

first program, but it really encourages States to develop their own work programs. And, unlike the Republican bill, the Deal substitute does not remove some existing mandates only to replace them with different mandates regarding payments for children born on welfare or payments to teenage mothers.

I believe that the Deal substitute offers the best approach to welfare reform. It takes a tough approach by setting time limits, and it requires people to be responsible for their own actions. It provides the necessary resources for welfare recipients to realistically achieve self-sufficiency, and I believe that the Deal substitute is the only welfare reform bill which gives the American people what they really want, which is a plan that makes work the number one priority, individuals responsible for their own actions, and welfare reform that gives the States the flexibility they need.

I thank the gentleman. I am sorry I am out of time.

#### WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I have said maybe on two occasions today that this is one of the most important debates that this 104th Congress will be engaged in, and it is important for us to understand what we are about to do here.

I know there are a lot of unhappy folks in this country, unhappy about the fact that there are too many families and too many children on welfare. I know that most people want change.

We must be fair in our representations about who wants change. Republicans want change. Democrats want change. Workers want change, and recipients want change. I think it is one thing that we can agree on.

No one has the corner on wanting reform. We would all like to see reform in the system, and it is absolutely incorrect to say that the President or Democrats did not have a bill, did nothing about reform.

The President had a comprehensive piece of legislation that he attempted to get into this Congress, the 103d Congress, and we got caught up in the health debate, and it turned into a nightmare, and there was not the opportunity to move on welfare reform as the President had planned. So it is not true that the President did not want welfare reform.

The difference between the Democrat and Republicans is the question of implementation. How will we do welfare reform? Will it be a plan that will offer real opportunities for people to get off welfare or will it simply be a plan to punish folks because for whatever reasons they have found themselves on welfare?

I think it is time for us to try and speak about this in a language that the

American public can understand. No, they don't really understand block grants and waivers.

Let's put a face on this discussion. We are talking about, for the most part, just plain old poor people and working people. We are talking about people, some of whom were born into situations through no choice of their own that keeps them locked into the cycle of poverty, and there have been no real guidelines, rules by which they can get out of the cycle of poverty.

We have some folks who work every day, and they are poor. They can't take care of their families. They need food stamps. They need some help with their health care needs.

And so these are real people. These are not pawns that should be used by politicians to gain favor with people who are very vulnerable at this time. This should not simply be a political issue where some politician stands up and says vote for me. I am going to save you money. I am going to get rid of all these bad people.

And we should not have politicians simply defining all of America's problems by talking about the welfare state. And we certainly should not have politicians who talk about taking America's children and putting them in institutions, in orphanages.

We need to talk about these problems in a real way. Yes, there are teenage pregnancies, too many of them, and most of us don't like the idea that babies have babies. But we live in a society where sex is glamorized, where it is promoted, where it is expected. In order for young women to be looked upon with favor, they must be sexual. Young women are sought after by young men and old men, some of them in their neighborhoods, some out of their neighborhoods, some of them who are poor young men who have not very much to offer, some of them politicians and others. We know what is going on in American society.

We need sex education. We need jobs. Jobs have been exported to Third World countries for cheap labor. We need jobs for educated people and not-so-educated people. We need a better education system. We need to deal with the root causes of this problem, and we need to build into welfare reform the real opportunity for people to become independent by offering real jobs, job training and child care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

#### FOOD ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in American history. The Republican Majority, with brute and brutal force, has begun a process to undo a half century of laws—laws that have taken this Nation from the depths of depression and malnutrition to soaring

heights of health. This process threatens the very strength of America. Federal nutrition programs were first started when it was realized that many of those poor upon whom we depended to join the military and defend us came to the job undernourished and poorly fed. If they could die for America, we reasoned, we should feed them while they were young.

This Personal Responsibility Act is irresponsible. It is irresponsible, for many reasons. I want to share five of those reasons with you. First, this Bill penalizes children. It penalizes children because, beginning immediately, fewer children than we now help and who need our help, will be helped. More than fourteen million children will receive less in food stamp benefits. More than six million children, born to younger mothers, will be denied benefits altogether. More than three million children, who do not know their fathers, will get reduced benefits, through no fault of their own. But, worse yet, more than 700,000 of those disabled children who received benefits last year will not receive benefits next year, under provisions of this Bill.

The Republican Majority will say they are making the system more efficient. The children born to children, without fathers and with disabilities, will simply suffer.

Second, this Bill has unfair work requirements. Because it does not clearly define the amount of compensation for the requirement to work, it could mean eighty hours of work for sixty-nine dollars in benefits—less than a dollar an hour. That is not fair. That is not just. That is not humane. At the very least, forced labor should require payment of the minimum wage. The Republicans will say that these workers may get a package of benefits worth as much as ten thousand dollars a year. That is deceptive. What about those who do not live in public housing? What about those who do not receive Medicaid? What about those who only get food stamps? What about child care costs? Those recipients will be forced to work for compensation far below the minimum wage. That does not encourage self-sufficiency. Third, the Bill puts people off welfare, without putting them to work.

Time limits for benefits, without job opportunities will not work. If an individual is able to work, we must insure that a job is available. Fourth, reasonable child care options should be a part of any work program. The Majority recognizes this by offering an amendment to increase the amount of money in the Bill for child care. But, the amendment falls far short. Under the Bill, there is a twenty percent cut in child care, affecting some 400,000 children. The amendment, if it passes, will put a small dent in those affected children. And, finally, but certainly not least, The Personal Responsibility Act creates block grants out of federal food assistance programs, thereby shifting the burden of nutrition programs to

the States. Instead of one nutrition standard, we will have fifty different standards. Instead of promoting our children—our future—we punish them.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Majority has the votes to force this Bill upon the American people. But, what they want and what we want are clearly different. They want block grants. We want healthy Americans. They want cheap labor. We want fair labor. They hurt children. We want to help children. They call the seventy billion dollars in benefit reductions "savings". We call them "cuts". They want to use that money to give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans. We want to use that money to give a break to the children of America. They want change. We want change. Their change is mean and cruel and will cause misery. Our change is for improvement. We want to put people to work, get them off welfare, prevent teen pregnancy, nourish infants, feed needy children and prepare our young for a productive future.

When the record of this period in our Nation's history is written, we want it said that we took people off welfare and put them to work, at a livable wage. We want it said that we fed children in their stomachs so that we could feed them in their minds. We want it said that while some wanted to hurt the people, reason prevailed, and we helped the people. I urge my colleagues to reject the Personal Responsibility Act. It is irresponsible.

□ 2230

#### CHILD NUTRITION IN THE WELFARE REFORM BILL

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today utterly and totally appalled by what I am reading in the bill H.R. 1214, the so-called "Personal Responsibility Act."

If this bill passes, and it just might—judging by the rapid-fire way this and other ill conceived "Contract With America"-inspired legislation is making its way on and off the House floor—the GOP itself should be held "personally responsible" for creating a measure that could create the specter of millions of hungry American children.

Let us take a close look at what will be cut and, if I may, let us use South Carolina as a case study on just how these cuts will affect some of the nation's neediest children.

First, the bill proposes to cut almost \$70 billion over 5 years in low-income assistance programs. As a part of these cuts, the bill will end the entitlement status of all federally funded child nutrition programs in lieu of State block grants, for the States to do what they will.

On the surface, this may sound like big government savings. But a closer look at this bill reveals that these sav-

ings are being made at the expense of our children.

On the chopping block are school breakfast and lunch programs, summer feeding programs, the special milk program and the commodities portion of school nutrition programs.

In South Carolina alone, the absence of the school lunch program could mean that 400,000 children will be denied what may well be their only balanced meal of the day.

Further, the bill repeals the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, better known as WIC.

In South Carolina, the WIC caseload is close to 124,000. WIC has been proven to be highly successful in meeting nationally standardized nutritional needs of women and children.

All totaled, South Carolina would receive \$96 million less in Federal funding for the school lunch and WIC programs.

Also on the cutting board are food stamps. This bill will cut spending by \$20.3 billion in the Food Stamp Program over 5 years. This portion of the bill would impose a rigid cap on food stamp expenditures, with no adjustments for inflation. It would also require certain recipients to go to work without providing any funds to States for job creation.

This portion of the bill would affect over 350,000 food stamp recipients in South Carolina and the State would receive \$174 million less in Federal funding for food stamps over 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have had a steady stream of visitors to my office in the past few weeks—bipartisan visitors—from the South Carolina PTA, the South Carolina Guidance Counselors, the South Carolina Food Service Association, the South Carolina Dietetics Association—people who are horrified at what this bill contains because they know first-hand what the true affects would be on children if this measure were to pass.

What is the impetus behind the GOP trying to pass a measure that has raised the ire of such diverse groups as the National School Board Association, the United States Conference of Mayors, the American Heart Association and the National Education Association?

Why are they so bent on passing a plan that would literally take food out of the mouths of the Nation's young?

It is not secret that Republicans intend to use the revenues raised from cuts to welfare programs to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.

Well, this "steal from the poor to pay for the rich" Robin Hood-reversal scheme has come under fire from all corners.

And the fact of the manner is, even though the Republicans would like to pretend that welfare mothers and their children are the bane of the Federal budget, the realities do not bear them out.

For even if the entire welfare program were totally cut today, it would make only a dent in deficit reduction.

So, this mean-spirited attack on welfare, and in particular, this hatchet job being waged against child nutrition program, is totally unnecessary and will not make any significant cuts in the Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, when this 104th Congress began, much reference was made to the orphanage heralded in the movie "Boys Town" as a model for the Nation on how to deal with children born to poor mothers.

Now, the Draconian measures proposed in this bill brings to mind another movie image, that of young poor and hungry "Oliver Twist," his small child's hands cupped, standing before a scowling orphanage director, piteously pleading, "More, sir?"

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 New York [Mr. FLAKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FLAKE 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 Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### SACRIFICES IN THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, we have debated for many hours today on the welfare reform bill, the so-called Personal Responsibility Act, and it is a very important piece of legislation indeed.

The Republicans say that this bill is about sacrifices. And indeed there are going to be 5 million families, and in those 5 million families there are 9.5 million children who are indeed going to make some sacrifices. Because for each one of those families, for each of the next 5 years on average, they will use nearly \$2,000 worth of income and food and care for children while the parents go to work and care for abused children and such.

And every one of those 5 million families has under \$15,000 of income at the