

not to exceed \$10 million. But the bureaucrats decided to add environmental language to the lease—despite the fact that the environmental issues had been addressed and resolved during three review processes and the fact that no launches would take place for two years thus eliminating the possibility of an environmental problem.

Then the civilian bureaucrats decided that the Space Center would have 60 days to submit a certified insurance policy. Clearly unreasonable because insurance companies rarely, if ever, issue certification of policies within 60 days.

Then, the bureaucrats decided that there should be no cap on the amount that could be sought and awarded in a liability suit—then Spaceport could be sued for any amount of money. Obviously no reasonable insurance company would issue a policy where they would be required to pay unlimited damages.

In the end, due in large part to bipartisan support and participation, the primary lease between the Space Center and the Air Force was signed.

Mr. Speaker, the process by which this lease agreement came to be signed should not be a model for future negotiations. It should have never reached an 11th hour deadline. It should have never reached a point where the Space Center was in danger of shutting its doors. It should never have reached a point where hundreds, and ultimately thousands of jobs, could have been lost. It should never have put tens of millions of dollars in private sector investment in jeopardy. It should never have put the future of commercial space development in California on the line.

One of the reasons the voters of America responded as they did during the 1994 elections was because of problems such as this. The American people have demanded a smaller and more efficient federal government that puts the interests of its people ahead of everything else. This ladies and gentleman, is the essence of the Contract with America.

While spaceport development and commercial space are not part of the 100-day agenda, they are very much in line with the goals and spirit of the 104th Congress. Our government must be willing to make America a strong and vibrant competitor in the international commercial space market. Further, the government must demonstrate to private industry that they are committed to making America a leader in the international commercial space market.

Mr. Speaker, the time for action is now. All of our international competitors—France, China, Russia, Canada, Japan, Australia—are moving forward in the commercial space arena. We cannot fall behind. Spaceport development must go forward in conjunction with an aggressive U.S. commercial space policy.

And who stands to benefit from this approach? Certainly space states such as Alaska, California, Florida, Virginia, New Mexico, Colorado, Texas,

Hawaii and others. But, more importantly, our nation stands to benefit. There is enormous economic potential if we are willing to do what is necessary to successfully compete.

As we saw at crunch time on the Vandenberg lease, commercial space is not a partisan issue—it is an American issue. It is an issue where Republicans and Democrats can come together and unite behind a cause that ultimately benefits all Americans.

□ 2030

#### WELFARE REFORM: SHELL GAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues once again in exposing the myths that the Republicans keep repeating about their welfare reform proposal and its impact on child nutrition programs. Later this evening, two of my colleagues will demonstrate how the Republicans are misleading the American people and how this block grant plan clearly cuts funding for essential child nutrition programs. But before they begin, here are the facts.

The Republicans claim their block grant does not cut funding for child nutrition programs, only the growth rate of these programs. They would like everyone to believe that their proposal increases funding for programs, such as school lunch, by 4.5 percent each year.

The truth is their 4.5 percent increase in funding for School Lunch is a fabrication. In fact, the bill doesn't even designate funding specifically for the school lunch, breakfast, or any other school-based meal program. The Republicans' numbers are nothing more than assumptions—I repeat, assumptions—of how much States may choose to use for lunch programs.

Even if States spent all of the money they receive under this block grant, this mythical funding increase would fall \$300 million short of the amount necessary to meet real needs. That is because the Republicans' plan won't keep pace with expected increases in program enrollment, inflation, or a possible recession. These needs require a 6.5 percent increase, so even the mythical 4.5 percent increase falls woefully short.

The Republicans' mythical funding also includes only cash assistance and not the value of direct purchases of food goods such as cheese and fruit. These direct purchases of food are a critical part of the school lunch program. In the first year, Republicans cut \$51 million from direct food assistance. Over 5 years, they cut \$600 million. That is a total shortfall of \$1 billion even if they live up to their hollow promise of a 4.5 percent increase in cash assistance.

That 4.5 percent promise comes with all kinds of trap doors that will drop

even more kids from the school lunch program.

The first trap door is that States would be required to use only 80 percent of the school block grant for school meals. Governors may transfer 20 percent to other programs. That means a potential additional loss of \$5 billion dollars from the program—\$1 billion a year. In my home State of Connecticut, if the Governor had this kind of discretion today and exercised it, the School Lunch Program would lose \$2 million in 1995 alone.

The second trap door is that these funding increases are not guaranteed—they will be subjected to the political whims of the annual budget process. So the Congress each year will be able to vote to reduce funding even more and drop even more kids from the program.

The Republicans also claim that their bill will cut bureaucrats, not kids. They couldn't be further from the truth. If Republicans were only interested in cutting administrative costs they would have done their homework: The entire administrative budget for all USDA feeding programs is \$106 million per year. The Republican plan would cut \$860 million in 1996 child nutrition programs alone. The bottom line is their cuts far exceed what is needed to control administrative costs.

The truth is, if the Republican proposal is enacted, 3,600 kids will be dropped from the School Lunch Program in Connecticut in the first year alone, and over half a million kids will be dropped nationwide.

The Congressional Budget Office has concluded the Republican proposal will cut \$2.3 billion over 5 years from school based nutrition programs and \$7 billion from all child nutrition programs over 5 years.

Republicans though don't want to admit this. They actually believe that these are not cuts. They boast that their plan provides savings. I ask you, how can you have savings, if you don't have cuts? This is the biggest Republican myth of them all.

The tragedy in this debate, Mr. Speaker, is that these Republican myths are being perpetuated so that drastic cuts can be made in a program that everybody agrees is working—and working well. And the savings—the money that will no longer be used to pay for a child's school lunch—will be used to pay for a tax break for the wealthiest Americans. It's shameful. It's mean spirited. It's just plain wrong.

#### WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, as we enter into this debate on welfare in this country, I think it is important to recognize that my colleague from west

Tennessee, the Honorable JOHN TANNER, told me not long ago when I first got here that he really believed that neither party had an exclusive on integrity or ideas, and I agree with that Congressman. And this should not be a Republican or a Democrat issue. This should be an American issue.

It is clear in my heart that this country wants this welfare system to change, not to be reformed but to be replaced. They want a working opportunity society. They do not want the continuance of the status quo with regard to welfare.

The Washington Post this morning—we all know the tendency politically of the Washington Post—editorialized and said about welfare: "Besides, what's the choice? The existing approach has failed and the public has no appetite for vast new social programs even if there were evidence they worked, and there isn't."

You know an outstanding Tennessee Congressman, Colonel Davey Crockett on the very floor of this House said about welfare, "We have the right as individuals to give away as much of our own money as we please as charity; but as Members of Congress we have no right so to appropriate a dollar of the public money" for charity.

Franklin Roosevelt said in 1935 about welfare: "Continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit."

There is a great article in this month's Reader's Digest. It is called "True Faces of Welfare." In it is a case study of a welfare recipient whose story appeared. Her name is Denise B.

"Denise says she would like to work. But she would have to earn a lot, she says, for it to be a better deal than welfare." She talks about how she would have to go to school, and work her way up to a higher salary. "It's a lot of work and I ain't guaranteed to get nothing." Welfare by contrast, is guaranteed—in her words 'until they cut it out, until they say no more.' Denise knows politicians are talking about that now and she does not believe they are wrong."

"Welfare," she offers, "is an enabler. It's not that you want to be in that situation. But it's there. We always know."

This has become a national attitude about this system, and it hurts children, and true compassion is what I want to discuss here tonight in my short time and as I rise to my feet to talk about welfare.

In my home city a social worker who I will leave unnamed came to me several times in the last few years to tell me of a story in Chattanooga, TN, where multiple children were being born for one reason and one reason only, and that is financial, to gain more benefits.

You know that system creates the worst form of child abuse imaginable, in my estimation, because children then are not born for the right reasons. They are not born because their par-

ents want to love them and sacrifice for them and set aside their own ambitions, and give to them and nurture and educate them. They are born so that they can receive financial benefits. And the stories continue to roll in of how many situations we have like this across the country.

The neglect that those children are suffering because this system promotes this kind of activity is what we need to focus on as we say listen. Everyone agrees, it is time to eliminate the welfare system and replace it with an opportunity society.

In the last 30 years we have spent \$5 trillion on welfare in this country, and we have got more illegitimacy, more poverty, more problems, more crime than you could ever buy with \$5 trillion. It has not worked and it is time to move on. And I believe from the very core of my experience, Mr. Speaker, that true compassion means having the guts to replace welfare at this critical moment in America's history.

#### TAKING CARE OF AMERICA'S CHILDREN

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, America is asking the question that Congresswoman DELAURO just answered, and that is how is it that the Republicans can say they are not hurting the School Lunch Program when they take over \$2 billion away from the School Lunch Program and over \$7 billion away from the nutrition programs for the children of this Nation?

The fact of the matter is they cannot. They cannot fulfill the promise of this Nation to feed hungry children, to take care of children in need, and at the same time remove these funds. The mythical increase as she referred to simply does not provide for the element of growth in the program that takes into account the ever increasing cost of food, the increasing number of children unfortunately in this country who continue to be eligible for this program, and what happens in the downturn in our economy.

So the result is that in fact the school breakfast program, the lunch program, the after school program, and the commodities program simply cannot be taken care of.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is referring to this Republican plan to block-grant all of these different feeding programs into one single grant of money, and they are arguing that they are not cutting back.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman is quite correct. What we see

here is the block grant. This is what you need, this is what you are trying to cover. This is the block, ladies and gentlemen, that you have to cover to take care of America's children. You have got to provide lunches for children who need lunches, you have to have food assistance in order to provide the commodities and fresh fruits and vegetables necessary so you can have a healthy lunch, and an after school and summer program because many children unfortunately, when school is out they still require food. It is necessary that they eat, they are still hungry. And of course the breakfast program has become more and more important as we see this is the key if children learn in the early hours of their school day and this is what is necessary.

But unfortunately you will see here that the Republicans do not do that. If you take care and provide full funding for lunches and you provide full funding for food assistance, and you do the breakfast program, you can see that the block grant does not cover the block because there is no funding available for summer programs which so many of our children rely on.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will further yield, the Republicans argue they are not killing these programs at all, in fact they are providing more money for them. And yet you have one of the blocks there, if I am not mistaken, the after school and summer program that is not provided for. How does this work?

Mr. MILLER of California. What the Republicans would do because they did not provide the increase for the commodities program, they would suggest the commodities is really taken care of, so there would be money left over to take care of after school and summer breakfasts, but there is, as is apparent readily to anyone in the audience, of course nothing here in the commodities program, and the commodities are a key component and that is why when Republicans say they are going to give a 4.5 percent increase for the nutrition programs they did not figure in the cost of commodities into their escalator. And once again there we find out that the block grant they talk about to feed American children is not fully covered and children now go without the commodities portion of that program.

□ 2045

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentleman will yield, the school districts I represent in Illinois, their commodity assistance which they receive actually is a way that they are feeding the kids in terms of lunches and breakfasts and so forth.

Now, if the Republican block grant does not provide enough money for the food district have?

Mr. MILLER of California. Well, your school district could take another action. It could take away the breakfast program and provide the commodities that are so terribly important for the school lunch program where they make