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 lead to in 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.