

The facts are simple. Under the latest formula, 17 States get less money than the Ways and Means Committee approved; 32 States are winners. The losers are: Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Guam, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico, New York, Texas, Virgin Islands, and West Virginia.

For the record, every time the Republicans changed the formula, four States got less. They are: Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, and West Virginia. Eight States were winners every time. They are: District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Nevada, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, and Virginia.

And the important point for the American people to understand is this: All of these changes happened without 1 minute of public discussion. So much for government in the sunshine. I guess the Republican majority thinks secret closed-door meetings are OK—so long as they are the ones having the meetings and making the deals. The American people deserve better.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT), 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.

---

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 26 AND H.R. 209

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 26 and H.R. 209.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

---

#### PUTTING AMERICA'S CHILDREN AT RISK

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I submit to my distinguished colleagues in this chamber that the lives and well-being of some 21.6 million of our nation's children are at risk if we are to allow the proposed welfare reform bill to pass.

I do not believe there has ever been any disagreement on both sides of the aisle of the need to reform our welfare programs. But to do so with such haste as if there is no tomorrow, or that because the Contract With America must be signed, sealed and nailed to the cross within the 100-day period—literally begs the question of why all the rush? Thank God for the U.S. Senate.

Some of my friends across the aisle have repeatedly said the best way to administer

these welfare programs is to let the States do it. And without question some States have been very successful at getting people off the welfare rolls, and give them productive jobs and add more meaning to their lives.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that not all States operate with the same efficiency, and I can just imagine that with 50 different bureaucracies, with 50 different sets of laws and regulations, with 50 different state court rulings, with 50 different budgetary priorities—will result in what I suspect will be utter chaos and confusion—and if I'm correct Mr. Speaker, when you block-grant a federal program to a state, that state does not necessarily have to spend the funds for what Congress had intended—and if that is the case, Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to those 21.6 million children that are not going to receive the full benefits of such federal programs.

Let us reform our welfare system, Mr. Speaker, but let us do it like we are flying like eagles, and not run around doing so like a bunch of turkeys.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD newspaper editorials on this subject, as follows:

#### WHAT SPECIAL INTEREST?

(By Bob Herbert)

MARCH 22, 1995, NY TIMES.—On Sunday more than 1,000 people, many of them children, rallied outside the Capitol in Washington to protest cuts in the school lunch program, which is just one of many excessive and cruel budget proposals the Republican majority in Congress is trying to hammer into law.

The theme of the rally was "Pick on Someone Your Own Size," which was another way of saying that the G.O.P. bully boys might consider spreading the budget-cutting pain around, rather than continuing their obscene offensive against the young, the poor, the crippled, the weak and the helpless.

The Republican reaction to the rally was interesting. Amazing even. Spokesmen for the party denounced the protest organizers as exploiters of children and defenders of special interests. Exploiters of children! What an accusation from a party that is trying to throw poor children off the welfare rolls; a party that would eliminate Federal nutritional standards for school meals; a party that would cut benefits for handicapped children; a party that would reduce protection for abused and neglected children, even though reported cases of abuse and neglect tripled between 1980 and 1992.

Please, a reality check.

And "defenders of special interests"? A Republican in the era of Newt can say that with a straight face? On Monday, Richard L. Berke wrote in The Times:

"Indeed, many Republicans are seeking to punish groups that did not support them in the past to insure that they are never again abandoned. While Democrats have never been timid about hitting up lobbyists, Republicans are going even further, to the point of dictating whom business groups should hire."

The cold truth is that the Republicans currently in Congress are raising the phenomenon of special interests to dangerous new heights. The lead paragraph on a Washington Post article on March 12 said:

"The day before the Republicans formally took control of Congress, Rep. Tom DeLay strolled to a meeting in the rear conference room of his spacious new leadership suite on the first floor of the Capitol. The dapper Texas Congressman, soon to be sworn in as House majority whip, saw before him a group of lobbyists representing some of the biggest

companies in America, assembled on mismatched chairs amid packing boxes, a huge, unplugged copying machine and constantly ringing telephones."

The eager lobbyists had wasted no time in taking up Mr. DeLay's offer to collaborate in the drafting of legislation that would scrap Federal safety and environmental rules that big business felt were too tough. When the bill and the debate moved to the House floor, the Post story said, "lobbyists hovered nearby, tapping out talking points on a laptop computer for delivery to Republican floor leaders."

The mind boggles at the very idea of a Gingrich Republican criticizing anyone as a captive of special interests. Republicans in the era of Newt aggressively hunt down special interests and demand to be taken captive. If, of course, those interests have lots of money.

And when it comes time to make sacrifices to bring the Federal deficit under control, those interests are spared. No pain inflicted there. The Republican zeal for budget cuts comes to an abrupt halt in the face of the real special interests. The so-called Contract With America is actually a contract with big business. Keep in mind the lobbyists writing legislation in Tom DeLay's office. They weren't representatives of the American people, poor or middle class. They represented the real beneficiaries of the contract.

According to the National Center for Children in Poverty, 24 percent of all American children under the age of 6 are poor. Under the twisted values of the new Republican majority, these children become like wounded swimmers in shark-infested waters. Their very vulnerability is a signal that they should be attacked.

James Weill, general counsel of the Children's Defense League, said, "They are taking that part of the American population that is in the deepest trouble to begin with, the group with the highest poverty, the greatest vulnerability, and because they are so politically powerless they are attacking them the most. That, to me, is the worst aspect of what they are doing."

---

#### HOUSE TAKES UP LEGISLATION TO DISMANTLE SOCIAL PROGRAMS

(By Robert Pear)

WASHINGTON, March 21.—The House of Representatives today took up sweeping legislation that would dismantle many elements of the social welfare systems put in place by the Federal Government over the last 60 years.

There was little suspense about the outcome; Republicans predicted that the bill would be approved late this week on a party-line vote.

"Based on the hysterical cries of those who seek to defend the failed welfare state, you would have thought Republicans were eliminating welfare in its entirety," rather than just slowing its growth, said Representative Bill Archer, the Texas Republican who is chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Archer, declaring that "the Republican welfare revolution is at hand," said the Republican bill sought "the broadest overhaul of welfare ever proposed."

For their part, Democrats acknowledged that their substitute measure had little chance of passage but predicted that they would make political gains in the debate by attacking the Republicans as cruel to children. Representative John Lewis, Democrat of Georgia, for instance, infuriated the Republicans when he said their "onslaught" on children, poor people and the disabled was reminiscent of crimes committed in Nazi Germany.

Representative E. Clay Shaw Jr., Republican of Florida, said the comparison was "an absolute outrage."

The Congressional Budget Office said this week that the Republican bill would cut \$69 billion, or 6 percent, from projected spending of \$1.1 trillion on welfare, food assistance, child care, Medicaid and other programs over the next five years. The cuts appear larger—about 11 percent of projected spending. If Medicaid is omitted from the calculations, as Democrats say it should be. The bill makes only minor changes in Medicaid, the health program for low-income people.

The outlook for the bill in the Senate is murky. Senators of both parties have expressed doubts about the House Republican plan to give each state a lump sum of Federal money to help the poor, with few Federal standards or guarantees. Many senators say the Federal Government must retain more responsibility for the use of revenue raised through Federal taxing power.

Representative Harold L. Volkmer, Democrat of Missouri, attacked the Republican bill as "very mean-spirited, very radical." Much of the money saved by cutting aid to the poor would be used to finance tax cuts for the wealthy, he said.

The welfare bill, a cornerstone of the Republicans' Contract With America, would replace several programs, like Aid to Families With Dependent Children and the school lunch program, which guarantee benefits to anyone who meets the eligibility criteria, with direct cash payments to states. The states could then use the money in any way they chose to assist low-income people.

Republicans are still wrestling with the concerns of anti-abortion groups and some Republican lawmakers who say that provisions of the bill would encourage abortions. Those provisions would prohibit use of Federal money to provide cash assistance to children born to unmarried women under 18 or to women of any age already receiving welfare.

House Republican leaders said the ban on cash assistance for those children would probably remain in the House bill. But they said they might accept amendments allowing such families to receive assistance in the form of vouchers, which could be used to buy diapers and clothing for the children.

Representative Bill Goodling, Republican of Pennsylvania, said current welfare programs had "enslaved" the poor. And Representative Gerald B. H. Solomon, Republican of upstate New York, asked, "What is compassionate about welfare programs that encourage dependency for two, three or four generations?" Democrats said they were not defending the current welfare system.

In its report on the bill, the Congressional Budget Office made these points: The proposed work requirements for welfare recipients are unrealistic. The bill says that half of single parents and 90 percent of two-parent families on welfare must work. Based on experience with work programs in the past, the office predicted that no states would meet those requirements.

The Federal Government would save more than \$5 billion a year by making legal aliens ineligible for Government benefits that they now receive. The budget office said 1.7 million aliens would lose Medicaid coverage, while 1.1 million would be denied food stamps.

The bill would cut \$20 billion, or 14 percent, from projected spending on food stamps over the next five years. About 800,000 of the 27 million people now on the rolls would lose their benefits because of work requirements, which stipulate that able-bodied people 18 to 50 with no dependents must work at least 20 hours a week.

Of the 5 million families now receiving Aid to Families With Dependent Children, 2.8

million would lose some or all of their benefits. The number of disabled children receiving cash benefits under the Supplemental Security Income program would be reduced to 538,000 from 900,000.

Representative Sander M. Levin, Democrat of Michigan, told the Republicans, "You use a meat ax against handicapped children and their parents."

#### WORK REQUIREMENTS—TEMPORARY FAMILY ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANT

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, we do need to reform the welfare system. I rise in support of the Deal substitute and wanted to raise one issue to my colleagues.

Yesterday during this debate the Utah demonstration, welfare demonstration, was raised by one of my colleagues on the Republican side as an example of work requirements which work, which H.R. 4 was patterned after. I would like to just share a memorandum from the State of Utah Department of Human Services and let me quote:

We do need to alert you to the impact which one key element, prescriptive work requirements, will have on our own very successful welfare reform demonstration program. Our understanding is that the work requirements were modeled after Utah's program. The following is meant to clarify that the prescriptive work requirements of title I are not congruent with our policy.

They go on to say that the act, as drafted, would prohibit this approach, the act, as drafted, would require dramatic changes in how SPED is operated in Utah. I would urge my colleagues to support the only bill which does follow the Utah work requirements approach, the Deal substitute.

[The letter referred to follows:]

STATE OF UTAH, DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SALT LAKE CITY, UT.

To: Laurales Sorensen, Legislative Analyst, Governor's Office, Washington, D.C.  
From: Robin Arnond-Williams D.S.W., Deputy Director.  
Date: March 9, 1995.

Re: Work Requirements—Temporary Family Assistance Block Grant.

It has come to our attention that the House Ways and Means Committee has now completed its mark-up of welfare reform including Title I. Temporary Family Assistance Block Grant. On behalf of the Department of Human Services, I want to express our appreciation to you and Joanne for allowing us maximum opportunity to provide input into this process. While we believe the final product embodies the core tenets of welfare reform and will strengthen efforts to move individuals off assistance and out of poverty, we do need to alert you to the impact which one key element—prescriptive work requirements—will have on our own very successful welfare reform demonstration program. Our understanding is that the work requirements were "modeled" after Utah's program. The following is meant to clarify that while the concept of requiring participation and work are integral to both

Utah's single parent Demonstration Program (SPED) and our Working Towards Employment Program (formerly EWP), the prescriptive requirements of Title I are not congruent with our policy. To summarize our requirements:

SPED requires universal participation in self-sufficiency related activities by all single parent recipients of cash assistance—no exemptions are provided. 90% of recipients actively participate, those who choose not to participate are sanctioned \$100 per month.

Two-parent families are served under the Working Towards Employment Program. Universal participation of 40 hours per week for one parent and 20 hours per week for the second parent is required. Cash assistance is received only after completion of these participation requirements. Of the hours required, at least 8 hours must be in job search, the remaining hours can be any combination of employment, education, or training.

While most adults in SPED participate in job search or work prior to education or training, this is not appropriate in all cases. Often, we involve participants simultaneously in employment/job search and education/training activities under the philosophy that employment and education go together.

Twenty-five percent of SPED recipients are working in unsubsidized employment which strongly show Utah's commitment to employment (this compares with a national rate of approximately 10%). About 27% of recipients are involved in education activities ranging from basic education to GED to short-term skills training to college. Over half of these recipients are also involved in employment, job search, or mental health counseling. For the remaining recipients, two issues are paramount:

First, for those in GED, short-term training or English as a Second Language educational activities, our experience has shown that the best course is for them to concentrate their full-time efforts on completing these educational paths and then moving into employment that will eventually move them off the system. The act as drafted would prohibit this approach. If we expect a recipient without basic education, specific skills or a work history to immediately go into job search and employment there is a danger of setting them up for failure, producing only short term results, and encouraging the "revolving door" approach to receipt of public assistance.

Second, some individuals cannot work 20-30 hours a week as well as attend school, particularly persons with other barriers such as mental health problems, a disabled child, or transportation problems. This will be particularly detrimental to our rural SPED sites where geographical distances may add as many as 2-3 hours of driving time as a recipient goes from home to child care to place of employment to school to child care to home in a given day. The act as drafted would require dramatic changes in how SPED is operated in our rural areas.

Under SPED, we often push adults to complete education and training as soon as possible. Often we require 40 hours of participation with no time off for summer etc. This significantly reduces their stay on assistance. We expect that the language restricting participation in education and training, could double the length of time some participants are actually involved in education or training and therefore, remain on assistance.

Finally, we need to once again express our concern regarding this level of prescriptive statutory language. In order to effectively meet the goals of welfare reform, states