

way of thinking is finally being scrutinized, I submit these are well-intentioned people with well-intentioned programs that simply have not worked.

After billions of taxpayers dollars we have not ended poverty and in fact, the problems associated with poverty has worsened. Welfare programs should not be judged by how many people are on them, But instead, by how many people are off them.

Mr. Speaker, this situation must end and that is why this Congress must reform welfare now. I remember when our President as a candidate said: "We will end welfare as we know it." Instead of fighting us, instead of using disingenuous scare tactics, I encourage our President to join us in our efforts.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today is a day for the State of Texas. It is Texas Independence Day. I wanted to ask the House to sing just one chorus of "Texas, Our Texas," but I did not get much response.

Unfortunately, I looked at it and looked at the Republican Contract on America and realized that they are celebrating giving women, children, and senior legal immigrants independence from nutrition programs. They are celebrating by putting in jeopardy Social Security.

Today is also Sam Houston's birthday, the first President of the Republic of Texas. But he was not born in Texas. Actually he was born in Virginia and was a Federal officeholder in Tennessee and in Texas.

But under the bill that passed out of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee last week, he would be ineligible for programs under that Republican bill. Because of the Republican bill, the USDA estimated that \$1.3 billion would be cut over 5 years for the school breakfast and lunch programs. The Texas Education Agency estimated the welfare bill would cut school lunches in Texas \$261 million.

DEMOCRATS DISTORTING REPUBLICAN WELFARE PROPOSAL

(Mr. EVERETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the current welfare system has been a nightmare for children. It is a fact that long-term welfare dependency harms children.

A study by Child Trends found that children in families dependent on welfare for long periods of time have more developmental problems than children dependent for only short periods. The problem is, most welfare recipients are long-term dependents. So it is no sur-

prise to learn that 69 percent of children in chronically dependent welfare families score in the bottom third of all children on vocabulary and language skills tests.

The sad fact, Mr. Speaker, is that welfare is probably far worse for children than for anyone else involved, because it gets them into the same habits of dependency they are surrounded by, resulting in an almost unbreakable cycle of welfare.

And yet, my liberal Democrat colleagues come to this floor to deceive, to distort, and to disinform about the Republican proposal on the school lunch program. They are so concerned with protecting the bureaucracy that they are blind to the greater tragedy to children that is going on in my State of Alabama and right outside this Capitol. That is sad, Mr. Speaker.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT PUTS SOCIAL SECURITY AT RISK

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, those who are arguing that the current form of the balanced budget amendment puts Social Security at risk are undeniably correct. The amendment says that in the year 2002 it will be mandatory that any surplus from Social Security be used to reduce the overall deficit elsewhere in the Federal Government for the purposes of achieving balance. What this means is that there will be a constitutional imperative to the Congress to cut Social Security expenditures if they need to do that to make up the deficit elsewhere.

That is not an academic threat. The Speaker of this House has demanded that the Bureau of Labor Statistics recalculate the Consumer Price Index. Reducing the Consumer Price Index has as its major impact saying that older people get less of a cost-of-living increase under Social Security.

So when the Republicans push a form of the balanced budget amendment that allows, indeed, compels, any surplus in Social Security to be used to offset a deficit elsewhere and simultaneously argues that we should cut the Consumer Price Index, which has as its major fiscal impact reducing the cost-of-living increase, we see why Senators are right to oppose this amendment in its current form.

LOOK BEYOND THE RHETORIC

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans work hard to change the way Congress does business. The minority party in both Chambers works hard to preserve the status quo. The balanced budget amendment, up for a

vote today, hinges on the cooperation of Democratic Members. Without their help, the hopes of the American people will be dashed.

Unfortunately, the prospects do not look very bright. Of course, once the country goes broke we will have Social Security and all the other programs they complain about being cut. And as the Republicans attempt to reform welfare systems, they are being met by stiff resistance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the American people to look beyond the rhetoric. The Republicans are trying to change the direction of this Government. We are trying to pass the balanced budget amendment. We are trying to reform a broken welfare system. Sadly, the Democratic Party now is left defending only the status quo.

DO NOT REPEAL THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, in this contract hysteria, let us not lose sight of the things that came into being for a strong national purpose.

The voters in November did not mandate the destruction of a program that has worked well for half a century.

Repealing the National School Lunch Act, which has successfully fed hundreds of millions of hungry children since 1946, will affect children in public and parochial schools, regardless of income.

In 1981, the Reagan administration slashed over \$1 billion from the school nutrition programs.

As a result, over 2,000 schools were forced to drop out of the program, leaving 2 million children without a nutritious school lunch. Under this block grant proposal, States would receive \$2 billion less for school meals over the next 5 years.

Due to drastically reduced funding, a State may choose not to subsidize meals for children who pay full price, forcing the school to raise prices.

BLOCK GRANTING SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM WILL GIVE STATES MORE CONTROL

(Mrs. CUBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I find myself compelled to rise and speak once again on behalf of truth and against the untrue accusations from the other side of the aisle.

In no uncertain terms, the Republicans in Congress do not intend to deprive school children of nutritious meals.

Less than a week ago a Wyoming newspaper's headlines read "GOP Hopes To Abolish School Lunch Programs. Democrats Say Children May

Starve by the Thousands.' Nothing could be further from the truth and the Democrats know it.

Funding for school lunch programs will increase by 4.5 percent each year over the next 5 years. That is not a figure that would lead a reasonable person to believe that the school lunch program will be eliminated.

Block granting the school lunch program will give the States more control to spend the funds where they are most needed. And by requiring States to use at least 80 percent of the funds for meals for low-income children, no one should be afraid that children will go hungry.

The school lunch program will not be eliminated. Now, eliminating the jobs of the Federal bureaucrats who micromanage the nutrition programs is an excellent idea. That is one way to save money in Washington for food for kids.

Let the Democrats take care of the bureaucrats—the Republicans will care for the children.

WELFARE REFORM SHOULD EMPHASIZE SELF-SUFFICIENCY THROUGH WORK

(Mr. ORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I, like many of my colleagues and the majority of Americans, strongly favor welfare reform. It is crucial to transform the welfare system from one which fosters dependency to one based on self-sufficiency.

Yet, the plan moving through Congress lacks emphasis on the one element critical to welfare reform: work. A person entering this newly reformed system could spend 2 years before engaging in any activities that are geared toward work. That simply isn't good enough. It is not good enough for taxpayers, and surely it is not good enough for people receiving welfare benefits who are becoming more alienated from the labor market.

The goal of welfare reform should be to provide people with assistance in setting a path toward self-sufficiency through work.

I have filed H.R. 865, the Self-Sufficiency Act, patterned after a successful welfare reform program in Utah which has reduced the welfare caseload in one area by 30 percent in just 2 years. More importantly, this was accomplished by putting people to work in the private sector.

Let us reform welfare, but let us base it on work.

AN UP-OR-DOWN VOTE NEEDED ON AID TO MEXICO

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to take food out of hungry children's mouths, and we are not going to cut Social Security. That is baloney. But let me tell you something that really is happening, today. The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury are sending \$52 billion, \$52 thousand million down to Mexico, without any act of Congress.

This is where the people's money is supposed to be spent, in the Congress of the United States. They could not get the votes to bail out Mexico in the Congress, so the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, who is protecting his own rear end in my opinion because he is a financial adviser, did an end run around the Congress of the United States.

They have already sent \$7 billion, \$7 thousand million down to Mexico, and that economy continues to go down into the tank. We need an up or down vote in this Congress on spending the taxpayers' money to bail out Mexico. The President is not a dictator. He should not be doing it unilaterally.

THE TRUTH ON SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, once again the truth is revealed. Republicans want to cut Social Security today, and then abolish Social Security tomorrow. Listen to this editorial from American Civilization, the rule book for the extremist wing of the Republican Party.

As we bury the rest of the welfare state in preparation for the 21st century, it is time to slay the largest government entitlement program of all, Social Security.

The Republicans say they will not cut Social Security and Medicare. Then when they get caught they admit they want to. Then they deny it, then they admit again they plan to cut Social Security and cripple Medicare. The Speaker should come clean on Social Security before he accuses others of lying about it.

In the one chance this year to save Social Security from major cuts, every Republican but six voted against an amendment to exempt Social Security. Social Security is a covenant between the American people and the Government. It should not be violated.

□ 1030

DEMOCRATIC WHINING

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, every day the Democrat Party stands up and they weep and they whine and they mourn about the Contract With America. In fact, there has been so much crying on the left side of the aisle that

the EPA has had to declare it a wetlands.

Because while the Republican Party is busy contracting with America, the Democrat Party is busy contracting from America.

The Democrats are outraged because issues that they have ignored and oppressed for 40 years can be brought up before the American people for a vote in 100 days. It has left them without an agenda. To them welfare works. Bureaucrats and regulations are good. Deficit spending is OK because amending the Constitution to keep America alive is somehow worse than balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, this revolution is not about NEWT GINGRICH. It is not about the Contract With America. It is not about the Republicans taking over Congress. It is about change and challenging the status quo. It has a momentum of its own. It is about less government, lower taxes, fewer regulations, and more personal freedom. I hope that they will join us.

IT'S MEAN

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today seeking an answer. The House Appropriations Committee is meeting this morning to mark up legislation that would rescind selected appropriations that were authorized for fiscal year 1995. My question is: How do they justify some of these rescissions that have been proposed by the appropriations subcommittees?

We all realize that cuts have to be made in the Federal budget and that we have to rethink how we spend our constituents' tax dollars. But how can they be so mean-spirited as to make these cuts at the expense of the people we are trying to help.

Discretionary programs for low-income people account for 12 percent or \$64 billion of the Federal Government's total discretionary spending; but as a result of proposals made by the appropriations subcommittees, these programs would bear 63 percent or almost \$11 billion of the cuts. Of \$17.5 billion that was cut by appropriations committees last week, \$14.9 billion were cut from five departments: Education, Health and Human Services, HUD, Labor, and VA. To my thinking, that is just mean. It looks to me that these cuts are intended to justify the tax cut for the wealthy that the Republicans promised in their Contract on America.

FACTS ON SCHOOL LUNCH

(Mr. GANSKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to let the American people know the truth about school lunches. I keep hearing that the Republican proposal