

to come with me to every home across America: a little shanty, a little ramshackle farmhouse. In my area, we have some cardboard and tin-roofed places where the poor live.

I can assure the Members, and I challenge anyone to deny, that in some of those houses Members will find a hungry child that had no supper tonight. Members will find an elderly person that had no supper tonight. I challenge anyone to deny that. They cannot, because that is the fact. That is the purpose for what we use the food stamps.

All the other areas we can address, and we have. It pains me to hear Members using the political "40 years, 40 years." For 28 of those years, those 40 years, we had a Republican President, that Republican President that tried to cut some of the programs. How ironic.

I quote:

I cannot lend my support to the concept of turning back to the States all responsibility for achieving child nutrition goals. In short, we have a continuing obligation to ensure that the nutrition needs of our truly needy youngsters, wherever they may reside, are adequately met. This is and must remain a national priority goal.

Quoting the Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], who chairs one of our committees at this time. That is a quote from the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, to end the colloquy that was previously discussed, I yield 17.5 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the gentleman from Oklahoma is correct in his understanding of the language and intent of section 556.

Further, my colleague raises extremely important points in relation to the approach being taken by the administration's EBT IEI proposal. I look forward to digging deeper into this issue during the oversight hearings which we are going to hold on the subject.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, can we please end the class warfare argument or discussion or partisan exchange and get to food stamp reform? We have had a lot of discussion about school lunches, which is not even part of this debate, we are talking about food stamps. We have had a lot of talk about the food costs and how we cannot really match the food costs.

Only in Washington is a 2 percent increase considered a cut. If food prices go down, food stamps, benefits, will go up 2 percent. It happened in 1990. If the food costs go up, and nobody can predict that, other than the gentleman from Texas DICK ARMEY the self-declared Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in this body, but if food costs would go up we will appropriate the

money with a supplemental, so that deals with the problem of food costs.

Quality control, it is out of control. It is over 8.5 percent. The Panetta plan reduces it back in terms of quality control to 6 percent. That is in part how we control these costs.

Somebody mentioned the WIC program. We are not discussing WIC here. There is \$25 million sitting there in the account of WIC. It was cut \$25 million. We had \$50 million, it is down to \$25 million. They have to advertise on the radio to get more participants. It is a good program, by the way.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Dakota said that some school child in North Dakota was going to go hungry because of school lunches. The Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities has informed this Member \$1 million more next year than last year. We will cut the paperwork and the administration and we will give the money to that very hungry child.

Let us really talk about food stamp reform. In 1985, 19.9 million people were on food stamps. It went up to 20 million in 1990, 22.6 in 1991, 25.4 in 1992, and in 1993, 27.3. When the economy goes down, the food stamps, that expenditure goes up. When the economy goes up, food stamp expenditures go up. We simply want to control the growth of the program. We will address the needs, if in fact they are needed.

The opportunity of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL] is a deal but it is not the best deal. We should be supporting this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LET US HOPE REPUBLICANS GET THE MESSAGE

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the other side is crowing about the success of the Contract With America. Well, here is a poll that came out today. Headlines: "Public Growing Wary of GOP. More Now Trust Clinton To Help the Middle Class."

Here are some results of this poll: Most Americans think Republicans are going too far in cutting Federal programs that benefit children, the elderly, the poor, and the middle class. Fifty-nine percent of Americans think Republicans will go too far in aiding

the wealthy. Fifty-two percent of Americans agree the more they hear about what Republicans do in Congress, the less they like it. Fifty-one percent of Americans think Republicans in Congress were trying to do too much in too short a time. Fifty-three percent of Americans trust the President more than Republicans in Congress in protecting Social Security. And 52 percent of Americans trust the President more than Republicans in Congress in helping the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are sending this message to the Republicans on the Contract With America: "Hold it. Be careful. Do not rush it. You are overdoing it. There are some essential programs, cutting the middle class, cutting children, that are going too far."

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD that newspaper article, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 21, 1995]

#### PUBLIC GROWING WARY OF GOP CUTS

(By Richard Morin)

Most Americans believe that Republican lawmakers are going too far in cutting federal social programs that benefit children, the elderly, the poor and the middle class, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News survey.

As a result, the survey suggests, President Clinton may be slowly winning back some of the political ground he surrendered to Republicans immediately after the GOP landslide in last November's congressional elections.

Clinton also appears to be getting a sustained second look from many middle-class voters who deserted the Democratic Party last year. In a critical reversal of attitudes, people now say they trust Clinton more than Republicans in Congress to help middle-class Americans, the survey found. Barely a month ago, Republicans enjoyed a clear advantage over Clinton.

Yet these doubts about congressional Republicans have not yet appreciably helped Clinton's overall public standing. His personal job approval rating stood at 52 percent in the latest survey, essentially unchanged from last month. And Republicans remain more trusted than Clinton to deal with the "main problems the nation faces."

A total of 1,524 randomly selected adults were interviewed by telephone March 16-19. Margin of sampling error for the overall results is plus or minus 3 percentage points.

The survey suggests that the honeymoon may be over for the House Republican "Contract With America." While a majority of those interviewed still give approval in concept to the contract, 52 percent also agreed with the statement "the more I hear about what Republicans do in Congress, the less I like it." Forty-four percent expressed the opposite view.

Among the public's biggest worries: the the Republican majority in Congress will cut too deeply and too quickly into social programs to finance tax cuts and other benefits to wealthy Americans.

Nearly six out of 10 persons—59 percent—agreed with the statement that Republicans "will go too far in helping the rich and cutting needed government services that benefit average Americans as well as the poor." That's a 14-point increase since January in public concern with Republican initiatives.

Pluralities specifically said Republicans in Congress were trying to make too many cuts

in the nation's education programs and in the school lunch program. (Republican lawmakers argue that they would increase school lunch funding but slow its growth.)

The survey also found that many Americans are wondering if the GOP is moving too fast on other fronts to cut federal spending and programs. According to the survey, 51 percent said Republicans in Congress were trying to do too much in too short a time, while 18 percent said they were trying to do too little and 30 percent said they were doing "about the right amount."

In other ways, too, the survey results suggest people are questioning whether Republicans' zeal to cut federal spending and programs will end up hurting average Americans.

By 52 percent to 38 percent, those interviewed chose Clinton over Congress when asked who will do better in "helping the middle class." Barely two months ago, Republicans held a 49 percent to 41 percent advantage on this measure. And 55 percent said that Clinton understands the problems of "people like you," while an equally large majority said the Republicans in Congress do not.

Republicans retained their advantage over Clinton on such traditionally GOP issues as managing the economy. But even here, the president appears to be closing the gap. According to the poll, 47 percent of those interviewed trusted Republicans in Congress more to deal with the economy, down from 56 percent six weeks ago. At the same time, the proportion trusting Clinton more on economic matters increased from 34 percent to 43 percent.

The survey also suggests that congressional Democrats were successful in their efforts during the recent balanced budget amendment debate to raise doubts about the willingness of Republicans to spare Social Security entitlements from budget cuts.

By 53 percent to 34 percent, Clinton was trusted more than Republicans in Congress to protect Social Security. In early January, Republicans held a 7-point advantage over the president.

Overall, Clinton held the advantage over congressional Republicans when asked who would do the better job in helping the poor, protecting the environment and "protecting America's children," issues on which Democrats traditionally do well.

Republicans in Congress were trusted more than Clinton in reforming welfare, handling crime, cutting taxes and reducing the budget deficit, the survey found.

With the 1996 presidential election 20 months away, Senate Majority Leader Robert J. Dole (Kan.) emerged as the early front-runner for the GOP nomination, volunteered as the choice of 32 percent of those self-described Republicans interviewed. Every other Republican was supported by less than 10 percent of those interviewed.

Clinton was the volunteered choice of 55 percent of those Democrats interviewed, with every other Democrat finishing in single digits.

When matched in a hypothetical presidential election, Clinton and Dole finished in a tie, with each receiving 46 percent of the projected vote.

#### CLINTON AND THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

[Washington Post-ABC News Poll—March 19]

Do you approve or disapprove of the way Bill Clinton is handling his job as president since taking office in January 1993?

Approve 52 percent; disapprove, 45 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

Which of these two statements would you say represents the greatest danger for the country:

	Jan. 4 (per- cent)	March 19 (per- cent)
Republicans will go too far in helping the rich and cutting needed government services that benefit average Americans as well as the poor. ....	45	59
Democrats in Congress will go too far in keeping costly government services that are wasteful and out-of-date. ....	43	34

For each specific issue I name, please tell me who you trust to do a better job handling that issue.

Areas where President Clinton received more trust:

	Clinton (per- cent)	Rep- ubli- cans in Con- gress (per- cent)
Helping the poor .....	61	27
Protecting the environment .....	54	36
Protecting Social Security .....	53	34
Helping the middle class .....	52	38
Protecting America's children .....	49	40
Areas where Republicans in Congress received more trust:		
Cutting taxes .....	36	52
Reforming the welfare system .....	38	51
Reducing the federal budget deficit .....	36	50
Handling the crime problem .....	41	48
Handling the nation's economy .....	43	47
Handling the main problems the nation faces .....	39	46
Areas where Clinton and Republicans are equally trusted:		
Upholding family values .....	44	45

NOTE: Figures may not add to 100% because "no opinion" is not included. The most recent figures are from a Washington Post-ABC News national telephone poll of a random sample of 1,524 adults March 16-19. Other data are from Washington Post-ABC News polls of approximately the same sample size. Margin of sampling error for all polls is plus or minus 3 percentage points overall. Sampling error is, however, only one of many potential sources of error in this or any public opinion poll. Interviewing was conducted by Chilton Research of Radnor, Pa.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

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

#### HONORING WILLIAM J. SHADE, A TRUE AMERICAN HERO

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

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor a member of a World War II, B-17 bomber crew for an act of heroism that, until now, has gone unrecognized. His name is William J. Shade, of Fleetwood, PA, and he was a technical sergeant in World War II. He has been awarded there Oak Leaf Clusters and one Air Medical.

William Shade was a radio operator and gunner with the 545th Bomber Squadron, based in England during the war. He entered the service in November of 1942. He received his preliminary training in California, and was later trained as a radio operator in South Dakota, and took gunnery training at Tyndall Field, FL. He was promoted to sergeant before going overseas in 1943, and while overseas was promoted to staff sergeant and later technical sergeant.

The accounts of William Shade's heroic act are taken from crew members who were saved by his bravery. These men would not have survived the mis-

sion were it not for Mr. Shade's actions.

On March 3, 1994, the 545th Bomb Squadron of the 384th Bomb Group based at Grafton-Underwood in England was dispatched on a mission over Berlin.

The crew had been briefed to expect less than perfect weather over the target. However, the briefing officer believed that the crew could fly above the weather somewhere between 20 or 25 thousand feet. As the mission progressed it became apparent that the bomber was not going to find weather good enough to maintain formation and bomb their target.

Approximately, two thirds of the way to Berlin, the mission was recalled and the B-17 was told to return to England.

Shortly after the bomber had completed its turn to proceed to their base in England, Sergeant "Chick" Metz, the ball turret gunner, requested permission to leave his battle station for a short time.

At this time, the plane was still flying at 25,000 feet. A few seconds later the oxygen control officer, Lieutenant Betalotti checked to see if Sergeant Metz had returned to his battle station, but he did not answer.

After a few more seconds he was again called and still did not answer. One of the waist gunners, Sergeant Alfter, went to check on him.

Sergeant Alfter reported that Sergeant Metz was apparently unconscious and would need some help. About the same time Sergeant Alfter lost consciousness because of lack of oxygen. A third person, gunner, Sergeant Gatzman, proceeded to the access door of the ball turret to give Sergeant Metz and Sergeant Alfter aid, but he too passed out.

Then Sergeant William Shade, looked through the door of the radio room, saw and recognized the seriousness of the situation for the three unconscious gunners, and began to take immediate action.

With no regard for his own personal safety, Sergeant Shade disconnected his own oxygen, and made it to the location of a walk-around oxygen bottle, which was very small and had only a few minutes of oxygen left. He was able to connect the ball turret gunners normal oxygen supply and then was able to connect Sergeant Alfter's and Sergeant Gatzman's supply. All three gunners regained consciousness within a few moments and suffered no permanent mental effects. If it had not been for the Sergeant William Shade's quick action under pressure, the three crew member's would not have survived.

When the B-17 returned to the base, one of the crew members mentioned to the debriefing officer that Sergeant William Shade should receive a medal for his actions. The debriefing officer, said the least that could be done was to give him a promotion. The officer promoted William Shade to staff sergeant then and there.