

break the bonds of dependence, we are told to sit down and shut up.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we will not sit down, and we will not shut up. We are going to stand up for the hopes of future generations. We are going to speak out on behalf of victims of the current system, both recipients, yes, and the taxpayers.

If the only coherent, straightforward argument made against welfare reform is the two command words to shut up, then maybe the protectors of the present system ought to consider at least getting out of the way.

The intellectual wellspring of the status quo seems to have run dry after a torrent of rhetoric and \$5 trillion of taxpayer money spent over the last 30 years on this ridiculous system of welfare that we have. The nay sayers simply have not made the case for protecting a bureaucratic Federal welfare system that penalizes work and rewards irresponsibility and writes off whole segments of our community.

So this Congress, I hope, is finally prepared to pass welfare reform. This bill is based upon true compassion. It has the work requirement. It protects children.

It seeks to discourage teenage sex and to crack down on deadbeat dads who want the Government to take the responsibilities for kids that they produce. They ought to own up and pay for these kids themselves. These deadbeat dads have been getting off for far too long.

Our welfare reform eliminates taxpayer-financed subsidy payments for drug addicts and alcoholics. We have been paying drug addicts and alcoholics welfare benefits and SSI benefits. It is disgraceful.

Importantly, it ends discrimination in adoption.

It is time for welfare reform. It is long overdue. We are finally going to pass this tomorrow.

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

[Mr. MFUME addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the chief sponsors of the Family Reinforcement Act, I rise in strong support of the goals of child support enforcement provisions and the Personal Responsibility Act. All are Republican welfare reform initiatives.

The condition of America's families is of utmost importance to the future of our country. We must act quickly and decisively to restore and encourage and protect our most fundamental unit of America society, the family.

I am here today to voice my support for the common-sense goals of H.R. 4,

reducing welfare dependency by ensuring that parents support their children, strengthening and streamlining the State-based child support system and giving the States the tools they need to get the job done.

Too many single parent families have had nowhere else to turn but to resort to government support programs. Too many children go to bed hungry or do without, all because their deadbeat parents outrun the current bureaucratic and time-consuming child support collection system. This has got to stop.

Republicans are working to change our child support collection system. Republicans want to help the needy children of America, particularly when we see that today \$34 billion is owed to children today by deadbeat parents. In my own State of Illinois, that is \$176 million on unmet obligations to the children of Illinois.

Let us look at what is in H.R. 4 regarding child support. The Personal Responsibility Act has three goals in child support: to reduce welfare dependency by ensuring that parents support their children, strengthening the State-based child support system and giving the States the tools they need to get the job done.

It provides for strong measures to establish paternity, requiring applicants and recipients of public aid to establish paternity for their children, granting States financial incentives for establishing paternity.

The bill also provides better tools to locate absent parents, making additional information available to the States, including law enforcement systems and data on licenses, newly hired employees and members of organized labor.

H.R. 4 also provides streamlined procedures to collect child support. In fact, if you look at the States' caseload, which has grown almost 150 percent since 1983, then you will discover that this plan helps States manage caseloads more effectively by providing expedited procedures to order genetic testing, enter default orders and issue subpoenas.

It also removes the barriers that exist when parents reside in different States by requiring States to honor the child support orders of one State so no parent can avoid child support by leaving the State their child lives in.

And it also puts in place tough techniques, tough tools so States can enforce child support orders, strengthening the States' enforcement capability by allowing States to use assets, income and even lottery prizes to satisfy child support debt.

It also requires licensing agencies to collect social security numbers so States may match child support and licensing records and impose restrictions on licenses held by people who fail to support their children.

With adoption of the Salmon amendment today, it allows States to place liens on property of deadbeat parents who fled their States, such as someone

who would flee my home State of Illinois, to avoid their responsibility to their own children.

Ladies and gentleman, H.R. 4 provides tough tools to help deadbeat parents be located and, of course, be forced to meet their responsibilities. If you look at the facts, if you look at the record, H.R. 4 helps kids. In fact, when you know the facts, that too many deadbeat participants have stiffed their own flesh and blood for far too long, then it is time to support the Personal Responsibility Act.

Let us vote for real reform that helps kids, helps children. Let us pass H.R. 4 tomorrow on Friday.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AND REQUEST OF MEMBER ON SPECIAL ORDERS LIST

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name replace that of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] on the list for special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN]?

There is no objection.

WELFARE TO WORK

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 think we can all agree that the welfare system is in need of reform. But the Republicans' idea of welfare reform is to callously toss welfare recipients off the government rolls without much thought to getting or keeping them on payrolls.

You will get no arguments from me that the best way to reduce the welfare rolls is to find jobs for many of the recipients. But merely requiring welfare recipients to find jobs without looking at the factors that make it difficult for them to get or keep these jobs is a reform measure that is primed for failure.

H.R. 4, is the GOP's "Personal Responsibility Bill," takes practically no responsibility for providing mechanisms by which these welfare recipients can make a realistic transition from welfare to work.

First, the bill that we are debating here today contains no funding for work programs. Under this bill, welfare recipients can receive government assistance for up to two years before they are required to work. Why not begin right away with helping these recipients find gainful employment?

Second, this is the same bill that would put low-income working mothers in a bind by cutting federal funds to existing childcare programs.

Let's look at South Carolina, for example. Under this bill, federal childcare programs would be consolidated into a State block grant that would cut \$31 million in Federal funds to the State over five years—meaning that over 5,000 fewer children would receive Federal childcare assistance that year. When are they going to realize that affordable and reliable childcare is a major factor in a single mother's ability to find and keep a job?

Also, another crucial factor in getting welfare recipients to work and in keeping them working, is income. We can not realistically expect a working mother to be able to take care of a family while only earning minimum wage. If we are going to require welfare recipients to go to work, why not require that these jobs provide a liveable wage so that working moms may be able to sustain themselves and their families?

And although this is a separate issue, if you look at the fact that a single mom stands to lose Medicaid benefits for themselves and their children in lieu of a low-paying job with no health benefits, it would make more sense to stay on welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate of welfare reform. But I support realistic and humane welfare reform—one that includes programs that will train current recipients for real jobs; one that addresses the real need for reliable and affordable day care; and one that take into consideration the need for real wages so that these recipients can become self-supporting, productive members of society.

ILLEGITIMACY AND REDUCTION OF POVERTY

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are talking about welfare, and the reason we are talking about welfare is that H.R. 4 is on the floor and for the first time in 40 years we are going to undertake to reform a failed system.

How do we know that this system has failed? Well, first of all, I suppose we know because there is acclamation on the point. I do not think anybody is arguing it. But, besides that, what we can do is look at certain indicia of whether or not it is a success. What have we done, what have we gotten after 35 years of great society?

Well, what we have gotten is we have spent about \$5.3 trillion on welfare since the early 1960s, \$5.3 trillion. Have we reduced poverty in that time? No, we have not reduced poverty. In fact, what we have found is that poverty was coming down year by year by year by year, right from the beginning of this century to the late 1950s and early 1960s, and since we have been throwing money at the problem in tremendous amounts poverty has leveled off and stayed flat.

But the amount of money that we have thrown at the problem has increased and increased and increased and increased by any measure, by measure of nominal dollars, current year dollars or by measure of percentage of Gross Domestic Product. In fact, when you measure by Gross Domestic Product, we have increased the amount from about less than 1 percent of GDP to nearly 4 percent of GDP that we are spending on welfare.

What have we gotten? Have we reduced poverty? No, we have not reduced poverty. What have we done? Well, we have found that we are in a situation with respect to illegitimacy that is truly alarming, truly alarming because it has more impact, it has more implications for what will happen in the 21st century than any other social challenge that we face.

Let us look at numbers for a minute. First of all, we know that in the minority community among blacks two out of every three births is now out of wedlock. For all those people that think this is a problem that is somehow only in the minority community, let me tell you that is absolutely wrong. One out of four white babies is now born illegitimate. Fully one out of three of all births in this country is now illegitimate.

What do we know will happen with respect to kids who grow up in single-parent homes? Well, we know that welfare has failed children more than anyone. It is the cruelest thing that we could be doing to our children.

□ 2030

We know it for a number of reasons. First of all, children in families which are dependent on AFDC for prolonged periods have more developmental problems than children dependent for shorter periods. Sixty-nine percent of children in chronically dependent welfare families score in the bottom third of all children on vocabulary and language skill tests. The source on that is the Life Circumstances and Development of Children in Welfare Families, a profile based on national survey data in the Child Trends Magazine.

We also know being raised in a family dependent on welfare dramatically reduces a child's intellectual abilities and life prospects. Researchers from Baruch College in New York City studied the effects of being raised in a welfare family on the intellectual abilities of children aged three to six. Children on welfare do worse in school, they tend to have other developmental problems, they are three times more likely to end up on welfare themselves. And teenage girls who grow up in fatherless families are far more likely to have early intercourse, pregnancies and abortions than those from two parent families.

What kind of perverse and cruel form of compassion would encourage children to have children? And then condemn them to a dead end cycle of government dependency? What could pos-

sible be more cruel to children than this failed system?

We could not have consciously designed a more destructive system than the one that we currently have. And that is what perplexes me the most about how it is that liberals are defending this system.

What you hear from my friends on the other side of the aisle is well, yes, we need reform, but. It reminds me of the "me too, but" disease, where you say "Yes, we are going to fix this now. We didn't bother for the past 30 years, even though we have been in control of this place for the past 40 years. But now we agree with you, we need to fix this, we need to have reform, but."

Then you start to equivocate and change and not come up with the real reforms that in fact will do the two things that we must do in order to restore some sort of confidence in a welfare system that will actually help people, to give them dignity. And those two things are to encourage marriage and to encourage work.

NUMBERS OF CHILDREN AND SCHOOL LUNCH

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last night, we showed how the Republicans are playing a shell game with the Nation's child nutrition programs. We illustrated that the Republicans would rob Peter to pay Paul in order to support programs, such as school lunch, school breakfast, and WIC. Tonight, no games—just the sad, sorry truth.

The truth is if the Republican welfare reform proposal is enacted, thousands of children in this country will lose their access to a nutritious school lunch. The number I am placing on this map tonight represents the 3,600 children in my homestate of Connecticut who will be dropped from the School Lunch Program under the Republican proposal—and that's in the first year alone. The Republican plan cuts funding for school lunch and by doing so it cuts kids. The Republican plan takes money away from programs, like school lunch, which are efficient, effective, and working to keep our kids healthy and productive, for one reason and one reason only—to pay for tax cuts for the rich.

This is the truth. This is why the Republican welfare proposal must be defeated. I urge my colleagues to look at this map and contemplate the horror of these numbers. These numbers represent children—children who need our help and who are relying on us to do the right thing. I urge my colleagues to remember their needs when the time comes to cast this important vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ].

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing an assault on the