budgets.

All told we may be wasting as much as \$750 million for this project.

I have asked the General Accounting Office to look into this matter and to detail the costs involved. This is exactly the type of rescission we should have made. The Navy does not even know if it can spend this money. Certainly it cannot spend this money in this fiscal year. Meanwhile, far less expensive alternatives are available that build on existing infrastructure instead of needlessly duplicating what we already have.

At the same time that vital readiness programs are underfunded, when we are grounding aircraft and cutting training, when some military families are having to use food stamps, when Army divisions are not combat prepared, this Congress should be going over each and every program to determine if it is really necessary or it could be done at less cost.

Unfortunately, I am not given the opportunity to offer an amendment to rescind the funding in that bill because while we had to, I think quite correctly, find the funding in the chapter where we were either trying to add or subtract money, I would hope next time we have a rescission bill that we could go anywhere in that bill to find the funding and anywhere in the appropriations for a given year to find the funding.

While I supported the bill, I would like to see that type of flexibility provided in a rule from the Committee on Rules because last night it was impossible to amend portions of the bill once an amendment had already been made and that makes no sense.

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

[Mr. VOLKMER 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 gentleman 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS 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 gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GEPHARDT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ELEMENTS OF WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, this next week we are going to be voting on a major piece of legislation and we are going to have several options when it comes to welfare reform, ending welfare as we know it today. And surely the time has come when we must do this for America.

I have had the opportunity like other Members of Congress to meet with welfare recipients who feel trapped, who do not think they have a future. Many of them do not have the education and training, many of them are mothers with small children. They want a better way of life but they feel very dependent today and want government to offer some incentives rather than being trapped in a life of welfare. They are not proud of themselves. They know they are not mentors or role models for their families.

We have got third and fourth generations that are in a life of welfare. Yet we know the world of work offers self-esteem and self-worth and a future not only for those welfare recipients, but for those dependents as well.

Congressman DEAL, myself, and four other Members of the House of Representatives have been meeting during the last Congress and in this Congress to come up with some legislation that we are very proud of, that we are going to be introducing next week. This legislation, welfare reform which we have introduced, offers three principles, those of work, individual responsibility and State flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, our proposal places an emphasis of moving recipients into the private sector as soon as possible, includes real work requirements, requires recipients to sign a binding contract, applies significant sanctions to those who fail to comply with the terms of the contract, fulfills the pledge that recipients must be working after two years, requires recipients to participate in work or work-related activity in order to receive benefits.

Recipients who refuse a job would be denied benefits; makes every effort possible to provide the funding and tools necessary to move recipients to self-sufficiency, establishes a minimum number of hours a recipient must spend in work, job search, or work-related activity which leads to private sector employment in order to receive benefits.

□ 1500

We remove all incentives which make welfare more attractive than work and remove the biggest barriers to work, child care and health care.

Mr. Speaker, our proposal contains a visible, or a viable, work program with

real work requirements. We maintain the guarantee of benefits for all eligible recipients who comply with the specific requirements. We maintain the current food and nutrition programs such as school lunch, WIC, and Meals on Wheels. We eliminate SSI benefits to alcoholics and drug addicts. We reform and revise SSI for children in a fair and equitable manner which eliminates the fraud and abuse, and controls the growth and ensures due process for each and every child currently on the rolls, ensuring that no qualifying child loses benefits.

Mr. Speaker, ours is a responsible, workable approach which maintains the Federal responsibility without simply shifting the burden to the States. In short, our bill will end welfare as we know it today. Recipients will be required to work for benefits, but there is an absolute time limit for receipt of these benefits. Our plan provides the best opportunity for welfare recipients to become productive members of the work force. We provide States with the resources necessary to provide this opportunity without incurring an additional fiscal burden. We have a real opportunity in America to give people hope and give them a future once again.

Mr. Speaker, I have had horror story after horror story from people at home in Tennessee, as well as throughout the United States, about welfare, and I encourage those that are listening to write and let us know in Washington, DC, that they are behind welfare reform and support the Deal legislation next week.

SHOULD THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BE MANAGING THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIM). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, should the Federal Government be managing the Food Stamp Program?

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I rise today because the Food Stamp Program provides clear evidence that the Founding Fathers were correct when they advocated a limited role for the Federal Government.

I'm talking about a system that has increased in cost to the taxpayers by 300 percent. I'm talking about a system that wastes \$3 billion yearly in fraud and errors alone. I'm talking about a system that does nothing to address the root causes of recipients' needs. I'm talking about the Federal Food Stamp Program—a monument to Great Society pseudocompassion.

In Marvin Olasky's "The Tragedy of American Compassion" we see an exceptional portrayal of how American society can and will take better care of its needy without the interference of

the Federal Government. Olasky tells how, in 1890:

a successful war on poverty was waged by tens of thousands of local charitable agencies and religious groups around the country. The platoons of the greatest charity army in American history often were small, and made up of volunteers led by poorly paid professional managers. Women volunteers by day and men by night often worked out of cramped offices and church basements.

What Olasky is describing is an America that reaches out to its fellow man. Private charities and churches are still capable of doing that and they can do it much better than the Government has.

Mr. Speaker, people may be listening tonight and thinking—that's what the Republican welfare reform bill is supposed to do. They would be correct, if not for one exception. That exception is the Federal Food Stamp Program. A decision has been made to exempt what is by far the largest Federal food assistance program from the block grant concept. We're block granting AFDC, we're block granting WIC, we're block granting school nutrition programs, but we're going to keep the Federal Food Stamp Program at the Federal level.

Olasky compares the attempts to do this with an anecdote from mythology. "Year after year," he writes, "proposals to tinker with the bureaucracy and reduce the marginal tax wall caused mild stirs in Washington, but even the best proposals mirrored Hercules's early attempts to kill the nine-headed monster Hydra; each time he hacked off one head, he found two growing in its place."

Block granting the Food Stamp Program by itself is not slaying the monster, but I reject the notion of some great Federal responsibility to administer the program. The taxpayers providing the funding are residents of the States. It is taxpayer money, not money belonging to the Agriculture Committee, the Congress, or the Federal Government. We should take the administration of this program closer to the people.

This chart provides a perfect illustration of why we should take the administration of this program closer to the people. As you can see from this chart, about 25 percent of the costs of the current Food Stamp Program are not used for the potential purchase of food. In fact, right off the top of the Federal funds for food stamps, \$1.1 billion is issued for a special block grant to Puerto Rico. Next, the Federal Government must reimburse the States for about half of the administrative costs that the States incur for issuing these coupons. This does not take into account an additional \$250 million in other administrative-type costs that decrease the benefits. And even after all these bills have been paid, we still have to consider that there is 1.9 billion dollars' worth of coupons that are issued erroneously. This includes caseworker mistakes, unintentional mistakes

made by recipients, and about \$500 million in intentional deceit on the part of recipients. Last, but certainly not least, we have heard estimates from the Secret Service that there is an additional \$1 billion lost to illegal food stamp trafficking. After all these costs are factored into the equation, we are left with 75 cents for every taxpayer dollar that might go to the purchase of food for the needy. And may I remind you, this doesn't consider the fact that the States also spend approximately \$1.5 billion in administrative costs as well.

Why does it cost so very much to provide food services to those who are in need? It costs so much because the Federal Government is attempting to provide the services. My amendment would change all of that. Instead of layer upon layer of administrative guidelines, regulations, and rules at every level of government, this amendment would simply repeal the administrative nightmares and give the States the flexibility needed to provide true and meaningful welfare reform. As you can see from the chart, my amendment, which almost mirrors the contract language, would limit 5 percent of the block grants for administrative expenses. It requires that 95 percent of the funds from the block grant be used for food assistance for the economically disadvantaged. It is simple, clear, and I believe quite compelling. How can we argue against sending the funds to those who are closely and acutely aware of the problems and eliminating the red tape that has prohibited success in the Food Stamp Program. If we take the Federal bureaucracy out of the equation, what remains is a lot more money for food assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK], my colleague.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

Mr. Speaker, when Bill Clinton campaigned for President as a new Democrat he promised to end welfare as we know it. What happened? The Democrats first so-called reform actually expanded welfare spending by \$110 billion and it destroyed what was left of workfare. It was business as usual: more government, more taxes, more bureaucrats.

But you know what Mr. Speaker, the American people weren't fooled. Last November, they said to the liberals, "enough is enough." They understood that in no area is the intellectual and spiritual bankruptcy of the American left more apparent than in welfare reform. The liberal left's notion of reform is to spend more of other peoples' money. Their notion is to have the poverty industry and the professionally indignant churn out more of the perverse regulations and programs which have turned so many of our people into a mass of favor seekers.

This is the liberal Democrats' version of welfare reform: Have a child out of wedlock, don't have a job, and don't live with a man who is working. If you do these things the taxpayers will take care of you. Uncle Sam will give you a check each month, with free medical care, free food, and under Mr. Clinton's plan, 2 years in a Federal job program and free child care. You see the liberals can't breakout of their Washington-knows-best mentality. They want to undo the damage of 30 years of failed Federal programs by creating more Federal programs. Mr. Speaker, since 1965, we have spent over \$5 trillion on welfare and all we have to show for it is disintegrating families, children having children, burned out cities, and a 30-percent illegitimacy rate. We won't make a dent in the problem by trotting out the same tired old liberal ideas.

We can make a good start today by endorsing the food stamp block grant amendment. This amendment returns us to the original welfare reform formula in the Contract With America. It freezes funding at the 1995 spending level and provides almost \$19 billion in savings over 5 years. But, more importantly, it says people getting food stamps under the age of 60 must work.

Mr. Speaker, we were sent to Washington to put people to work and to get the Government's hands out of the peoples' pockets. Let me tell you where we will be if we don't get a handle on the runaway welfare train. This year food stamps will cost the American people \$26 billion. If left alone food stamps will cost us \$32 billion by the year 2000. Today Federal welfare spending stands at \$387 billion, by 2000 we will spend \$537 billion on welfare entitlements. Simply put, the madness has to stop.

The food stamp block grant eliminates the Federal middleman and cuts the heart out of the Washington bureaucracy. It says the real innovators are in the States and the counties. These are the people who are closest to the problem. They know peoples' needs. They are on the front line in the fight against poverty. They understand its causes and they can provide the moral and spiritual leadership so many of our citizens so desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of welfare reform is to get people off the Federal payroll. The best welfare program is a job. By cutting government, taxes, regulations, and bureaucrats we can create a new era of opportunity that will make it easier for poor Americans to get back on their feet.

I want to close with remarks from the Governor of Michigan, John Engler, who is leading the fight to take government back from the bureaucrats and the social planners. Governor Engler tells us:

Ultimately, the debate over welfare reform is a debate about our basic principles and values as Americans—about the value of work, responsibility, freedom, and self-reliance. It's a debate we cannot afford to lose. It's a debate we can win—if we act in time.

Mr. Clinton is right about one thing, it really is past time to end welfare as we know it. Let's start with food stamp reform.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK].

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about block granting food stamps to the States, opponents of the idea express doubts about the ability of State government to reform the program. Forgetting momentarily that the Federal Government has not shown any ability to operate the program under its own auspices, let us look at what the States have done with welfare reform.

First of all, Wisconsin Governor, Tommy Thompson, introduced a number of innovative programs that reduced welfare rolls in his State by 25 percent, saving State taxpayers \$16 million per month. In 1988, he began Learnfare which discourages truancy and promotes education. In 1990, he started Children First, a program to increase child support collections. In 1992, his Parental and Family Responsibility Initiative removed disincentives to marriage and discouraged children from having children. This year, he launched Work Not Welfare requiring able-bodied recipients to work for cash benefits.

Michigan Governor, John Engler, who we heard about prior, offered welfare clients incentives to work and required them to sign a social contract agreeing to work, receive job training, or volunteer at least 20 hours per week. In just 2 years, the plan has helped nearly 55,000 welfare achieve independence, and welfare caseloads have fallen to their lowest level in 7 years, saving taxpayers \$100 million.

Massachusetts Governor, William Weld, signed legislation last year to strengthen child support collection which is expected to save \$102 million in AFDC and Medicaid expenses and enable an estimated 7,000 families to discontinue the AFDC Program.

□ 1515

This year, he introduced welfare reform requiring able-bodied welfare recipients to take a job or community placement within 60 days in exchange for child care and health care benefits.

In addition, Governor Thompson recently identified four principles around which any welfare system should be built. These include: First, to end indefinite cash assistance; require work of able-bodied adults as a condition of receiving temporary assistance; include provisions to reduce illegitimacy; fund States, not individuals, by ending individual entitlements.

Michigan Governor John Engler stated matters well on February 9 at an Agriculture Subcommittee hearing on food stamps. The Governor said, and I quote, "Let me be absolutely clear on this from the start: America's governors understand the importance of good nutrition, especially for children, pregnant women, and other vulnerable individuals. None of us would adopt

policies that would take food from the mouths of people in need. On the contrary, we want the freedom of a block grant to be able to help more people with better, more efficient community-based programs that better meet local needs," end quote.

Governor Engler also said, and I quote, "With the freedom of block grants, I trust my human service department directors and their colleagues at the county, city, and neighborhood level to get the job done. And I trust local charities, civic groups, churches, synagogues and mosques to make sure that the children and mothers to be in their respective communities get the proper nutrition."

Mr. Speaker, I know some people feel that the Federal Government is inherently better at providing food assistance. I believe the track record shows otherwise. The closer the administration is to the people who need the food, the better that administration will be.

How effective are churches and private charities in dealing with hunger? As early as the pilgrims establishing a community in Massachusetts, Americans have shown compassion for one another free of government interference. Marvin Olasky, in *The Tragedy of American Compassion*, quotes Pilgrim leader William Bradford describing the benevolent activities of those Pilgrims who remained healthy. Bradford's account describes able-bodied men and women cooking food, washing clothes, and providing medicinal aid to those less fortunate.

Olasky writes that the need to offer personal help and hospitality became a frequent subject of sermons, which in colonial days were more powerful in shaping cultural values, meanings, and a sense of corporate purpose.

Congregationalist and Presbyterian sermons noted that faith without works of compassion was dead. Anglicans also argued that those blessed materially by God should have compassion for the poor by descending into misery when necessary in order to help them up: This in one order of life is right and good; nothing more harmonious.

And when Methodism spread in the 18th century, American followers propagated John Wesley's advice to, quote, "Put yourself in the place of every poor man and deal with him as you would hope that God would deal with you."

I do not need to document the work of organizations like Catholic Social Services, Lutheran Social Services, and the United Jewish Appeal. I even have some firsthand experience at church-directed charities. I ran the food pantry at 12th Avenue General Baptist Church in Evansville, IN. We met people's needs, we took an interest in people's lives. That is the America I know. That is the America that used to be and can be again if we can get away from this idea that the Federal Government is our nanny.

At this time I would like to offer time to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think that if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] wants to conduct a colloquy, I will be happy to talk with the gentleman about it. But it seems to me that the Committee on Agriculture varied the Contract With America and from the change that the people in America have been asking for, and that is a smaller Federal Government and local control. And that is what we were sent here to accomplish.

We are not eliminating food stamps. We are not eliminating food assistance. We are in favor of kids growing up good and strong. And good, healthy fat ones is what we want, right?

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. So, I think that it is important that people understand in the world that the Education Committee designed three block grants for child care, for family nutrition, and for school-based nutrition. And all of those programs provide more money for all of the programs.

And not only do they provide more money, but they allow the States to be their own judge of how to spend that money and move a little bit of it around to wherever the priority projects are in each State, based on each State's needs, each kid's needs, each school's needs. Would you agree with that?

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I think the Committee on Ways and Means designed block grants for child protection and family assistance, so the two committees together have formed block grants that protect children, protect the school system, protect the pregnant women, infants, and children's programs, and make America safer and better. And, in addition, ask only in return that they please work for whatever benefits that they receive. Do you think that is too much to ask for Americans to do?

Mr. HOSTETTLER. I do not, sir.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Would you not think that most Americans want to work anyway?

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Yes, sir, they sure do.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. And we are going to give them that opportunity, along with greater and better benefits based on their own local input and needs.

And I think there seems to be resistance in this town to doing things that would protect our children at home. Most people here would say that the resistance here wants to keep the massive Federal bureaucracy in operation, the massive Federal control over every individual's life, including the kids.

And we are teaching the kids, I think, would you not agree, that we are teaching the kids that the Federal Government knows best? And I defy anybody to say, whether you or I, or

anybody else in this House of Representatives or Senate, knows what is best for the children in their own hometown, in an individual school district, in an individual home.

Would you agree?

Mr. HOSTETTLER. I would most assuredly agree with you.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. And I like your chart by the way. I did not get a chance to tell you that. But I think all the people that vote for the remainder of the welfare bill under block grants, but refuse to make this needed change should rethink their vote, because we think we need to be consistent; consistent with the Contract With America, consistent with the wishes of the American people, and consistent with the ideas and principles of the conservative party, the Republican party. Given America back to Americans. Thank you for letting me talk with you.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Thank you very much, sir.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSTETTLER. The Rules Committee is graciously allowing me to do my special order, and I would like to continue and conclude at this time. But there will be an opportunity later.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman will not yield.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for putting it so well. The local, State, and county governments know best. That is where our tax dollars come from, and we need to return the idea that they know what is best. Theirs is the resource of the money. Let them do things in their locales that they think is best.

There is a quote that says, "Welfare is a narcotic. A subtle destroyer of the human spirit." Who said this Mr. Speaker? Was it, A, Charles Murray; B, Ronald Reagan; or C, William F. Buckley? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is none of the above. The quote is from Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Who would you say, Mr. Speaker, has been least effective in meeting the needs of the poor? A, Mother Teresa; B, the United Way; C, the Salvation Army; or D, the Federal Government? If you formulated your answer based on dollars spent, you would probably choose one of the top three. But in answering the question, Who has been least effective in meeting the needs of the poor, the answer is clear. The Federal Government has failed.

Why, then, would we think of a federally run food stamp program as the ultimate social safety net as some are calling it? Marvin Olasky, in "The Tragedy of American Compassion," writes how charity workers deal with applicants for assistance. They start with the goal of answering one question: Who is bound to help in this case? Charity workers then called in relatives, neighbors or former coworkers or coworkers.

Relief given without reference to friends and neighbors is accompanied by moral loss. Mary Richmond of the Baltimore Charity Organization Society noted, and I quote, "Poor neighborhoods are doomed to grow poorer and more sordid whenever the natural ties of neighborliness are weakened by our well-meant but unintelligent interference."

Another minister said, quote: "Raising the money required specially on each case, though very troublesome, has immense advantages. It enforces family ties and neighborly or other duties instead of relaxing them."

The Federal Government does not do any of these things. The proposed plan for food stamps, while less of a budget strain than the current system, continues on with the Federal tradition of throwing money at the problem.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would ask that Members consider the idea of block granting food stamps and the idea that the Federal Government does not always know best and that State and local governments can best meet the needs, along with private and religious charities, to meet the needs of our neighbors. And I give back the balance of my time.

SAVE THE CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for yielding. And I am sorry the prior gentleman would not yield to me, because I had several things that I thought would have been a very interesting discussion.

I heard what he said about State and local government and that is where the money is raised, but he is asking us to raise it at the Federal level and then give it back to them to spend however they want with no strings attached.

And so I think I am the one standing here as the real conservative. I figure if they want to spend money with no strings attached, they ought to raise the money. Why in the world are we going through this system and then going up and down the elevator?

I think if we are raising the money here and we are giving it to localities to spend, we should be saying there should be nutritional guidelines. We should be saying to farmers who get subsidies from us that they ought to have a buy crop insurance rather than wait and if there is a disaster, the Federal Government bails them out.

If the State and local government want total say in how they spend money, then they have the right to go raise that money and they are on their own. So I found that really amazing.

I also wanted to point out to him, he was citing Governor Engler of Michigan. And on the wire service at this moment there is a story about Gov-

ernor Engler saying that conservative micromanagement is just as bad as liberal micromanagement. And he is pointing out that between the prison bill and the Republican welfare bill and many other things, they are micromanaging, but only they are micromanaging in their way. So let us clear the air of some of this politics.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise and say a few things. No. 1, I have on this Save the Children scarf. A lot of us are going to be wearing these next week. We never thought we were going to have to wear them for saving American children, but that is what we are doing. We are going to have to wear them to save American children because all of the sudden we are watching all sorts of programs that were their safety net being totally dismantled in the name of all sorts of political smoke and rhetoric that is blowing everywhere. And I think that is very unfair.

An awful lot of the cuts we pass today, and the things we will be doing next week, are going to go—and I am a Democrat, so I do not have as fancy a chart as he does—they are going to go for tax cuts. They are going to go for tax cuts, and these are supposed to be great things for America's families.

Yes, they are great if you make over \$100,000. If you make over \$100,000, this tax cut is going to mean \$1,223.23, on an average, per person. That is great.

However, if you make less than \$100,000, guess what? It is going to mean \$26.05. So for most Americans, I think this is a real distortion of what is happening.

I think too, when you look at where this comes from, again, what you see is 63 percent of the cuts that we are talking about are coming from only 12 percent of the programs. This is not across the board.

□ 1530

They are not cutting DOD. They are not cutting the space program. In fact, there are programs in the space program that went up as much as 400 percent. They are not cutting those programs. No, no, no. You are cutting children. Obviously children caused this debt. I do not remember that. I do not think children had anything to do with this debt. And I think to jeopardize their future is positively outrageous.

When you look at low income programs, you again see that when you break it down to discretionary low income programs, they got 15 percent of the cuts; other discretionary programs only got 1 percent of the cuts. Now, tell me how that spells fair? I do not think it spells fair at all.

I had a few other things to say on this 72d day of the contract. I know the gentleman from California wants to talk too. I will be yielding to him very shortly. But here we are on day 72 of the contract. We are seeing all sorts of ethics violations piling up in front of the Committee on Ethics. We are seeing all sorts of legislation that has not