

## WELFARE AND CHILD NUTRITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON LEE] is recognized for 23 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I just wanted to respond to some of the comments that the gentleman from Florida made in terms of term limits.

It is very popular to stand in the aisle or stand up in the well and talk about how one is for term limits, but it is very interesting to know that the gentleman who is for a proposal to limit a Member's term to 12 years he himself has served in that body for 15 years and about to serve one more year which would be a total of 16 years and is not for retroactivity.

I just find it amazing that Members of Congress, those who speak the loudest about term limits, are those who have served in this Congress for 16, 20 and some have served as long as 25 years.

If the gentleman is really for term limits, then I would suggest to the gentleman that he not run for reelection and commit to the American people and basically practice what he preaches and say to the American people here tonight that since he is so committed to this term limit ideal that he is not going to seek reelection.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I do not have the time, but I would be happy to engage with the gentleman on the debate of term limits. But I do not control the time, but I would certainly suggest to the gentleman that if he really wants to be true on the issue of term limits and true to the American people he himself ought to not seek reelection.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Would the gentlewoman yield just on that one point?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I can yield you 15 seconds.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I just want to respond that I am ready to walk out of here voluntarily when every other Member of this body is willing to do it. Other than that, I am penalizing my district.

I do not think that is a good, logical thing to do, but when we have uniform term limits for everybody, whether it be voluntary or otherwise, I am ready to go out. I think that is the logical thing to do, but I do not believe we are going to do it voluntarily. That is why we need a constitutional amendment.

□ 2340

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. We are never going to do it voluntarily, because you have decided not to do it yourself.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I do thank you and I know that we have had a vigorous debate this evening, a

myriad of issues which include term limits.

I want to just, for the brief time that I have to really speak to the American people, I might imagine that some would say that they have been spoken to, but there has been a fury, if you will, and a flurry of discussions today dealing with welfare reform and dealing with where this country needs to go in the 21st century.

One of the great concerns, when you involve yourself in great debate, is, of course, the rising emotions. Today I have heard a number of examples of people who pull themselves up by their bootstraps, individuals who looked over on this side of the aisle, the Democratic side of the aisle, and talked about African American illegitimacy in terms of babies. I know that this is not a castigating of one race of people over another or one group of Americans over another. We know this whole question of welfare reform is not a question of African Americans, White Americans or Hispanic Americans or Asian Americans or any other kinds of Americans.

It is a question of people. What I say, Mr. Speaker, is that in fact all of us are looking for the best way to deal with the issue of welfare reform.

I have maintained since this debate has started, and let me offer to say to those who might be listening, that I am a new Member. So I think it pales worthless to be able to talk about what happened in 1982 and 1983, which I hear many of my Republican colleagues talking about. We now have before the American people the agenda that they want us to have. And that agenda has been an agenda supported by Democrats and Republicans. I imagine Independents. And I imagine all people. That is an agenda that moves people from welfare to independence, the ability to be Americans and stand up and be counted and to be responsible but to also have dignity and self-esteem.

The debate that we have gathered this evening and over these last hours points decidedly by the Republicans to undermine and to cause the lack of self-esteem to come about in people who are now on welfare. By those stories of talking about how people should be independent and how they pull themselves up by the bootstraps, it is accusatory and it is not helpful.

I spent time in my district, as many people have, and I have touched those who are experiencing the need to be on welfare. And I can tell you that the mothers have told me, one and all, this is not the way I want to run my life. This is not the way I want my children to live. I really want to be part of the all American dream.

I hear from people like Alicia Crawford who said, to go and ask a person for assistance, this is a welfare mother, age 30, and she said, is as if you are giving up everything, your dignity, your self-esteem, your ability to walk about. She said, your self-esteem is low. With the help of the welfare sys-

tem, you can find a job which will give you a sense of independence, self-esteem and self-worth.

But you know what, the program that is being offered by the Republicans that they call welfare reform takes away job training, has a sense of mean spiritedness that does not include child care and certainly blames the Government but yet has no way of creating jobs.

Three amendments that I offered to the Committee on Rules and offered to be presented to this House, and that was an amendment that included job care, job training, rather, child care, and a unique, I think perspective, that many my colleagues have supported in the past and are supporting even now, and that is to provide a reasonable incentive for the private sector to provide those welfare recipients who have been trained and are able to work.

Is that not fair? Is it not fair to recognize that Government cannot be the only employer of those seeking independence? Unfortunately, the Republican plan does not include any of that sense of understanding.

Able-bodied parents who are on welfare two to one have said, We would like to work. But yet there is no recognition in the present legislation that is before us to allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, say we are not asking for a handout. We are asking for a hand up. But I tell you what we get with the Republican bill, major cuts for the state of Texas. Our comptroller has already indicated what rescissions will bring about. Let me tell you what would happen to the State of Texas over a 5-year period if we have the present welfare reform package passed in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Title I would block grant cash assistance for needy families resulting in \$323 million less in federal funding for Texas over the next 5 years. Title II for abused and neglected children, in foster care or adoptive placements would lose \$196 million for Texas. What does that actually mean?

I served on the Harris County Protective Services Administration's Foster Parent Retention Program. I lived and breathed the stories of foster parents in terms of the great need, one, that we have in our communities to retain foster parents and what foster parents go through to mend the broken spirits and sometimes broken bodies that come into their homes. Are you telling us that we will block grant them and when there is no money in the bottom of the pot we then say to those abused and neglected children, we have nowhere for you to go, stay and be abused. And if happenstance, you are maimed or killed, so be it.

That is what we are saying. Foster parents who are sometimes at their very last rope because we do not have a enough across this Nation. We did not have enough in Harris County, and we are looking for different resources to be able to allow them to hang on because they were doing such a wonderful



job. But yet we are telling them in this new welfare reform, which I really call welfare punishment, that we will tell those in the state of Texas and many other States that you will have 196 million. That is abusive in and of itself. That is child abuse. That is not being responsive to the needs of our community and of our children.

Title III would consolidate child care programs into a block grant that would cut \$172 million from Federal funds that would be provided for Texas children over the next 5 years. That is 29,000 fewer Texas children that would be served.

I heard a discussion here today that saddened me for it failed to realize the excitement of a young woman. First off, the young woman has not gotten pregnant to get welfare. It has been documented that that is not the case. In fact, most Americans do not believe that. And I would say that primarily because we have documentation that says, and it is refuting all of what the Republicans are saying their mandate has given them.

It says, they asked the question of the American people, should unmarried mothers under the age 18 be able to receive welfare? Interestingly enough, 57 percent of the Republicans said yes; some 63 percent of the Independents said yes; and 67 percent of Democrats. Should welfare recipients in a work program, should they be allowed to receive benefits as long as they are willing to work for them? Same high numbers: 63 percent Republicans said yes; 70 percent Independents and 66 percent Democrats.

I do not know what the mandate is that the Republicans are saying that they have in order to be able to cut off people who are trying to rise up.

My point about child care is, these young energetic mothers who happen to have babies are looking for job training to prepare them for the 21st century. They want to work in high tech jobs. They want to work in clerical jobs. They want to understand the new computer age, the new super-highway. And they are prepared to go out to work. Yet child care is costing any of them, no matter what wages they are getting, particularly if they are at the minimum wage, they are getting some one-third of whatever their wages might be for child care.

Here in the Republican bill we find out that they do not want to give child care to anyone with children under 5. These are young women and possibly young men who are at the prime of their life, who want to have training, who want to get out and work, who want their babies who are 15 months old and 2 years old and 3 years old and 5 years old to understand that mom or the parent, whoever it might be, has the dignity to go out and want to be something and someone.

And then we find title III and title V repealing the nutrition programs, the school lunch programs. And, oh, the

stories we have been told about the school lunches.

First we are told that there are really people who are working-class people who really do not want the lunches. Then we are told that bring the old fashioned bag lunch and go back to the good old days. I can tell you that I truly came from a family, a mother and father, lived with my grandmother. We worked to pull our bootstraps up, if you will. We were looking for the shoes, but we did not have the sadness that people have today, and we were gratified by the kinds of services that were offered to us and my brother. And we made the best of it.

Those were the days that maybe you could bring a mayonnaise sandwich or maybe you could skip, if you will, a lunch for a period of a day or so because things were not as bad as you would find them today, but we go into homes today and we find people living in such degradation, not brought upon by crack and selling drugs but simply because of the poverty, the need of jobs, the lack of education, poor schooling.

□ 2350

So I would simply say rather than maybe getting a good oatmeal breakfast every morning which I got, which even though it was the same old same old, it was a good breakfast, some of these children are not getting any kind of breakfast. And we are told by the American pediatric Association that these children are going hungry in school here, suffering from dizziness; they are not understanding what is going on if they are not on the school breakfast program; that sometimes these meals are the only meals that our children get throughout the week. Kid Care, which is in Houston, a private organization in the city of Houston, has said how many meals children miss. And in fact if they do not get the Kid Care, which is a charitable organization, over the weekend and sometimes during the week, they do not eat all weekend long, and the only time they eat is when they come to the school that Monday morning.

What are you going to say when you block grant child nutrition programs that in fact help our children to learn, help the teachers to be able to control the classroom, and clearly as you can note, the kinds of loss that we are suffering here in Texas, the impact that nutrition block grants will have on WIC programs which have proven to be successful in and of themselves.

If you just look at these numbers, although they go up simply to 1992, you can simply see when we have the prenatal WIC which deals with nutrition and the prenatal care of those mothers that we say have gotten pregnant just to get on welfare, and I have never heard that story, but we notice what has happened: the decline in infant mortality.

Is it not interesting that a community like the city of Houston that has

such a high rate of infant mortality is being compared to Third World countries. Can we even stand as an international world power when we are losing infant children at the rate of Third World countries? That is what will happen with the kind of nutrition programs that is in the Republican plan.

I am looking clearly and supporting both the Deal plan that has been proposed, a Democratic plan, and as well the Mink plan. All of those concern themselves with welfare to work. But at the same time, they recognize that you cannot fill a bucket up with water, then let it run out, and when a dying man or child comes for a drink of water you say to them, "I am sorry, we have no more."

This is what the program is that we have. And then title IV talks about the difficulty or the lack of welfare for legal immigrants. Let me simply say something to you. I am reminded of being taught as a child what the Statue of Liberty stood for, and let me share any misconception. Legal immigrants pay taxes. They pay taxes. I think what we need to understand is that welfare dollars come from our taxes, and so it is certainly irresponsible not to consider those who pay taxes and work and fall upon hard times.

Interestingly enough, we find ourselves with the SSI allotment under title VI denying some of our most severely disabled children. What I am bringing to the point of the American people is I think that we have a voting population and a constituency that is certainly more sympathetic than what is occurring on the House floor. They have decidedly said that if people are willing to work, let them continue to get benefits so that they can bridge themselves to independence. Do not cut off 18-year-olds. Help them get to the point of independence by job training, by child care, and certainly job incentive.

It is interesting to find out there are letters coming in from adoption agencies begging my office for children. We feel it is a mistake to make child protection a block grant. There should be a Federal standard to protect abused and neglected children. It should not be a matter of geography that determines how children should be treated.

This is the issue because what is happening in the State of Texas, which has not been traditionally high in its AFDC payments, this new formula that will be utilized as indicated by our comptroller has said that we will be hurt, we will be hurt in the State of Texas, our children will be going to drink out of an empty bucket. There will be known dollars for abused children, there will be no dollars for adoption assistance, there will be no dollars for WIC assistance programs, there will be no dollars for school lunches and breakfast programs, there will be no dollars to help us understand our own children.



I do not understand this. It is frustrating that when I go home and I have to see a headline like "do not short change Texas children." Is this a ravaging radical, somebody irresponsible? No. It happens to be the President and chief executive of Children at Risk, because before we left home we were pleaded with by the youth commission that is formulated in Harris County, we were pleaded with to remember the children.

Under the proposed legislation Texas would get \$558 million annually for our children, but it would indicate that we would lose dollars because of the formula.

This means that Texas has 7.3 percent of the U.S. child population, New York 4.4 percent but we would be losing money because we would not get the number of dollars to serve that population.

Our children are at risk. And it is very important to understand that as our children are at risk, we are in fact suffering the lack of investment in those children.

Where are the family values we talk about and I have heard them discussed in this very emotional debate about grandmothers and mothers and those good people who raised us? I hear the comments saying that the good people who work do not want their tax dollars thrown away. And if I can share with you what has happened in the WIC Program, gain, and to emphasize again, for example, how this program has again been effective, but I hear all of that kind of talk about where we are, and why we are in fact trying to do it this way, the Republicans say.

But let me show you these numbers. WIC prenatal care benefits saved, if we want to save taxpayer dollars, \$12,000 to \$15,000 for every very low birth weight baby prevented. Is that saving the taxpayers dollars? Is that true investment for the time that we spend?

The gentleman from Louisiana is interested in this issue as well. But, does this save us money? It does save us money; that we would invest to avoid a child that is born that cannot learn, that cannot think and then to have dysfunctional behavior in school because they were a low birth weight baby. This is an investment in our future.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. This whole debate is really not necessarily about mothers, it is really about children. And I think all too often we lose sight of the fact that this is really about 15.7 million children who cannot make the decision and could not make the decision about what household they are born in, they cannot make the decision as to whether or not they are handicapped or not handicapped or have some type of birth defect.

But we can help in the area of prenatal care and we still find ourselves in this Congress cutting money for prenatal care where we have babies dying, high infant mortality all across this country, and I just want to commend the gentlewoman from Texas for taking out the time at this very late hour in talking about the need to preserve some of these programs, because these programs actually affect real people and those real people so happen to be children.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I thank the gentleman, and let me simply say as I close, I have this picture up because I want to emphasize our children are our future. Our Democratic colleagues know that and they know that Texas will lose 100,000 children who will not be able to eat school lunch and of course this is not a me, me situation, me in Texas, you in Louisiana, someone else in New York. This is really about our children.

I think what we need to do in the U.S. Congress is clearly to emphasize not the stories of yesteryear about what grandmother did for me and how we pulled our bootstraps up because we realize by the year 2000 we will be losing \$1.3 million in aid to children, SSI will be losing 348,000 children, in foster care 59,000 while about 14 million children will not have school lunches, 2.2 million under this program, and 14 million children will lose food stamps.

We need to move this agenda forward and vote for legislation that will in fact assure that parents, but yes, children can be able to move with their parents from dependence to independence.

We must ensure our children of a future and we must ensure that the ugliness that has been brought about by the debate or the mean-spiritedness is not the way that we go.

We must ensure that these numbers that I have cited, the 2.2 million in school lunches will not be caught up in the term limits debate, is not caught up in what part of the country we come from, but realize actually we confront that we must represent and govern all Americans. It is so very important.

I hope tomorrow will be a day and Friday will be a day that we vote for legislation that is not a mean-spirited, mishmash, patchwork, but in fact will be a comprehensive and informative piece of legislation that goes to the U.S. Senate that represents all of the people and reflects the polls that are saying Americans are compassionate taxpayers, middle class, rich, whatever you want to call them, working class, poor people are compassionate for our children. That is what we are missing in the legislation that is being proposed. And that is what I had hoped that we would be able to work toward, my colleagues, that that would be the case and that we would be successful in making this legislation effective for all of the people and especially our children.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to again speak against the short-sightedness and apparent spitefulness of H.R. 1214—the Republican welfare reform proposal.

Mr. Speaker, all Democrats unequivocally acknowledge the shortcomings of our current welfare system and are genuinely determined to do the bipartisan work necessary to fix that system.

I, for one, have always believed that welfare should be a hand up, not a hand out.

I want very much to join with all my colleagues in crafting forward-thinking reform that will provide welfare parents and their children with real hope and a renewed sense of individual responsibility.

By promoting the American work ethic with intelligent reform, we can finally make our welfare system live up to its original purposes and promises: To lift people out of poverty; move them into real jobs; and empower them to become independent, self-supporting and productive citizens.

To that end, I offered, in good faith, amendments to this welfare bill that would have accomplished three very important things.

First, so that able-bodied welfare parents ready to work could actually find real jobs in the private sector—as opposed to make-work government jobs—I proposed offering a tax incentive for businesses willing hire them.

I believe corporate America is willing and able to do more when it comes to expanding and preparing our workforce.

Second, so that welfare parents could acquire the training and job-skills private sector employers rightly demand, I proposed that the Federal Government ensure funding for training and education programs needed to prepare welfare parents for the competitive world of work.

And third, so that parents could complete their training and begin a regular work schedule without undue fears about the safety and care of their young children, I proposed that the Federal Government provide assistance for transitional child care.

Mr. Speaker, these common-sense amendments were rejected out-of-hand by the majority on the rules committee.

Unfortunately, the G-O-P proposal before this body makes no job training or child care provisions for welfare parents. And the short-term budget savings it boasts are to be squandered on tax breaks for some of the most comfortable citizens.

For the moment, let's set aside the obvious moral questions the GOP proposal raises. Let us just talk practicality.

If we just begin slashing aid to families with dependent children, emergency assistance for families, childcare assistance, nutrition assistance including the WIC and food stamps program, and supplemental security income for families with disabled children, what will we accomplish beyond tax cuts for the well-to-do?

And what will we do when the bills for our shortsightedness come due?

Will we be forced to raise taxes 5 years from now to pay for costly emergency health care as nutrition-related childhood diseases reach epidemic proportions?

How will we cope with the inevitable explosion of homelessness of women and children?

Are we fiscally prepared to build jails and orphanages to the horizon so that we might incarcerate or house all those Americans who



the GOP bill would relegate to futures outside the mainstream economy?

And does corporate America want a workforce that excludes the potential and creativity of millions of Americans who, in some cases, are literally dying for a chance to succeed?

I do not think the American people would answer yes to any of these practical questions?

The Department of Health and Human Services has analyzed the GOP welfare proposal and their findings are not encouraging.

HHS projects that, during the next 5 years, 6.1 million children nationwide would be cut off from AFDC benefits. Nearly 300,000 in my home State of Texas alone.

I will share more revealing numbers in a moment but my point is this: if family values are truly a concern of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, why won't they work with us to preserve America's safety net for families.

This welfare reform debate is indeed one of values. We must ask ourselves, what kind of nation shall America become as we prepare for the 21st century?

Shall we wisely seek to nurture the vast potential of all our citizens, or merely those with political clout?

Do we want welfare reform that steers people into productive work, or shall we continue driving them down the dead-end road of dependency?

Mr. Speaker, these are our choices and we dare not consider them lightly?

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. EDWARDS of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of the death of a friend.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MINGE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today until 7 p.m., on account of family illness.

#### 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. GENE GREEN of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DURBIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEAL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. THURMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LINCOLN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLEMENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLINK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLYBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OLVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MFUME, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WAMP for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MYRICK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SALMON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. ISTOOK.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. PORTMAN.

Mr. BATEMAN.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in two instances.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD in two instances.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. CONDIT.

Mrs. MALONEY in two instances.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. HOYER.

Ms. LOFGREN.

Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Ms. DELAURO.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOOLITTLE.

Mr. PALLONE.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Ms. PRYCE.

Mrs. MORELLA.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 midnight), the House adjourned until Thursday, March 23, 1995, at 10 a.m.

#### CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1994 TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following report for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
*Washington, DC, March 14, 1995.*

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In compliance with Section 4(a) of Public Law 85-804, enclosed is the calendar year (CY) 1994 report entitled, "Extraordinary Contractual Actions to Facilitate the National Defense."

Section A, Department of Defense Summary, indicates that 45 contractual actions were approved and that 5 were disapproved. Those approved include actions for which the Government's liability is contingent and can not be estimated.