

103^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. RES. 525

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to welfare reform legislation.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 18, 1994

Mr. KNOLLENBERG (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KIM, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EWING, Mr. CANADY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HORN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means

RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to welfare reform legislation.

Whereas, since 1965, welfare spending at the Federal, State, and local levels has cost United States taxpayers \$5,000,000,000,000;

Whereas, despite rapid increases in welfare spending since the inception of the War on Poverty, the poverty rate in the United States has not been reduced significantly;

Whereas 14.7 percent of United States residents were mired in poverty in 1966, versus 14.5 percent in 1992 (the last year for which figures are available);

Whereas the Federal Government spends on welfare programs more than twice the amount required to lift every person on welfare from poverty; and

Whereas welfare rolls have increased sharply since the enactment of the Family Support Act of 1988, and less than 1 percent of recipients of aid to families with dependent children work, and the costs of implementing such Act have exceeded estimates by \$10,000,000,000: Now, therefore, be it

1 *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Rep-
2 resentatives that any welfare reform legislation that
3 passes the House of Representatives—

4 (1) should result in net savings to the United
5 States taxpayer within 5 years;

6 (2) should limit increases in aggregate spending
7 for welfare programs to the rate of inflation;

8 (3) should not require any new taxes;

9 (4) should not increase the Federal deficit by
10 more than the amount by which the Federal deficit
11 would increase in the absence of the legislation; and

12 (5) should not require State or local govern-
13 ments to bear any administrative costs that would
14 not be borne by such governments in the absence of
15 the legislation.