

to a tax cut. By applying the "savings" to a tax cut, they will "increase" spending. Does that make it more clear? Some refer to this logic as "sincere confusion." In my State of North Carolina, we call it "sleight of hand." If it wasn't so sad, it would be very funny. They claim they want to help children, but their bill hurts children.

Under their bill, there is no guarantee that poor children will receive free meals when they are hungry. Under current law, children in poverty levels get their meals free. Under their bill, only 90 percent of funding is targeted for children at certain levels of poverty. Under current law, about 10 percent more of such funding is targeted for these same children.

They say that block grants will save on administrative costs. But under their bill 80 percent of the "savings" or cuts will come directly from food assistance. Tomorrow, the debate on the Personal Responsibility Act will conclude in the House. We will take a vote, and it may pass. But that will not end the fight.

WELFARE REFORM NEEDED IN AMERICA

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my friend, Mr. HOKE.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], that according to the CRS report of March 20, 1995, that for her fine State of North Carolina there will be a \$10,343,816 increase from 1995 to 1996 in the Republican block grant program for school-based child nutrition programs.

□ 2145

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak about fathers. In our debate on this critical welfare reform bill, it seems to me that in all our talk of mothers and children, we have forgotten the role of fathers. Now I know that our welfare reform bill includes tough legislation to make deadbeat dads pay for the children they have fathered. But I would ask my colleagues to consider the much larger issue of why we have such a problem with absentees fathers. The tragedy of the present welfare system is that it has led to an increase in illegitimacy.

Could the welfare system be any more destructive to the family than it is? It has made fathers trivial. The illegitimacy rate in this Nation has risen from 7 percent in 1965 to 32 percent in 1992. The more I think about it the more I struck by one simple question—where have the fathers of these illegitimate children gone? The answer is terrifying. Fathers have been replaced by the Federal Government through the welfare system. What a ridiculous idea. The Federal Government is nobody's father. The Federal Government should

never try to serve as anyone's father. It is disgraceful that so many people have become dependent upon the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, when I was growing up in Valdosta, Georgia, my father Charles Norwood was there for me. He was a simple man, a printer, and he was there for me, to teach me right from wrong, to let me know in no uncertain terms when I behaved unacceptably. My father put bread on our table, clothes on our backs, and a roof over our head.

All I learned about respect and responsibility, I learned from my Democratic father. From him, I learned that I needed to be responsible for myself, not ever once considering that government would take care of me.

Mr. Speaker, an entire generation of young people are being born today without fathers. Why do children need fathers in today's America? The food on their table comes from food stamps. The roof over their head comes from public housing. When you need a doctor, there's always Medicaid. And of course the clothes on their backs come by way of a welfare check. We are replacing the financial importance of fathers with the power of the Federal Government to take from one man's labor and give to others. But what of the moral importance of fathers? That role has simply been abandoned by the welfare system. The social fabric of our society is being torn apart by the disappearance of the family unit.

Mr. Speaker, our welfare reforms are an important step forward in trying to restore the value of fatherhood in this Nation, because we say to those people who would seek the assistance of government * * * you must be responsible in having children; you cannot continue to expect an additional payment simply for having an additional child. We say to welfare mothers, you must name the father of your child * * * and we say to those fathers, you must be responsible for your actions. Our reforms force people to consider the responsibility of their behavior in parenting.

Mr. Speaker, I know the debate has tended to focus on welfare mothers, but I'm deeply concerned about the fathers of the 1 in 3 babies born out of wedlock. I want to say to them, be a man and accept your responsibilities. Parenting is not a game; it means tremendous obligation that you must uphold. It is not just a financial responsibility, it is being there for your children, it is teaching them right from wrong, it is teaching them values and making sure they know what it means to be a productive member of our society. It is being sure that your children learn to take care of themselves. It is making sure that your children live a better and more productive life than their parents. It is making sure that you leave your children a better America.

To my colleagues on the other side, I would ask you to step back and consider what has happened to our society.

This bill is not simply about welfare mothers and their children. This bill is about the destruction of families. You cannot possibly defend what the welfare system has done to families. It is deplorable; it is immoral; it is undeniably wrong. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to drop the nasty rhetoric we have used the past few days, and do what is so clearly right to reestablish the sanctity of the American family.

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

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

FALLACIES IN REPUBLICAN REFORM

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to address some of the CRS report Mr. HOKE brought up tonight and last night, because we have had a chance to analyze that. Mr. Speaker, I want to place in the record a letter from a student I received today from the Aldine School District who talks about how important the school lunch is to her and how she believes the Preamble to the Constitution pointed out that we are supposed to provide for the general welfare. Now, we need to reform welfare, but we need to recognize that is still a part of our Constitution.

The student praises the benefits of the school lunch program in the Aldine community, and last night Members from the Republican side and Congressman HOKE talked about the CRS memorandum, that I had a chance to read today and claims that school lunch funding under the welfare block grants was sufficient.

However, this memorandum points out that the children under the Department of Defense were left out, were left out, until it was put in on the floor, because three committees looked at it and forgot 57,000 children. This memo says that was left out.

The memo does not take into effect the programs folded into the school nutrition block grant. The memo does not estimate the 1997 to year 2000 funding based on the assumption that the CRS did not want to guess at what new programs would be established by the States.

This does not do anything except talk about next year. When they talk about the State of Ohio getting \$11 million, we hope the Committee on Appropriations in 1997, 1998, and 1999 would fund that money, but there is no guarantee. This assumes the system will change in such a dramatic way that the current assumptions will not work. That is what this CRS report says.

That is why it is extreme to stand up here and talk about it in this bill. What Members of Congress should focus on is the shell game that this does. It takes away that guarantee of that school lunch for an authorization and maybe an appropriation, maybe.

In the amendment today we had a chance to vote on the school lunch program in Mr. DEAL'S amendment. The school lunch program would have been protected in current law. But we saw on a party line vote who wanted to protect the school lunch program, and that voted failed on the Deal substitute.

Current law provides that school districts are reimbursed for every meal and the Republicans' promise of an increase again depends on what will happen in their Committee on Appropriations.

Let's take for example what happened last week in the rescissions bill. We have a track record already in the first 100 days of cuts in summer jobs programs for students, and I would hope the U.S. Senate would take that out. I would be glad to pin my label on there for the State of Texas, because our comptroller estimates we will lose \$35 million in school lunch funding.

HOUSTON, TX.

Hon. GENE GREEN,
Longworth House Office Bldg.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR GENE GREEN: My name is LaDeirdre C. Lane and I am an 8th grade student at Kentwell, Aldine I.S.D. In my history class our teacher gave us an assignment to write a government official talking about an issues that we feel very strongly about.

I feel strongly about the welfare reform. I feel that this one proposal that shouldn't get past Congress. For one, it would take money out of our school lunch plan. Many of the students in my school already eat free or reduced lunch. For some of these students it might just be the only hot meal that they get all day. Secondly there are people out there who abuse these government fundings, but for every one who abuses, there are two who really need it. Without welfare many families would end up starving and in poor health.

Also another reason is stated in the preamble of the Constitution that we the people must promote the general welfare and in this one saying that must take effect. I would appreciate if you would take my ideas into consideration.

Thank you for your time, and I hope that my ideas have begun to turn the wheels of progress, I will be waiting to hear a response from you.

Sincerely yours,

LADEIRDRE C. LANE.

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

[Mr. COLLINS of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MODERN WELFARE SYSTEM HAS NOT WORKED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the issue before us this evening is what has worked and what has not worked in the modern welfare society of America. Clearly the current system has not worked. It has encouraged dependency upon the Federal Government; it has encouraged illegitimacy; it has discouraged self-reliance and the basic idea of work.

In short, it has promoted many of the behaviors and values that are exactly opposite of what every single Member of this body would raise their own families by.

Mr. Speaker, the original intent of the welfare system has been lost. What was intended to be a compassionate provision to help people has turned into a destructive and permanent fixture of dependency for many who are entrapped within it. Sadly, many of these people have chosen to make their living for themselves and their families without working by choosing to take AFDC, food stamps, and countless other programs which cost over \$300 billion annually. This is wrong and unfair for them and taxpayers, and it must stop.

What the Personal Responsibility Act aims to do is to require individuals to look to themselves and their families and not to Washington in order to become productive members of society.

I cannot help but consider it worthy of mentioning a couple of startling facts about a county in my home State of Tennessee, one that I partially represent, the county of Shelby, which includes Memphis. According to the Commercial Appeal, the local daily newspaper in Memphis and Shelby County, one out of every four families with children under the age of 18 draws monthly welfare checks. According to the same publication, when Federal welfare dollars are combined with State welfare dollars, that total amount is the single largest source of money for Shelby County, TN. Not the payroll of Maybelline, not the payroll of Schering-Plough, not even the payroll of Federal Express; not the payroll of any single business or industry can match the welfare dole of the government in Shelby County, TN. That is what welfare is doing for one of Tennessee's most populous counties. And while maybe not to such a large degree, that is what welfare is doing to all the rest of the country, and that is what we are trying to change.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened in recent days to the inappropriate charge that children are going to be hurt with our bill. I sat here and listened as we have gone about our Contract With America and attempted to make those changes we said we would make in our contract. On the balanced budget amendment, I have heard about poor children there. In tort reform, I heard about poor children being hurt there. In regulatory reform, I heard about poor children being hurt there. Unfunded mandates, the

same thing. The crime bill, the same thing. Even in the national security bill, I heard about poor children being hurt.

I am most eager, as we begin to talk about term limits next week, to see how they are going to say poor children are going to be hurt by that. But we are not going to hurt children by term limits.

Just as we heard from the other side that Republicans do not have a monopoly on Christianity, and I agree on that, the Democrats do not have a monopoly on love of children. We have got some fathers and some grandfathers on this side, and to do that you have to have children.

We are not going to hurt children. What is hurting children is the current system of welfare. It encourages kids to have kids, and fathers to abandon their responsibilities, and families to set poor examples for their children by not working. The Republican welfare reform plan requires work and other responsibility. It changes the status quo. It encourages dignity, and it gives hope to all who may use it to succeed.

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

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

VICTIMS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, last Friday in Duluth, in my congressional district, I met with a group of people I can only describe as victims of the Republican contract: College students who will lose their financial aid; poor, elderly people who will lose their home heating assistance; elementary school children who will lose their school lunch and school milk programs; and foster grandparents who work with disadvantaged youth.

□ 2200

Then at the end of the day, late that evening I got a phone call from my son Ted, A graduate student in theology, saying he would lose his summer job if the Republican cuts are enacted.

Let me tell you about Ted. He is a Notre Dame graduate with a double major in theology and great books.

Following graduation, he committed a year to volunteer service at a job placement center for the homeless, Saint Joseph the Worker in Phoenix, AZ, living with five other Notre Dame graduates on \$60 a month. And on weekends he volunteered in youth ministry at a neighborhood parish.

Ted then spent 2 years in campus ministry at Sacramento State University and is now in his second year of