

something about this, by the time our children reach middle age they will be confronted with a tax rate of 82 percent just to finance the debt and social programs. Since Congress did nothing last year, the President came forward this year and slipped under our desk a note that said we are now talking about 84 percent.

So when we talk about what we are doing to the children, I think we also have to look at what we are doing to the children of the next generation when they become of age. It is just simply wrong.

In 1994 as we were told earlier, President Lyndon Johnson declared war on poverty. I think it is time that we as a Congress take a look around and count the casualties. Fortunately, or unfortunately for us, we do not have to go very far from this Capitol to see many of the casualties. As a matter of fact, if you walk about 10 blocks in any direction from the U.S. Capitol, you will see those casualties. You will see the hopelessness. You will see the despair. You will see the ingrained poverty which we have created.

I want to read a quote, and I think it is so good and it says so much.

By intervening directly in depriving society of its responsibility, the social assistance state leads to a loss of human energies and an inordinate increase of public agencies which are dominated more by bureaucratic ways of thinking than by concern for serving their clients and which are accompanied by an enormous increase in spending.

It was not me who said that, it was not NEWT GINGRICH who said that; it was Pope John Paul II, and he was absolutely right. The social welfare system created by Federal bureaucracies simply does not work. The tragedy of our welfare system in part is that it is costing too much money, and we are burdening our kids with a debt they will never be able to pay off.

But the real tragedy of their inalienable rights to use their God-given talents. We are with the perverse incentives of the welfare system today creating a system that creates dependency.

We have perverse incentives within the system. Children raised in families who receive welfare are three times more likely to be on welfare when they become adults. This system just simply is broke, and tinkering around the edges is not going to solve it.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are way out in front of us on this issue. They demand welfare reform. They want it this year. Thankfully, I think we are going to give it to them finally.

#### DO NOT CHANGE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, all of us agree the welfare system needs major changes, but I have not met anybody in my district, students parents,

teachers, school administrators, cafeteria workers, that think that we need to radically change the school lunch program.

Earlier this week I visited Tennyson Elementary School in Sheffield Lake, OH, east of where I live in Lorain County. I was taken around this wonderful little school by a couple of young men, 9-year-olds, third graders, named Will Emery and Zach Russell. I also met with Jennifer, Kelly, and Sarah Ward, three sisters at the school, and lots of other children; Mrs. Urmston, the principal, some people on the school board, administrators, and others.

It is clear. Every one of them said:

Do not mess with the school lunch program. It works. We do not want any changes in the school lunch program.

Unfortunately, Republicans in this radical proposal do not see it the same way in their move toward their extremism.

□ 2045

I would like to put on this board, add to this board what the school lunch cuts will mean in Ohio, another 13,400 children will lose their school lunches as a result of this Republican extremism.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Have you seen this CRS report?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have seen it. Every speaker that comes up uses the CRS report.

Mr. HOKE. We are both from Ohio. We both care about Ohio. It shows that there is an increase in funding for school nutrition programs, school lunch, \$11,500,000, 1996 over 1995. Why are we not on the same page with this?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Every teacher, every PTA, every group out there, every organization, every individual that knows about this understands the mean-spiritedness of these cuts. You claim \$7 billion in savings on the one hand so you can score for your tax cuts for your wealthiest constituents on the west side of Cleveland, and yet, on the other hand, you are saying "we are not making any cuts."

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to get in on this a little bit, too. The fact of the matter is that the block grant program, with some increase, is really the amount of children right now in the State that requires nutritional help. If there are more, as one of my colleagues has said earlier, it is like counting up to 100 and saying the rest of you are out of luck.

It does not take into account any recession. It does not take into account the fact that 20 percent of that block grant can be used for anything in the world that the State wants to use it for, even to build a bridge, if they like.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the economy goes bad in a certain area, there are a lot of parents laid off, those school lunches will not be increased for those kids.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Correct. There is nothing more coming from here. Nothing more will come from here. The States, there is nothing in the world to make the States do anything, including putting people to work. As a matter of fact, the Republican head of the Congressional Budget Office said just today that there was not a single state in the union that was going to meet the goal of putting people to work that is in this contract. That is the Republican CBO director. That is the word we got from him today.

We are trying, on our side, to get people back to work. We do not think that just after the amount of time that you can spend on welfare is up and you are thrown out in the street, we do not consider that success. We look at success in getting somebody to a job that they badly need and they badly want.

The Republican bill does not do any of that. It simply gives you the amount of time. If there are more children that need food than the block grant allows for, tough.

Now, if we can feed children in Somalia, we can feed people in the United States.

I yield back to the gentleman from Ohio, after I stick this on New York, 7800 children in my district alone will go without lunch.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, we will see, instead of running the School Lunch Program the way it has been run for 49 years to the satisfaction of almost every one in this country, we will turn it over to 50 State bureaucracies.

We will lose the power buying, if you will, and some of the savings that way, particularly in the WIC program, where infant formula will cost as much as \$1 billion more, several groups have estimated, because we will lose competitive bidding. We will end up in a situation where we have programs that work and instead we may turn them into programs that do not work.

If something is working, certainly the welfare needs reform, but something like the School Lunch Program standing alone works. I see no reason to change it.

#### MORE ON THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. I thank my friend from Illinois. I just have to point out that each time we see one of these little

pins go up on the map, there is a fundamental deceit going on. It is the only way that I can describe it.

In the State of California, I am sorry, in the State of New York, 1996 over 1995, under the block grant program, there is a \$28,798,000 increase in funding for school lunch programs. In the State of Ohio, \$11,500,000 increase in funding.

All that I can do is, I have to wonder if there is not something else going on. Who is being represented? What vested special interest is being represented? Could it be government bureaucrats? If we look at this, what have we got, \$1,900,000 that has been contributed by Federal employee PACs to Republicans; \$17,682,000 contributed by Federal employee PACs to Democrats, about a 10-to-1 ratio.

What is going on here? Are the children being represented? Or are the government bureaucrats, the Federal Washington bureaucrats being represented?

Mr. LAHOOD. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. I still was confused if the State of Ohio is getting, is this 11 million, \$11.5 million more?

Mr. HOKE. Eleven and a half million dollars more in 1996 under the block grant program than in 1995.

Mr. KINGSTON. I just want to make sure the record is complete. One of the other statements of the previous speaker was that the program has been rocking along for 41 years to everyone's satisfaction and there have not been any problems.

Here is the problem, and this is something really, I wish the President was watching tonight. We spend the third largest item on our national budget is interest on the national debt. We have not had a balanced budget since 1969. The third largest item is interest. It is just short of \$20 billion a month that we pay in interest on the national debt. To say that this program is not a problem is to me unbelievable.

Program after program is okay, not this program, not this one, everything is running fine, hunky-dory, no problems at all.

If you want to help children, you keep the country from going broke. How many kids are you going to feed when you are broke? You cannot do it. I am telling you, you cannot always lead with your heart. You have to use your brain and the formula.

Mr. LAHOOD. Reclaiming my time, I have not said one word yet on my own time, but I want to tell the American people what is happening here.

Last night we saw the distinguished gentleman from California stand up here with his paper plate display and move them around and try and shift things around to try to persuade the American people that if you say something often enough, my gosh, they might even believe you.

So we move this paper plate here and this one here and this one here and, all of a sudden, we have moved a bunch of

paper plates around. But we have not proved anything.

So tonight we get a little geography lesson. They bring a map of the United States of America. And we are trying to teach a little geography. And we bring these little cutouts of children to try and tell the American people again to continue the drumbeat, as I said, if we say it often enough, somebody is going to believe us, we are cutting school lunch programs.

You believe that if you tell the American people something often enough they will believe you. That is why you have been on the floor every night. And the truth is, and you know it is the truth, there is not one Member in this House, not one Republican, not one Democrat that want to cut the school lunch program. Nobody wants to do that. Nobody wants to do it.

But what we want to do is what you could not do when you had control of the White House, the House of Representatives, and the U.S. Senate. We want to reform welfare. You had your chance to do it. Where were you? You had two years to do it. You talk a good game. You talk a great game. But you never produce.

#### WELFARE REFORM

Tomorrow the House of Representatives will deliver on one of President Clinton's own campaign promises. We will "end welfare as we know it." But it will be a Republican-controlled House of Representatives forging ahead with this revolutionary task—not his own Democrat-controlled House.

This piece of legislation, the Personal Responsibility Act, is quite possibly the most important piece of legislation that I will vote on as a Member of Congress.

We have fought the war on poverty and, unfortunately, we have lost that war. We must now turn to solutions that will stop this cycle of generational poverty. Even though Americans remain compassionate people, we have to do something to stop kids from having kids—to make fathers and mothers more responsible—and to encourage able-bodied members of the work force to provide a proper livelihood for their families.

Welfare has exploded into an industry that no longer cares for—or effectively deals with—what Lyndon Johnson envisioned. His temporary assistance has turned into permanent poverty. The collapse of work and family has spawned crime, drug use, problematic educational environments, and other social ills—and the people who have suffered the most are the ones we want to help the most—the children.

Residents of my hometown of Peoria have been horrified last week by an occurrence on the north side. A young boy, age 11, was found dead in a vacant lot covered with plastic garbage bags. He has been beaten with a metal pipe and suffocated to death, a 14-year-old "friend" was charged with the murder. The mother of the slain boy was alleged to have allowed the child to smoke marijuana when he was 5. He was put in a foster home at a young age, but, later, was given back to his mother—a mother who has been convicted on prostitution charges, and is currently facing another charge for the same offense. And neighbors say the slain boy would wander the

neighborhood late at night—sometimes being locked out of his house. This is just another in a long succession of American tragedies. This takes place, only with different names, in cities all across our Nation. This is shameful—and immoral—and we must have the courage to face up to the tragedy of circumstances like this and do something about it.

This monumental task of reform will not be accomplished without naysayers decrying at every attempt. One example of this has been the Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] program. Liberals have been racing around breathlessly accusing Republicans of gutting the WIC program. When, in fact, the \$25 million rescission is coming out of a \$3.5 billion-a-year program. But, this is not a cut, as you and I understand the program. Each year, the WIC program runs a \$55 million to \$125 million carry-over of funds. In other words, this is what they usually have left over, because they have not yet been able to spend all of their budget. When the Federal Government is adding \$200 billion a year to the national debt, one place to start saving money to balance the budget is in carry-over funds.

More lies have been told about the school lunch program. Liberals have again accused Republicans of either cutting or abolishing these programs. The fact is that our plan would do neither. Our Nation's school lunch program for children would not be abolished or cut. School lunch spending will, in fact, grow by 4.5 percent every year through to the end of this century. Far from cutting its programmatic spending, the block grants would increase from \$6.7 billion next year to \$7.8 billion over the next 4 years. Our bill seeks to turn over all of the program's money to the States and let them run it in the most efficient way possible.

Finally, the \$27 billion food stamp program will be reformed by capping its growth to 2 percent a year and combining four other food programs into one. The bill preserves food stamps as a federal program to guarantee that any American who needs food will continue to have access to nutrition assistance. The reforms will result in a savings of over \$26 billion in 5 years.

The Republican proposal will break this vicious cycle of welfare. All able-bodied welfare recipients between the ages of 18 and 50, who do not have children, will be required to work. Having more children will no longer be rewarded. And we will means test for the nutrition block grant programs.

You will hear much crying this week from old-line liberals. We are about to bring changes to some of their favorite programs—programs that have been proven failures. These changes are desperately needed to change this system into a trampoline—not a hammock—for its recipients.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Let me remind, I have heard it tonight that we started with Lyndon Johnson's Great Society, 1969 was the last time we had a balanced budget. That was the last budget Lyndon Johnson submitted. So even though you trace it to 1965, the last budget, after 18 years of Republican leadership in the White House, we have not had a balanced budget since

the last one President Johnson submitted.

Mr. LAHOOD. Reclaiming my time, I am happy to say that we have all supported a balanced budget amendment. We could not get some of you to help us.

#### ON REPUBLICAN AND DEAL PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the former speakers keep talking about how they are not cutting money and then they start talking about how they are cutting the deficit. So which is it?

Mr. Speaker, the current welfare system has created a culture of dependency.

The system offers several incentives for welfare clients to shun independence and stay on the dole.

A single mother who goes to work could lose here child care, forcing her to leave her children home alone.

She could lose Medicaid benefits and go without health insurance.

And she could lose the food stamps that help her feed her children.

And for what?

To get a low-paying job that will leave her worse off financially, uninsured, and unable to supervise her children during the day.

You might ask, what could possibly be worse?

The answer is, H.R. 4 the Republican's Personal Responsibility Act.

The Republican bill would worsen poverty and hunger for innocent children by making deep cuts in benefits, especially during economic downturns.

It would do far too little to empower welfare recipients to rejoin the work force with education and training.

It would scale back the very child care funding that would liberate welfare recipients to go to work.

The plan is punitive, irresponsible, and cruel to children.

The Republican plan could render millions of Americans with nothing to lose.

No cash assistance, no housing, no day care, no medical care, and no jobs.

In New York City alone, experts are projecting that by the year 2000: 76,000 poor children will lose AFDC benefits, an allowance they need for food, shelter and clothing; 300,000 more children will require child care slots so their mothers can work. However, the Republican plan cuts child care spending by \$1.6 billion; 60,000 children would be dropped from the school lunch programs; 640,000 children would see their food stamps decrease by 30 percent.

Simply saying, "No more welfare, go get job" is not welfare reform.

The Republicans want people off of welfare. The Democrats want people to get a job.

The Deal substitute is not perfect.

But it is far better than the Republican plan.

Although it was defeated tonight parts of it should be a model when the Senate takes up the bill.

At least, the Deal substitute operates in the real world.

It recognizes that for welfare recipients to go to work, child care is essential.

So it invests in comprehensive child care.

It recognizes that for welfare recipients to go to work, they need skills and training.

So the plan invests in comprehensive training, education, and workfare programs.

The Deal plan's Work First Program supplies a vehicle of real assistance for recipients to move into the work force.

And once they do find a job, the Deal plan would extend their medical coverage for 1 to 2 years.

These are the tools of economic empowerment which are tragically absent from the Republican plan.

But make no mistake: this is a tough plan.

People must develop and carry out comprehensive plans to get back to work or they lose their benefits.

The Deal substitute requires teenage recipients to stay in school and make the grade or they lose their benefits.

It calls for punitive measures for deadbeat parents, like direct income withholding, revoking their drivers' license, or revoking their professional licenses, thus paralyzing their careers until they do right by their children.

And the Deal substitute targets a major source of welfare dependency—teen pregnancy—with major prevention.

The Republican plan contains no prevention plan except to cut off benefits, and hope less children are born.

It could be described as tough love.

The Republican bill just tells children, "tough luck."

The Democratic bill requires work and demands responsibility.

I would like to put this into the map illustrating the children cut off of school lunches.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following information for the RECORD.

#### CRS REPORT ON CHILD NUTRITION—TALKING POINTS

CRS released a report Tuesday comparing 1996 estimated state funding levels for the child nutrition programs under current law and under the Republican block grant. The numbers in the report are calculated differently for the school based block grant that we have seen before, showing a \$73 million increase in school lunch and breakfast funding under the block grant when compared to USDA's 1996 baseline. The Republicans are using these numbers to show that they do not cut school meals even when compared to the USDA baseline projection in 1996.

The report supports Democratic statements about total cuts:

Over \$800 million CUT in the total amount available for child nutrition programs in 1996

CRS supports CBO's estimate of a total child nutrition cut of \$7 billion over 5 years (this is not stated in this report but is the CRS stated position)

The report assumes a cut in school meal service to children:

Because the block grant provides so little (\$1.5 million per state, on average) over what schools will need to serve their students just lunch and breakfast, the CRS chart assumes that schools will not use these funds to operate summer food or after school food programs.

The report compares projected spending for lunch and breakfast under current law in 1996 to the Republican's entire school meal block grant. The block grant is supposed to be used for lunch, breakfast, summer food, and after school food. It compares apples to oranges.

The summer and after school/child care food programs serve some of our nation's poorest children. Summer food programs, in particular, have proven essential to the health and safety of children in high poverty areas—these children get what may be their only nutritious meal of the day and become involved in planned community group activities. Summer food keeps kids off the streets and in the school yards.

Furthermore, the report states the, "FY 1995 and FY 1996 estimates of spending under current law are likely to be understated. The amounts shown in the tables do not reflect the actual amounts of funding that States will receive either under current law or under the proposed block grants. They should be used only for the purpose of comparing the likely shifts in spending among the States under the proposed block grants."

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I really had not intended to get involved in this until I had heard one of the most flagrant misstatements that might have ever been made on the House floor when my friend from Georgia said, you know, we want to put this money towards the deficit.

Less than an hour and a half ago, the Republican Members of this body had an opportunity to vote for cuts that would have put the money towards the deficit. Unanimously, they voted against it because they want to give that money to millionaires who got all the tax breaks during the 1980s so they can get more tax breaks now.

□ 2100

#### MEMBERS' DISCUSSION RELATIVE TO RECOGNITION IN SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. EWING, is recognized.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be substituted for that of Mr. EWING.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would object.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Would that be the gentleman to whom I yielded half my time last night objecting?

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thought we were under a five-minute rule. I would be glad to yield time when I come, but, Mr. Speaker, if we