

the last one President Johnson submitted.

Mr. LAHOOD. Reclaiming my time, I am happy to say that we have all supported a balanced budget amendment. We could not get some of you to help us.

ON REPUBLICAN AND DEAL PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the former speakers keep talking about how they are not cutting money and then they start talking about how they are cutting the deficit. So which is it?

Mr. Speaker, the current welfare system has created a culture of dependency.

The system offers several incentives for welfare clients to shun independence and stay on the dole.

A single mother who goes to work could lose here child care, forcing her to leave her children home alone.

She could lose Medicaid benefits and go without health insurance.

And she could lose the food stamps that help her feed her children.

And for what?

To get a low-paying job that will leave her worse off financially, uninsured, and unable to supervise her children during the day.

You might ask, what could possibly be worse?

The answer is, H.R. 4 the Republican's Personal Responsibility Act.

The Republican bill would worsen poverty and hunger for innocent children by making deep cuts in benefits, especially during economic downturns.

It would do far too little to empower welfare recipients to rejoin the work force with education and training.

It would scale back the very child care funding that would liberate welfare recipients to go to work.

The plan is punitive, irresponsible, and cruel to children.

The Republican plan could render millions of Americans with nothing to lose.

No cash assistance, no housing, no day care, no medical care, and no jobs.

In New York City alone, experts are projecting that by the year 2000: 76,000 poor children will lose AFDC benefits, an allowance they need for food, shelter and clothing; 300,000 more children will require child care slots so their mothers can work. However, the Republican plan cuts child care spending by \$1.6 billion; 60,000 children would be dropped from the school lunch programs; 640,000 children would see their food stamps decrease by 30 percent.

Simply saying, "No more welfare, go get job" is not welfare reform.

The Republicans want people off of welfare. The Democrats want people to get a job.

The Deal substitute is not perfect.

But it is far better than the Republican plan.

Although it was defeated tonight parts of it should be a model when the Senate takes up the bill.

At least, the Deal substitute operates in the real world.

It recognizes that for welfare recipients to go to work, child care is essential.

So it invests in comprehensive child care.

It recognizes that for welfare recipients to go to work, they need skills and training.

So the plan invests in comprehensive training, education, and workfare programs.

The Deal plan's Work First Program supplies a vehicle of real assistance for recipients to move into the work force.

And once they do find a job, the Deal plan would extend their medical coverage for 1 to 2 years.

These are the tools of economic empowerment which are tragically absent from the Republican plan.

But make no mistake: this is a tough plan.

People must develop and carry out comprehensive plans to get back to work or they lose their benefits.

The Deal substitute requires teenage recipients to stay in school and make the grade or they lose their benefits.

It calls for punitive measures for deadbeat parents, like direct income withholding, revoking their drivers' license, or revoking their professional licenses, thus paralyzing their careers until they do right by their children.

And the Deal substitute targets a major source of welfare dependency—teen pregnancy—with major prevention.

The Republican plan contains no prevention plan except to cut off benefits, and hope less children are born.

It could be described as tough love.

The Republican bill just tells children, "tough luck."

The Democratic bill requires work and demands responsibility.

I would like to put this into the map illustrating the children cut off of school lunches.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following information for the RECORD.

CRS REPORT ON CHILD NUTRITION—TALKING POINTS

CRS released a report Tuesday comparing 1996 estimated state funding levels for the child nutrition programs under current law and under the Republican block grant. The numbers in the report are calculated differently for the school based block grant that we have seen before, showing a \$73 million increase in school lunch and breakfast funding under the block grant when compared to USDA's 1996 baseline. The Republicans are using these numbers to show that they do not cut school meals even when compared to the USDA baseline projection in 1996.

The report supports Democratic statements about total cuts:

Over \$800 million CUT in the total amount available for child nutrition programs in 1996

CRS supports CBO's estimate of a total child nutrition cut of \$7 billion over 5 years (this is not stated in this report but is the CRS stated position)

The report assumes a cut in school meal service to children:

Because the block grant provides so little (\$1.5 million per state, on average) over what schools will need to serve their students just lunch and breakfast, the CRS chart assumes that schools will not use these funds to operate summer food or after school food programs.

The report compares projected spending for lunch and breakfast under current law in 1996 to the Republican's entire school meal block grant. The block grant is supposed to be used for lunch, breakfast, summer food, and after school food. It compares apples to oranges.

The summer and after school/child care food programs serve some of our nation's poorest children. Summer food programs, in particular, have proven essential to the health and safety of children in high poverty areas—these children get what may be their only nutritious meal of the day and become involved in planned community group activities. Summer food keeps kids off the streets and in the school yards.

Furthermore, the report states the, "FY 1995 and FY 1996 estimates of spending under current law are likely to be understated. The amounts shown in the tables do not reflect the actual amounts of funding that States will receive either under current law or under the proposed block grants. They should be used only for the purpose of comparing the likely shifts in spending among the States under the proposed block grants."

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I really had not intended to get involved in this until I had heard one of the most flagrant misstatements that might have ever been made on the House floor when my friend from Georgia said, you know, we want to put this money towards the deficit.

Less than an hour and a half ago, the Republican Members of this body had an opportunity to vote for cuts that would have put the money towards the deficit. Unanimously, they voted against it because they want to give that money to millionaires who got all the tax breaks during the 1980s so they can get more tax breaks now.

□ 2100

MEMBERS' DISCUSSION RELATIVE TO RECOGNITION IN SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. EWING, is recognized.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be substituted for that of Mr. EWING.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would object.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Would that be the gentleman to whom I yielded half my time last night objecting?

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thought we were under a five-minute rule. I would be glad to yield time when I come, but, Mr. Speaker, if we