

are going to have that as a procedure, then we will probably have about 20 Democrats over here.

Mr. GREENWOOD. It was a procedure that your side began earlier in the evening.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. We have someone who has already spoken, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GREENWOOD. No, I have not spoken.

Mr. LAHOOD. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. State your inquiry.

Mr. LAHOOD. Previously when a Member from the other side asked to have their name substituted earlier this evening, it was allowed. But if you do not want to play by those rules, that is fine, Mr. GREEN, but that is what we were doing earlier on.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that Mr. GREENWOOD had spoken earlier under the 5-minute rule. If he has not, and I will take your word for it because I know you spoke, but maybe it was yielded because we have been yielding time to many different people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not spoken on his own time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Actually, my intention is to yield some time to your side because I think the Nation deserves a little debate.

Mr. BROWN, if you would like to step up, I would like to yield some time to you so we could have a colloquy here because I was mystified by your comments.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] took the microphone earlier this evening and talked about the State of Ohio losing X number of dollars under the Republicans' proposal for the school lunch program. And we checked, and in fact under what we are proposing to do, compared to what would have happened had we done nothing, the State of Ohio gains \$11.5 million.

Then I think your colleague from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] queried you and said, gee, why are we not on the same page here?

The Congressional Research Service tells us that the plan the Republicans have proposed, a 4.5 percent increase gives Ohio \$11.5 million. Your response was, well, just ask PTA leaders or the teachers. We are supposed to be here providing the Nation with some information.

Now, let us get it straight. Here are the facts:

When the Democrats, and I went through this last night, when the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate and the White House just last year, you made available for the school lunch program an increase of 3.1 percent. The President of the United

States in his budget proposal for this year said, let us take it up to 3.6 percent increase this year. So we say how about 4.5 percent? And how about 4.5 percent for the next 5 years?

Now, I would like to know what the assumptions are that you use to put your little stickers up on the map. What is the assumption that you use as to why there is a cut in the program when we are increasing it 4.5 percent for the next five years, which is far more than the President has proposed in his budget? How does that become a cut?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The fact is you talked, the Republicans over and over and over again take credit for \$7 billion in savings.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Wait, I reclaim my time. I will yield you time if you will and if you can respond to the question. And the question is this:

The Congressional Research Service says, quite logically, if we increase funding for the school lunch program by 4.5 percent compared to what your President asked for, our President asked for, 3.6 percent, Ohio receives an \$11 million windfall. Now, you have said Ohio is going to get cut. If you can and if you will respond to that question, I will yield you time. Comments I have no time for.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There is an overall cut in nutrition funding. That money can be in at least one of these nutrition programs, children nutrition programs.

Mr. GREENWOOD. We are talking about the school lunch program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The fact is that with inflation, with more children in the program, with bad years that can happen when parents are laid off in a school district, that there will not be enough money for school lunches.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Reclaiming my time. Reclaiming my time.

That is what I thought. That is what I thought. The fact of the matter is that the Office of Budget and Management in the White House looked at inflation in the food market, looked at the trends in the growth of the school population for the whole country, and said if you want this program to continue to meet all of the eligibility requirements, if you want to produce the benefit, if you want to anticipate growth in the program, if you want to anticipate inflation in the food market, in the food basket, you are going to need 3.6 percent in the coming fiscal year. We said we want to do better than that. We went to 4.5 percent.

Now your hypotheticals are, well, what if there is a recession? What if children appear from another planet unpredicted by the White House? Now, come on, let us get serious.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield, the President has a 6.5 percent increase built into his budget. There is no—

Mr. GREENWOOD. In the school lunch program?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. Overall in the child nutrition program.

Children, it is not necessarily a national recession or children falling from another planet. It is a plant closing in a community when a lot of parents all of a sudden are out of work and there is no help for those families, they turn to the school lunch program.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Reclaiming my time.

So, in other words, the cuts on your map, despite the fact that we are increasing funding for every State, the cuts that you are illustrating on your map are anticipating hypothetical plant closings?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Hypothetical recessions, hypothetical depressions?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman let me finish a sentence?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Sure.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The fact is you claim \$7 billion in savings so you can fund tax cuts for millionaires, not deficit reduction.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Reclaiming my time. That is a diversion. I am reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is that every time we try to pin you down about what these funny numbers are about compared to the realities, compared to the truth.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Where in the legislation does it say 4.5 percent? If the gentleman would yield? It does not. It is a number that you have manufactured to try to hide the cut in school lunches and cut in child nutrition.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, let me try to respond a bit to the colloquy that has occurred in the last few minutes and say that it does not make any difference what CRS says or what we say. Ultimately, it is what the principals in our schools say about their School Lunch Programs that matters. And what they will tell you is that each time they get more children.

The point I wish to make is, ultimately, what matters is what the principal says about how much money she will have to feed those kids through a School Lunch Program, given the growing number of children and the growing cost of feeding those children. That is what counts most.

What is worse about this bill, H.R. 4, that you have in the Contract on America is that when you say you are going to increase funding 4.5%, that is just talk. Because, quite honestly, what you have done in H.R. 4 in the Contract on America is you have changed the game. No longer do you guarantee a child that lunch.

Because, see, you may want to give 4.5 percent increases. I may want to

give 4.5 percent increases. We do not make the decision. The appropriators do in this House of Congress. And if the appropriators do not allocate your 4.5 percent increase, if they do not allocate a dime, those children do not get a dime.

That is not current law. Current law does not leave itself at the whims of politicians to decide what children will get. Current law says, we do not want to put this in the political realm. Let us leave it for the children, and let us make sure they are guaranteed an opportunity to have a decent lunch or breakfast.

Your bill, the Contract on America bill, does not do that, and that is perhaps the most important point. You can claim you are increasing funding by billions of dollars. You can claim percentage increases over what we have this year. It is all just a claim because you cannot guarantee you are going to do one thing or the other.

In fact, you are already making changes to your own Contract on America welfare proposal from what was in writing and what you promised people in November 1994. So why should anyone believe that what you promised in November, which has already changed, is what you are going to do in 1997?

Let me go on to something further I prefer to discuss because it is getting very little attention.

For children who are disabled right now, we should beware. If you are a parent of a child who is disabled, it is tough enough right now to raise a family. But if you have disabled kids, I suspect you can tell just about anybody in this room, in this floor right now, that it is an even more daunting challenge, regardless of your income level.

But if you are a parent trying to raise a family and if you are a parent trying to raise a family with a disabled child, beware because H.R. 4, the Newt Gingrich Contract on America welfare proposal, will tell your children you are no longer going to get supplemental security income which helps you supplement your family income to provide services to your disabled child.

Beware because about 225,000 children in America are going to be dumped from a program where families are assisted in aiding their disabled child. And over the next 5 years, around 700,000 disabled children will be denied SSI as a result of the Contract on America welfare proposal.

In Los Angeles, roughly 20,000 disabled children and also blind children receive SSI. H.R. 4 changes all of that.

Now, we hear claims by the supporters of H.R. 4 that we have parents who are abusing SSI. The supporters of H.R. 4 say that the caseload in SSI for disabled children is growing because parents are teaching their kids to pretend that they are retarded in order for them to qualify for SSI.

Are there parents abusing SSI? Are there 225,000 disabled children faking their disability? Well if there is fraud,

then let us deal with that aspect within the eligibility process for SSI for disabled kids. But the political Contract on America goes too far. It is overkill.

Let me give two or three quick examples.

Six-year-old Jennifer suffers from congenital bowel malformation which requires a colostomy. She also suffers from eye problems and lacks peripheral vision which causes her to run into walls. At age 6 she was not yet toilet trained.

Kendra, 2 years old, suffers from a rare growth condition in which one arm is twice as long as the other, causing loss of balance, motor impairment and spinal curvature and a loss of lung volume.

Both of these two young children probably will not qualify for SSI. So here we see it. Cuts to kids. Cuts to school lunch. And what else do we have? Cuts to taxes for the rich and wealthy. \$66 billion is saved under H.R. 4. What is it for? Tax cuts for the wealthy. This is not the way to go.

WELFARE REFORM

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, here we are debating what I believe to be one of the most important issues of our time, welfare reform.

This has not been a particularly civil debate. Frankly, I am amazed by the rhetorical warfare being waged by the opponents of welfare reform. And that is exactly what they are—opponents of welfare reform who are defending a failed system which has cost this Nation almost \$5 trillion and has hurt the very people it was designed to help.

In addition, many of the comments made by these welfare reform opponents have been completely out of line. I find it ironic that the standard lines Democrats have used for years—lines like dividing the country along racial lines; deceiving the public by hiding the facts; engaging in class warfare; favoring the rich at the expense of the poor—are precisely—are precisely—what the Democrats themselves are doing.

What we are trying to do is fundamentally reform a system that does not work.

How compassionate is it to continue with a system that has quadrupled illegitimacy rates over the last 25 years; where 68 percent of black children and 23 percent of white children are born out of wedlock?

The current welfare system has created a cycle of dependency where the average length of stay, including repeat periods, is 13 years. The current system robs people of the dignity of work. Of the 5 million families on welfare, only 20,000 people work. Is it compassionate to maintain this kind of system?

There are rampant abuses in the current system such as in the SSI Program. The number of recipients in this program has nearly tripled over the past 5 years because SSI isn't going solely to the disabled children where it's supposed to go. It is going to drug addicts and alcoholics who are not eligible for these benefits yet continue to receive them.

Is it compassionate to maintain this kind of system?

Then there is the exploding cost of maintaining the current welfare system. Over the past 30 years, the Federal Government has spent almost \$5 trillion on various forms of welfare assistance. If we do not act, welfare spending will increase from \$325 billion in 1993 to \$500 billion in 1998.

Is this what the Democrats call reinventing government and cutting spending?

The Republican reform bill will fundamentally change the welfare system of America, but not in the way our opponents have described. Allow me to remind welfare reform opponents and the American people of the facts in the Republican bill:

First, the Republican welfare reform bill saves \$66.3 billion dollars over 5 years by slowing the growth of, or freezing, welfare spending not by cutting it. Only in Bill Clinton's Washington would reductions in the rate of increase or a freeze be considered a cruel slashing of spending.

Second, with all of the reforms Republicans intend to make in the current welfare system, spending will still increase from 1 year to the next.

For example, under the Republican plan, funding for school lunch programs increases 4.5 percent in each of the next 5 years—which is more than Bill Clinton's proposal.

Third, the Republican bill addresses the critical problem of skyrocketing illegitimacy by no longer rewarding those on welfare with additional benefits for having more children.

Fourth, the Republican bill is based on the belief that work is necessary, essential, dignified, and is the best opportunity for moving welfare recipients into jobs.

Fifth, the Republican bill puts American citizens first by eliminating welfare assistance—not emergency medical services—to noncitizens.

Sixth, the Republican bill cracks down on the deadbeat parents who would abdicate their responsibilities by establishing uniform state procedures and computer registries.

Seventh, the crux of the Republican bill is an acknowledgement that the Federal Government has not done a good job of administering aid to those in need and that the States can do a much better job of providing this aid—if they are given the flexibility to do so.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that would more clearly demonstrate a lack