

back here so people could continue to look at them because I think facts are stubborn things, and I think the more the American people get a chance to see the real facts about what we are talking about relative to welfare reform and reform of our nutrition programs, the more that they will see that the facts are on our side and that this is not a plan designed to cut the nutrition program. As a matter of fact, some of my more conservative constituents back in the district are saying, "Why are you allowing these programs to grow the way you are? We'd like to see you freeze these programs."

We are being accused by some of our Democratic colleagues of being mean-spirited and we are hurting children. But I was reminded of a quote the other day from Ralph Waldo Emerson. He said, "There is always a certain meanness in the argument of conservatism, joined with a certain superiority in its facts."

As we show the facts and as the American people get to know the facts, I think they will recognize that when we are talking about meanness and particularly as it relates to our children, I think the meanest thing we can do to our kids is leave them a debt which they will not be able to pay off. That is exactly what we are doing, ladies and gentleman.

Last year the President's own budget officers backed up by the General Accounting Office said that unless we make some changes, by the time today's kids reach our age, they may be confronted with an 82-percent tax rate. In fact, we are stealing from their future. I think the American people are way out in front of us. I think they expect some real cuts. As a matter of fact, all of my town meetings have centered around cut spending first. Frankly, I think some of my constituents are upset because we have taken so many things off the table. As I said earlier, I think they want real cuts in welfare, they want real cuts in some of these programs, and in fact as you look at the charts, whether you are looking at welfare, the Nutrition Program, the WIC Program, all of the other programs, we are actually seeing significant increases.

We have only been here about 9 weeks but it is interesting to me to learn the vocabulary of Washington. Here an increase can be called a cut. But we look at the numbers, and the numbers speak for themselves.

If we look at the Family Nutrition Block Grant Program. According to the current programs, we would be spending in fiscal year 1996 \$3.585 billion this year. Fiscal year 1996. Under the Republican plan, we are going to spend for the Family Nutrition Block Grant Programs \$3.684 billion. That is not a cut. The American people know that is not a cut, and I think the American people want cuts.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, if I could with a quote, and I will not tell who said this because I think it is such

an important message, but I would like to share this with the body:

The government has extremely limited resources to address the many and urgent needs of our people. We are very keen that this real situation should be communicated to the people as a whole. All of us, especially the leadership of political organizations in civil society, must rid ourselves of the wrong notion that government has a big bag full of money. The government does not have such riches.

The speaker went on to say:

It is important that we rid ourselves of the culture of entitlement which leads to the expectation that the government must promptly deliver whatever it is that we demand and results in some people refusing to meet their obligations.

That was not NEWT GINGRICH who said that, it was not even Thomas Jefferson who said that. That was said less than a month ago by Nelson Mandela, addressing some people in the Democratic Parliament in Cape Town, South Africa.

Let me just repeat that last sentence because I think it is so important and I think that is what this debate is all about. Are we willing to finally ride ourselves of this entitlement attitude that we have?

He said:

It is important that we ride ourselves of the culture of entitlement which leads to the expectation that the government must promptly deliver whatever it is we demand and result in some people refusing to meet their obligations.

Mr. Speaker, this exercise that we are going through, whether we are talking about the nutrition programs or welfare reform, is really about changing the attitude not only of Washington but of the American people. We cannot go on under this principle that people are not responsible for themselves. Our welfare reform is really about reinforcing some of those principles, some of those values, if you will, that we know work. We need to reemphasize work, we need to reemphasize personal responsibility. That is what this exercise is about. The facts, the numbers are on our side. Frankly I think, Mr. Speaker, the American people are on our side.

#### FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans say that really they are not cutting nutrition programs, and I do not intend to suggest that they mean to cut and suggest they are not cutting.

We are probably looking at this in different ways. I would think that the emphasis ought to be placed on will they serve more children in the long run or will they serve less? Is the current policy being enforced or will they indeed have a new policy which may yield more money but serve less people?

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that wedding oneself to entitlement certainly is not wedding oneself to invest in our future. Wedding oneself to entitlement is not the same as saying children are our most precious commodity. And entitlements as to some of the basic necessities as food and shelter and health seems to be consistent with what democracy is all about, not necessarily wedding them to be on the dole. I would argue for consistency in terms of America and reaching out to help those least among us as reaching out to help those who are most affluent. It was indeed President Kennedy who said, and I agree, that if this Nation cannot respond to the many who are poor, certainly this Nation cannot defend the few who are rich. That is true, Mr. Speaker.

What are those myths they are saying? They are saying, well, there is going to be more food indeed for school lunches.

I would submit, indeed they are cutting. In fact, the chart we have here indicates surely that they are cutting as a whole.

They say indeed that what we are doing, we are increasing the School Lunch Program 4.5 percent. Indeed, that may be so, but consider this, Mr. Speaker. In that 4.5 percent, you are not taking into consideration inflation, you are not taking into consideration the increase of students who will be there, but yet that same approach was not led to the defense. Indeed, you did take into consideration when you were looking at the budget for defense that in order to maintain that level of service, we have to make an adjustment for inflation. But indeed you did not do that.

When you take all of the nutrition programs together, this chart clearly shows that over that 5-year period, there would be cuts of at least \$7 billion. You see, when you take all the many nutrition programs together and begin to block grant them into two, something else happens to that, particularly the ones that you have the nutrition where you have WIC and other programs. You begin to have the programs who are in need competing among themselves. How does that affect the American people?

I will tell you, it certainly affects the day care people and those who are working because they are going to find that their day care is going to go up and beyond, to make work affordable, they are going to have to increase their outlay for day care because now the choices will be how much money we spend on WIC, how much money we spend on day care.

You say, well, 80 percent of those funds are designed for WIC. Well, WIC does not want to help people get over the first 2 or 3 years and find that the mother is now working and all of a sudden her day care is going up because you are pulling away the support that you had there before day care.

Block grant in itself may not be an evil concept but block grant under the guise of efficiency and better service and local control, it needs to be examined. I submit to Members that in the block grants, in cutting, we may indeed be offering an unfunded mandate because those people who are closest to their citizens will be going to their county commissions, be going to their State general assembly, because they have come to understand that these programs are there and they no longer will be there. You will say, we have given the block grant and we have capped them.

The other issue about block grants is that it does not indeed take into consideration the downturn of the economy. It makes no adjustment for that whatsoever.

Given these factors, it cannot be made substantial when we go beyond the rhetoric that more children will be served. The truth is, more children will not be served. Why? Food is going up, and the school and population is growing.

Which of us would rather tell the last 5 kids of the 25 that are there that they are not going to be able to be served? You must begin to understand why people are so outraged is they cannot believe that you understand this and will still go forward. It is not that we think anyone has more of a disregard for young people than we are, but apparently we do not share the same vision for the future to allow this to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of us to begin to think not in terms of entitlement when we think of our children but think of our children as our future. To the extent we fail to invest in our future, we fail to invest in our society.

#### MORE ON FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the preceding speaker joining us in the well, the gentleman from North Carolina. I appreciate her point of view and especially her last couple of comments. However, I thought for a time tonight we had made real progress because it seemed the preceding speaker, Mr. Speaker, had decided to back away from the terminology "cut."

Let us again state for the record, the proposal offered by your new majority in the Congress of the United States, a proposal that for child nutritional programs adds \$200 million over what President Clinton outlines in his budget, a plan that calls for annual increases over the next 5 years of 4.5 percent every single year, friends, those are increases.

The numbers, with all due respect, offered by the opposition are phantom numbers because they speak of \$7 billion in cuts, \$7 billion that don't even exist.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is this: We do confront a deficit of stark proportions for us all. In fact, by some estimates since in essence the national debt is compounded every nanosecond, it continues to grow, by some estimates we confront a national debt that affects every man, woman and child in this country to the tune of their share in the national debt, for you and me and for everyone else, fast approaching \$20,000.

We have a simple choice: Either we can continue to play the tired old politics of the past which are akin to a schoolyard game of am-not-are-too, am-not-are-too, or we can face this serious problem and take a look and decide to rein in the growth of spending to what is reasonable, to what is rational, and, yes, taking into account the inflation rate, what is most effective, and that is behind our notion of changing these grants to block grants, to let those on the front line fight the battle.

It is true there is a very real difference in philosophy here, because those in the new majority, Mr. Speaker, believe that people on the front lines can best fight this battle and believe it is not incumbent upon a bureaucracy run amok in Washington, DC to decide how best to spend money.

□ 1930

Your new majority in this Congress realizes that what might work in Philadelphia might not work in Phoenix and that people on the front lines in the State of Pennsylvania and Arizona and North Carolina and across this Union can best decide how to fight the battle.

But again, the programs are not being cut. Really, this begs a larger question, and one I think of stark importance to our Republic. Do we face the challenge now and deal with it responsibly, or do we remain wedded to the politics of the past?

We heard with great fanfare my friend on the other side from California just repeat all the arguments and all the incendiary rhetoric. Let me submit to you that if we fail to deal with this problem, if we continue with the same old name-calling, the false numbers, in essence those who are wedded to the past, those who are the guardians of the past have become, in essence, the enemies of the future. For in maintaining a tired old broken-down welfare state, they have, in essence, declared war on the next generation of Americans.

All we ask is this, Mr. Speaker: That we in this body in which it is a great honor to serve, that we do what every American family at one time or another has to do, Mr. Speaker, to gather around the kitchen table and make some hard choices.

Can good people disagree? Yes. Good people can disagree. And certainly there is a difference in philosophy that I delineated.

But I would challenge the other side to come forward with positive programs to tell us where the cuts will come, to tell us where the changes will come, instead of trotting out the tired old rhetoric of the past.

The stakes are too high. The future beckons us.

#### IN THE FRONT LINES WITH THE WIC PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me in the well talked about the front lines. I do not know where he was yesterday, but I was at the front lines. I went and visited a WIC program in Springfield, my hometown in Springfield, OR.

Apparently the gentleman is quite unfamiliar with the programs. They are run by local boards. In fact, the chairman of the board of our local WIC program is a Republican lawyer who a couple of years ago thought about running against me. So there is an incredible amount of discretion and weight given to local control.

What did I not see at the WIC program yesterday? I did not see this: I did not see a low-birthweight baby who was suffering tremendously and who was going to be an extraordinary expense all paid for out of the other pocket of the taxpayers, by Medicaid. I did not see one of these yesterday.

But what I did see were a bunch of healthy kids and some parents coming from a whole bunch of different circumstances. I want to talk just a little bit about that.

I saw a teen mom yesterday, a category of recipient who would be cut off from benefits in the Ozzie and Harriet world of the other side of the aisle. We should not have teenage pregnancies, and, by God, if they have them, they are not going to get any benefits.

What is going to happen to the baby in that world? You want to punish the teenager. What about the baby? I do not even think you should be punishing the teenager. A little counseling is a little more in order. I met a teen mom, and she had gotten some of that counseling at that WIC program. Counseling is one of the things cut off under the Republican block-grant proposal. You will give them the food vouchers still, but you will not get the nutrition counseling. They taught here how to breast-feed her little baby, and they were there yesterday, and they were a testimony to how well this program works.

I saw a working mom with two kids. She is working, a single parent, but she qualified for the WIC program, and you know what, her kids had nutritional problems. They both had a problem with dairy. They had dairy sensitivity. She did not know how to deal with it. She did not have the wherewithal to