

shown in research studies that, if you read to a child, you can improve their reading score. Actually there are some studies that show that, if you read to a child, you may actually be able to raise their IQ slightly, and he told me something that I will never forget.

He was going into those projects and reading to those kids, and those children were, by and large, children of single parents on welfare, and he would ask, many of them 5, 6 and 7-year-old children, "What do you want to be when you grow up?" And, yes, some of them would say I want to be a fireman or a nurse, but some of them would say:

"I don't want to work. I want to collect a check."

Mr. Speaker, a program that does that to millions of children is not a program of compassion and caring to children. It is a program that is cruel and mean spirited to children.

Today a young male being born to a mother, a single mother on welfare in the United States, has a greater likelihood of ending up on drugs or in the penitentiary than graduating from high school. The problem that we have with illegitimacy in our Nation today is a problem that has been created by the program that we are trying to change, and you cannot fix this problem by tinkering around the edges. The illegitimacy rate in this country has gone up from 5 percent to almost 25 percent in the white community. In the black community it has gone from less than 25 percent to, in some areas, as high as 70 percent.

If you look at what correlates best, what correlates in communities with problems like teenage pregnancy, drug use, illiteracy, juvenile crime, the thing that correlates best in those problems in those communities, Mr. Speaker, is the amount of illegitimacy, the amount of fatherlessness in those communities. A program that perpetuates and cultivates things like this is a cruel and mean-spirited program, and that program needs to be changed, and our bill makes a serious attempt at doing that.

We are not talking about tinkering around the edges. We are talking about promoting family unity, discouraging teen-age pregnancy and illegitimacy.

The fact that this program perpetuates it, Mr. Speaker, was driven home to me when I was a medical student working in an inner-city obstetrics clinic, and I had a 15-year-old girl come in to see me who was pregnant, and I had never seen this before, and I was so upset. I was grieved to see this. I looked at her and said her life is ruined, she cannot go to college, and I said to her, "How did this happen, why did this happen," and she looked up to me and told me that she did it deliberately because she wanted to get out from under her mother in the project, and she wanted her own place and her own welfare check.

This program needs to stop. The people have asked for it; we are trying to deliver.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the Members of the minority to stop their partisan rhetoric and join with us in reforming welfare and creating a program for the poor and the needy that strengthens family, does not undermine them, that strengthens the bonds of marriage, because it is strong families that make strong communities that makes strong nations, and our Nation cannot survive with a perpetuation of a program like this.

#### THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO WELFARE REFORM PLANS

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

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to add my little figure of the 8,200 students in my district in Massachusetts who are in danger of losing their School Lunch Program.

Mr. Speaker, we are nearly at the end of the debate on the Welfare Reform Program, and I do not understand really how anybody who has been listening to this debate or watching this debate could really understand the essential differences between the major bills, the Deal bill named after Congressman NATHAN DEAL from Georgia, and the Republican bill because I have rarely seen such deliberate misrepresentation in a debate. Today we saw Republican Representative from Missouri—and each of us has our charts—claiming with his chart that the Deal bill does not require work, does not require people to work, when the fact is that because—it was only because the Republican bill was ridiculed all over the country for not requiring work that they added an amendment just yesterday that brought the work requirement in their bill close to the Deal bill.

□ 2130

We had another top Republican leader from Pennsylvania going to the very edge of personal vilification today in suggesting to a Member that it was corrupt and immoral, yes, the words corrupt and immoral, not to support the Republican version of this legislation.

Well, my colleagues, the Deal bill had the strongest work requirement of any of the bills by honestly recognizing that if you care about getting people to work, you have also got to combat illiteracy and provide people with job training and a good piece of education and maybe some job placement services and reliable and safe child care so that parents can go to work.

All of those programs were cut under the Republican bill. All of those provisions were cut under the Republican bill.

Also a bill, by the way, that does not cut breakfast and lunches in a mixture, in a whole shell game of block grants. And it does not cut protection for abused children, and it does not cut day care for children so that their parents can work.

That was the kind of a bill that every Member of my party proudly voted for, and it represented real reform and a real opportunity to change the way we deal with welfare people in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans say that the war on poverty is lost, so they are substituting a war on poor children for the war on poverty. Five million families with 9.5 million children who are living on AFDC, plus millions more families with millions more children who are working families but low-income working families, those families would, under the Republican bill, lose \$50 billion of income and of food and of care for children while the parents work.

And for protection for children, protective services for abused children, all of those would be given over instead to some of the wealthiest people in America.

It is not to balance the budget, not even to deal with the deficit that we have in this country that we have been running. That is the kind of deficit that has been building, those huge deficits under President Reagan and President Bush year after year after year after a nearly balanced budget for many years beforehand. Not to do anything like that because they added an amendment that allows this money to not be used for the deficit but to be used for the tax cut that I have described.

This \$50 billion, and I have left out the \$17 billion that is used to pay by way of legal immigrants and changes in the legal immigrant status, this \$50 billion is exactly the amount of money that would be used in the next 5 years to provide tax cuts for the top 2 percent of Americans, those families making more than \$200,000 per year.

Mr. Speaker, only in NEWT GINGRICH's Washington would cutting \$50 billion in food and housing and income for low-income working and nonworking people and shifting that to the wealthiest Americans, only in NEWT GINGRICH's America would that be even possible.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and substitute for the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There is no objection.

#### CREATIVITY IN ARGUMENTS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to listen to the Democrats talk. They have the fantasy of Disney, the creativity of Steven Spielberg. And if they could speak as eloquently as Bill Clinton, they, too, would be in the White House.

Let me start by yielding the floor to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that, with respect to the State of Massachusetts from which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER], who just spoke on the other side of the aisle, comes and actually comes from a town that is close to my heart. I happened to go to Amherst College, and I believe that is the city he represents, among others in western Massachusetts.

According again to CRS, the State of Massachusetts will see a \$7.255 million increase in the block grant program, 1996 over 1995, for school-based child nutrition programs.

If anybody can show us how that is a cut over the CBO baseline, over demographics, over interest rates, over inflation rates, please come forward and show us how that is a cut. I keep seeing these red flags appear, and I am baffled. All I can do is go back to this other chart.

Mr. OLVER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I control the time, but I would be happy to yield to you.

Mr. OLVER. I think if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] would remember, I was very careful to point out that my 8,000 children are at risk of losing their school lunches, and the major reason why that is possible is because we have lumped several programs together in a block grant, which is the movement of the plates that has been talked about from last night.

In that process, 20 percent of that money can be moved at the whim of the Governor of Massachusetts to other programs in a whole series of different block grants. So there is extreme danger that a very large number of children may be left out of food in this particular program.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me reclaim my time only to keep it going quickly because we have got 5 minutes.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. If there is extreme danger of any child being at risk in the State of Massachusetts in 1996 for nutrition programs, then there would be even greater danger that that child would be at risk under the CBO baseline, the President's own numbers for 1996, because we are increasing the amount from 1996 under the block grant program more than under the CBO baseline program for the administration.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield back.

Also, the Governor of Massachusetts could put that 20 percent into the nutrition program rather than take it out.

Now I do not know who the Governor is, but I would trust my Governor. My Governor is a Democrat Governor of Georgia, and the Democrat Governor of Georgia, who is a big NEWT GINGRICH supporter—he is in the national Democratic clique—he says, “Give me the money. I can spend it better.”

Now, whether your Governor is Democrat or Republican, I will bet our Governor will be willing to go up there and show you fine people up in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts how to better spend your money. And if the people of Massachusetts do not trust him, maybe it is time to change water. That might be true also of the State senate and State legislature.

Mr. OLVER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I am going to yield to you, but we have got a real brief time, so please go quickly. No speeches.

Mr. OLVER. The gentleman is correct in indicating that it would be possible to move money from others of the five large block grants in this welfare bill. But take, for instance, the child care bill. You claim you want to put people to work. Our bill requires people to go to work.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time. When we are talking nutrition, and I guess we scored a hit because the gentleman has moved over to another field, let me say this real quickly. There is something that is very fundamentally important about this whole welfare debate, and I am glad we are here tonight. I am glad to hear folks like you talking about the Deal bill because it would have never gotten to the floor of the House had the Republican majority not taken over.

It just frankly was a very, I think, fairly responsible moderate proposal, but it never would have made it to the floor last year, and it did it now.

You know, the President said he is going to end welfare as we know it. He never offered a bill. Never. He ended welfare debate as we know it by not offering a bill.

Mr. HOKE. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. HOKE. How many years did the Democrats control the House?

Mr. KINGSTON. Forty.

Mr. HOKE. When did the Great Society start?

Mr. KINGSTON. 1965.

Mr. HOKE. 1965. So the Democrats, is this their welfare program that we are talking about?

Mr. KINGSTON. Generally.

Mr. HOKE. Did they try to reform it? Have they changed it?

Mr. KINGSTON. No. They got a lot of religion November 8.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the debate in the House on the Personal Responsibility Act will conclude. We will take a vote, and it may pass. But that will not end the fight. This struggle will continue in the Senate. And if the bill passes there in substantially the same form as the House, that will not end the fight. In America, nothing becomes law until both the House and Senate have acted and until the President of the United States has signed the bill. If the Personal Responsibility Act passes the House and Senate in its current form, it is my hope that the President will veto the bill.

Tomorrow, we will also consider the Mink substitute. Either the Deal substitute or the Mink substitute would be better alternatives to the Personal Responsibility Act. Both Deal and Mink provide resources to help move recipients from welfare to work—resources such as education, training, child care, and transportation.

The Deal substitute received a significant number of votes tonight. There is a chance that it may have more votes than the Personal Responsibility Act will get. In that case, it will pass the House.

One of the issues that remains as a point of contention is whether the Personal Responsibility Act cuts or increases spending for child nutrition programs. According to the Congressional Budget Office, an office now headed by a Republican appointee, the bill cuts child nutrition programs by \$7 billion over the next 5 years.

In 1996, we will spend \$300 million less on these programs than we are spending this year. When less is being spent from year to year, that is a cut in spending, not an increase. And, while there are dollar increases in spending in the years beyond 1996, those increases make no provision for inflation; population increases, that are certain; or for economic downturns. In other words, any increases in spending in the out years, will be offset by other cost considerations. Under current law, those cost considerations are taken into account.

By changing current law, the effect is that we are spending less for nutrition programs. When we spend less, that is a cut. Worse yet, under the block grant proposal, the States will be able to shift one-fifth of the funds to nonnutrition uses. When 20 percent of the money goes elsewhere, that is a cut.

The Republican majority calls these cuts “savings.” But, while insisting on calling them “savings,” they refuse to apply the money to deficit reduction. Instead, they intend to apply these “savings” to tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. It may seem confusing; however, let me summarize. The Republicans say their bill will increase spending. To increase spending, they want to “reduce” spending and call a cut a “savings”, but instead of applying the “savings” to “reduce” the deficit, they want to apply the “savings”

#### FOOD ASSISTANCE

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