

from his home. I'll make you a deal. You be here with a check made payable to the clerk for \$3,000 by noon tomorrow. If you're not here at 12:01, there will be a bench warrant issued for you and your son and I'll put you both in jail until you decide who's going to be boss of the family.

With that the father hits the kid in the head and said, "Look what you got me into." It took money out of the father's pocket to make him recognize he was responsible for his son.

That is what we are doing with victim restitution, making the victim whole from their tragedy, from their loss, having the criminal repay not only their debt to society by serving time but paying the victim back for their losses.

The Criminal Alien Deportation Act is something very important to me, because 5,500 people that are locked in the prisons of Florida are illegally in our country. The bill we passed last week will allow for deportation prior to their sentence completion back to their countries.

What do we do now? We allow them to serve the time in jail, then we release them and give them a hearing date to come back for a deportation hearing. They are criminals, they are not returning to a courtroom to be deported out of this country. They disappear; 48,000 failed to appear last year alone under that scenario.

Our bill provides that they can be deported from inside the jail cell to their countries, not allowed to roam the street, not allowed to commit other crimes. That is going to make big headway in the problems in America. It will also open up beds so that we can keep the rapists and murderers out of our prisons.

Local government law enforcement block grants, sending the money to the States and allowing them to decide what is the most important crime-fighting mechanism within their community.

These are a number of the things that we enacted this week. But something strikes me that we did not discuss what we need to discuss in America and we need to discuss it forcefully, is the protection of our children from sexual exploitation and sexual violence.

Sean from my office told me that there is an incident that is going to be reported tomorrow morning in the paper in our community about child pornography and the people that were involved. Once again we read in the headlines of another child dying or being abused or used in such a nasty and disgusting way that we allow our children to fall prey to these types of people.

These are the things that we must fight as Americans. We must protect our children from sexual violence, sexual abuse. We need to act together as a Congress to make certain that the children today and in the future know that they are safe, know that they will not

be abused and feel comfortable in this great country of ours, in America.

FEDERAL FOOD ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 40 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, there is a provision in H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995, that is irresponsible. As written, that provision would convert Federal food assistance programs into block grants. Block grant funds are free funds to State and local governments. They may not be used as intended. This irresponsible provision thus puts at risk various nutritional programs, such as food stamps, school breakfast and lunches, Meals on Wheels, and the Commodity Supplemental Program.

When H.R. 4 comes to the floor, I will offer an amendment to restore the Federal food assistance program. The block grant proposal does not take into account increased school enrollments, changing economic conditions, and national food nutrition standards. Confronting hunger in America is a serious matter. It should not be left to artificial time pressures and blind budget bludgeoning. It is not responsible to put the health of our seniors and children at risk. I invite my colleagues to join me in amending H.R. 4 to make it responsible on the issue of hunger. I will say more about that later. On the first day of this, the 104th Congress, I pointed out to my colleagues, that as we begin our work this year, we must remember that our first responsibility is not to the parties to which we belong, but to the people we represent.

It is for that reason that I supported many of the early votes on reform and several parts of the proposed rules package put forth by the new majority party. I believe the majority structured some important changes to the way we function, and those changes should not have been rejected by Democrats simply because they were offered by Republicans. At the same time, I reminded my colleagues that we must be forever mindful that no Member in this Chamber has a premium on what's best for this Nation. We all have a Contract With America. What makes us a great Nation is the compassion we show for those who live in the shadows of life. We are strong because historically we have been able to make a place for all who live here, including those least able to help themselves—the young, the poor, the disabled.

In this time of increased scrutiny, we must examine each and every program, but we must also consider each and every person affected by our changes. We must ask the question: Who is helped and who is hurt? And, at the end of each day, we must be honest about whether our actions helped the many in need or the few in clover. President

Kennedy said it best, 34 years ago, when he stated, "A country that cannot help the many who are poor cannot help the few who are rich." The contract to which each Member is bound, is to work in the best interest of the American people. On election day, we offered our services to this great country, and voters accepted our offer, from Rocky Mount, NC, and across the United States.

We all have a Contract With America. That contract involves being open to the challenge of change. We, in the Congress, must get beyond partisan politics and move to the high ground of principle. This is a new day and a new time. There are problems which we face that transcend party and politics. Teenage pregnancies stifle an entire community. Violence of any kind, whether driven by drugs or propelled by deep philosophical differences, can not and must not be tolerated. Economic justice must ring true this Congress. No child and no senior citizen should face hunger in this land of plenty.

If welfare reform is to have any significance, we must combine with it a meaningful jobs program. And, welfare reform without minimum wage reform is no reform. With a meaningful jobs program, there would be less urgency for another crime bill. Instead of calls to take back our streets, there should be calls to give our streets back to the average, hard-working, God fearing citizen. Unfortunately, on this issue, Congress has failed to heed the call. Last week and this week, the majority pushed through radical changes in our law enforcement system. They sliced fourth amendment rights, eliminating habeas corpus protections, cut prevention programs, community cops program eliminated and put money in to build more jails. It is a sad and difficult time for our Nation.

I too believe we can make our Government smaller, yet more efficient and more effective. That is why I applauded and supported several of the reforms offered by the majority. But, real reform must include an end to gag rules. There are important amendments that those of us in the new minority party have wanted to offer, amendments designed to improve and perfect the legislation presented. But Members have been muzzled by a majority determined to press their 100-day agenda under any and all circumstances. I will continue to stand up as part of the loyal opposition when I believe pomposity, audacity, and duplicity confront us. No party or person has an exclusive on such things as family values and personal responsibility. Those are standards I absolutely hold dear. And, no party or person should be able to take the right to speak from any of us. Too many have sacrificed for that precious liberty. Let no one forget. We all have a Contract With America. That is why I support the call of President Clinton for an increase in the minimum wage by 90 cents, over the

next 2 years. This increase would raise the minimum wage from its current level of \$4.25 to \$5.15. This is a much-needed increase.

There has been much talk about welfare reform recently. I support welfare reform. The current system does not work well, and it does not promote self-sufficiency. Reform, however, does not mean change for the sake of change. Reform means change for the sake of improvement. As we move to reform the welfare system, we must make sure that we make a better system, not just a different system. Welfare reform without wage reform will not work. The gap in income is growing between those who have a lot of money and those who have a little money. That is unacceptable. According to *Business Week* magazine, the income gap "hurts the economy." Almost half of the money in America is in the hands of just 20 percent of the people. That top 20 percent is made up of families with the highest incomes.

The bottom 20 percent has less than 5 percent of the money in their hands. A modest increase in the minimum wage could help the bottom 20 percent, and, it will not hurt the top 20 percent. Without an increase in the minimum wage, those with little money end up with less money. That is because the cost of living continues to rise. By 1993, families in the top 20 percent had an average income of \$104,616. Families in the bottom 20 percent in America had an average income of just \$12,964.

That is a gap of more than \$90,000. That amount of money makes a big difference in the ability of families to buy food and shelter, to pay for energy to heat their homes, and to be able to clothe, care for, and educate their children. That amount of money makes the difference between families with abundance and families in poverty. An increase in the minimum wage won't provide abundance, but it can raise working families out of poverty. As income dropped for low income families during the decade of the 1980's, costs escalated. While the income for the bottom 20 percent was declining, the rate of inflation for food, shelter, heating fuel, clothing, transportation, and medical care, was increasing. In other words, the cost of bread, milk, eggs, a place to sleep, heat, clothing to wear, a bus ride, and a visit to the doctor went up, as the income of poor people went down. The rate of inflation for each of those items increased, on average, 60 percent, with a low of 36 percent and a high of 117 percent. Despite these spiraling prices, Congress did not take any steps to increase the minimum wage, and poor people, the bottom 20 percent of America, became poorer. That deep valley remains with us today.

The bottom 20 percent of our citizens can have a full-time employee in the family, working at least 40 hours a week, and still not be able to make ends meet. The earnings of that family could place them below the poverty

line. It makes little sense to discuss welfare reform when working full time does not make a family any better off than being on welfare full time. Work should be a prize. It should not be a penalty. Work is a penalty when, despite an individual's best efforts, living is an unrelenting, daily struggle. Work is a prize when enough is earned to pay for essentials. Other nations, around the world, have been faced with the gap between high- and low-income workers. Those that have been able to close the gap are the nations that have enacted minimum wage increases for their workers.

We can learn from the experience of Germany, Japan, and France, for example. It should be noted that 62 percent of all minimum wage workers are women. Welfare reform, in the absence of minimum wage reform, will hurt women in a lopsided way. The Contract With America proposes to put 1.5 million welfare recipients into below minimum wage jobs by the year 2001. Most of those will be women. The number of working poor increased by 42 percent between 1980 and 1992. Many of those were women. In fact, income inequality in America is higher than it has been since 1947. Forty-eight percent of all poor children have parents who work full time. In addition, a recent study indicates that job growth in America is lowest where the income gap is widest. Closing the gap helps create jobs rather than reduce jobs.

Those who argue that an increase in the minimum wage will cause job losses, fail to look at the facts. First, no increase has caused job losses. But, more importantly, other recent studies have shown that an increase in the minimum wage tends to cause an increase in jobs, rather than a loss of jobs. The States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, subject of one of those studies, provide a classic example. New Jersey raised its minimum wage to \$5.05. Pennsylvania kept its minimum wage at the required level, \$4.25. Jobs increased in New Jersey. There were no job increases in Pennsylvania. I want my State of North Carolina to benefit from the New Jersey example. Indeed, a recent survey of employment practices in North Carolina, after the 1991 minimum wage increase, found that there was no significant drop in employment. The survey also found that there was no measurable increase in food prices. In addition, the survey found that workers' wages actually increased by more than the required change.

There are an estimated 117,000 minimum wage workers in North Carolina. Those workers are not just numbers. They are people, with families and children. They are farmers and food service workers, mechanics and machine operators. They are in construction work and sales, health, and cleaning services, and a range of other occupations. Their families helped build America, and they can help rebuild it. They do not need charity, they need a

chance. A chance is a reasonable increase in the minimum wage, as proposed by the President. We should reward work. The economy is hurt by the income gap between the rich and the poor in America. If we want to help the economy, help women achieve a level of equality, help our children and help all Americans achieve a better quality of life, we should pass a bill to increase the minimum wage. The best welfare reform is minimum wage reform.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to turn to the primary topic of my discussion for today. As I indicated at the outset, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 [PRA], a part of the Contract With America, would convert all Federal food assistance programs into block grants. I have many concerns with that proposal. My concerns are:

First, providing for block grants for the various nutrition programs would require the development of a formula for the distribution of the block grant funds. Is there a way to develop a formula that is fair and works?

Second, Federal food assistance programs would be cut by \$17.5 billion in the first 4 years under the Contract With America. Can those programs sustain such cuts and be effective?

Third, according to a Department of Agriculture study, the formula proposed by the Contract With America resulted in big winners and big losers. Is it possible to develop a formula that meets the needs of the intended beneficiaries?

Fourth, under the block grant program, States could use food assistance funds in any way, including cash grants and for purposes other than food purchases. I have two concerns about that: Won't the use of cash grants make fraud and abuse easier and won't allowing the cash grants to be used for purposes other than food purchases defeat the intent of the program?

Fifth, a major limitation of a block grant program is its inflexibility, particularly when the economy changes. How would such a program compare to the existing Food Stamp Program and other programs, like school breakfast and school lunch?

Sixth, in North Carolina, the nutrition programs serve as an economic stimulus and stabilizer for the State, especially for the farm community. Have changes to these programs taken into account the negative impact such changes might have on State and local economies?

Seventh, what will happen when States use up funds that have been provided under a block grant program?

Eighth, elementary and secondary school enrollments are expected to rise by 8 percent over the next 5 years. What will happen when school populations grow, and the money runs out?

Ninth, will we have waiting lists and lines of people who may have missed an opportunity to participate in a program?

Tenth, can we truly expect administrative savings through block grants

when the various nutrition programs are so different that they will need to be administered separately?

Eleventh, the WIC Program has worked and worked well. Why are we trying to fix something that isn't broke?

Mr. Speaker, the Children's Defense Fund has prepared an excellent briefing book on welfare reform, which was published in January of this year. I want to especially draw my colleagues' attention to the section of the briefing book entitled, "Why Safety Net Entitlements Must Not Be Converted Into Block Grants." Let me share with you the findings of the Children's Defense Fund from that section:

WHY SAFETY NET ENTITLEMENTS MUST NOT BE CONVERTED INTO BLOCK GRANTS

A number of proposals are being circulated that would transform key means-tested "entitlement" programs (food stamps, school lunches and other child nutrition programs, Medicaid, AFDC, and Foster Care and Adoption Assistance, among others) into block grants. Such a transformation of these key safety net programs would do incalculable damage to America's children and families, states' finances, and the nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, we must reform our welfare system but we should improve the system for the people and the Nation. We should do more than slogans.

□ 1640

Mr. Speaker, yes, we should reform our welfare system, because our welfare system is not working. But we should not reform the system just for change itself. We should reform the system to make it a better system.

We are called on to have a contract with our citizens that we represent. We were called to be faithful to our promise that we would obey the Constitution. I urge us to go beyond slogans, just slogans. Personal responsibility also takes in responsibility from this Congress. We have a responsibility to make sure these programs are administered efficiently as well as effectively.

Slogans will not feed the poor. Only our working to make sure these programs work will. And I urge my citizens, I urge my colleagues as well as citizens, to understand the nutrition programs have worked well for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

RECESS

Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1654

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GOSS] at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 86-380, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. KEMPTHORNE to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, vice Mr. Durenberger.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCHUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for after 12:30 p.m. today, on account of official business at Fort Drum, NY, with the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

Mrs. CHENOWETH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today after 1:30 p.m., on account of family illness;

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business;

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. CLAYTON and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALL of Texas.
Mr. ROHRBACHER.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
Mr. WARD.
Mr. CALVERT.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. HOKE.
Mr. LUCAS.
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.
Mr. WYDEN.
Mr. LARGENT.
Mr. BRYANT of Texas.
Mr. WILLIAMS.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. SHUSTER.
Mr. BONILLA.
Mr. SAXTON.
Mr. HAYES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TUCKER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WILLIAMS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. RIVERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TUCKER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SALMON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SALMON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TUCKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON, in two instances.

Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. JACOBS, in two instances.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. BARCIA.

Ms. ESHOO.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

Mr. OLVER.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mrs. THURMAN, in two instances.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. STOKES.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. MOAKLEY, in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SALMON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. GILMAN in four instances.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. NEY.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. HORN.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. SAXTON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 30 of the 104th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m., Tuesday, February 21, 1995, for morning hour debates.