

Institute audience.

After the Republican sweep of the 1994 elections, Morris was brought in to turn around Clinton's chances, according to *USA Today* and other press sources, which argue that Morris gave Clinton his current lead. But the fact that Gingrich is one of the largest liabilities for the Republican Party, would say something quite different.

LaRouche puts it emphatically: "Dick Morris is the disease that sunk the Democratic Party in the 1994 Congressional elections. He is the spirit, the soul, or at least the rear end, of the Democratic Party. . . . Therefore, we have to transform the Democratic Party within two months, in the process of an election. Therefore, we are deploying as a third force into the Democratic national campaign, in order to rally forces that can trust us. . . . Would you recommend to place trust in a leadership in the Democratic Party, and in the White House, which did nothing, while Jim Crow tried to run us out of the Democratic Party? A leadership which is ready to sell out to Gingrich, for the sake of . . . winning an election, by politics, not principle?"

Impeach Pennsylvania's Governor Ridge

LaRouche is absolutely committed to saving the Clinton Presidency and the Democratic Party. In addition to his "third force" campaign, LaRouche spoke of a second aspect. "At the same time, as part of the same package," he told "EIR Talks," "I'll be conducting and accelerating the campaign against Pennsylvania's Gov. Tom Ridge, whom I've indicted for his commission of what the Nuremberg court defined as a Nazi-style crime against humanity. Our problem is that a lot of the people who are in Newt Gingrich's camp in the Republican Party, and a few Democrats here and there, too, are very sympathetic to, or have committed similar crimes. California, for example, Wilson, the governor; Weld in Massachusetts, for example, another one of these criminals. We're focussing on Tom Ridge. Take out the lead duck, and then go for the rest of the flock. . . .

"Before Election Day, it is going to be very clear to a large number of Americans who are not yet persuaded of that fact, that Newt Gingrich's flock of inedible ducks, is a Nazi-style pack of Nuremberg-type criminals; and we shouldn't be reelecting them, or their kind, to federal office."

A principal vehicle for the campaign against Ridge will be the FDR-PAC, a new political action committee formed on Aug. 29 by associates of LaRouche in the Democratic Party. The committee will draw upon the Democratic tradition of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, to mobilize the traditional base of the Democratic Party—particularly labor and minorities—to defeat the "Contract on Americans."

With these two projects, LaRouche thinks that he and his friends will significantly shape the results of the November elections in their very unique way.

The murderous impact of the welfare bill

In the stampede to get the welfare "reform" bill (H.R. 3734 and S. 1956) through Congress and signed by the President, some important statements describing the real impact of the Conservative Revolution's program went unreported. The following are excerpts from the July 31 and Aug. 1 debates in the Senate and House on the "Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996," before the vote on the bill.

Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.): According to the Congressional Budget Office, federal funding in the coming years is approximately \$10 billion less than the amount needed to meet the work requirements in the bill.

Sen. Paul Sarbanes (D-Md.): What are the states going to do under this legislation when a recession hits, and more and more people slip into poverty, people lose their jobs, they are out of work? The bill essentially gives the state a block grant based on 1994 figures, and that's it.

Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun (D-Ill.): I want to refer my colleagues to the history of what happened before we had a national safety net for poor children in this country. I am looking at the spring 1995 issue of *Chicago History* magazine. It says, "In 19th-century Chicago, the debate over the care of needy children raised issues of Government versus private control and institutional versus family care." Mr. President, that is exactly the argument I have heard all day long on this welfare debate in this Senate today. We are revisiting the past. Let me show you what state flexibility got us last time, Mr. President. The last time we had state flexibility (in the 1890s), we had children sleeping in the streets, which was the first poster.

Here is another one. This is another part of the experiment, again, the history that maybe we have forgotten. The fact is, they were scooping children up from the alleys in New York, shipping them to Rockford, Illinois, and auctioning them off.

Sen. Bill Bradley (D-N.J.): The CBO [Congressional Budget Office] says that most states will ignore the request to put people to work and instead pay the 5%, \$50 penalty for the failure to meet the work requirements. It will pay them to do that. Just taking one example, the biggest city, New York City, which operates the largest work program in this country. Only 32,000 welfare recipients are in it, out

of 850,000 New Yorkers on welfare. The reason? Not because they do not want to do it—lack of money to create jobs. The mayor of New York City said that to meet the work requirements in the bill, the city would need \$100 million more than it will receive in this block grant. It can't do it, and so it will pay less, pay the \$50 bounty per person, to get out from under that work requirement.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.): In order to meet the 20% work requirement in this bill, California would have to find jobs next year for more than 166,000 current adult welfare recipients. But, in the last two years, the state added an average of only 300,000 people total to payrolls in non-farm jobs. How do we possibly create enough jobs to increase employment by another 50%—especially for a work force that is largely unskilled and under-educated? California is a state that has all but lost its production base, and is now producing either high-skilled jobs or hamburger flippers at minimum wage.

In order to move people into work, there must be affordable child care for parents. This bill does not provide anywhere near enough funds. The child care block grant in this bill is awarded to states based on their current utilization of federal child care funds. In California, there are 1.8 million children on AFDC [Aid to Families with Dependent Children]. California currently provides child care subsidies and/or slots to approximately 200,000 children. The Child Care Law Center estimates that under the welfare reform bill, as more parents are required to work, as many as 418,000 additional preschool children and 650,000 children aged 5 to 13 may need child care. This would be a 600% increase in child care slots. This bill does not come near the amount of child care dollars that would be needed in California to do this job.

The conference bill cuts food stamps by 20%. California loses \$4.2 billion. Last year, 3.2 million people relied on food stamps each month. California's unemployment rate is still high, at 7.2%. This bill would limit food stamps for an able-bodied adult with no children to a total of three months over a period of three years. If that person becomes unemployed, they would only be able to receive an additional three months of food stamps in that same three-year period. This bill would also bar all legal immigrants from receiving food stamps—there is no exemption for elderly, disabled, or children.

The major cost shift to California comes from the elimination of federal assistance for legal immigrants, most of whom are elderly, blind, and disabled—all of them poor—who came to this country under terms agreed to by the federal government. And yet, the federal government will not bear the cost of changing the terms of that deal—the cost of this policy shift will be forced onto states and counties. . . . But to change this policy on those already in this country—retroactively—and thus summarily dropping hundreds of thousands of elderly and disabled immigrants from federal support programs

like SSI [Supplemental Security Income], food stamps, and AFDC, onto already overburdened county assistance programs, is not only an abdication of federal responsibility—to me it is unconscionable. The impact of this cost shift to California counties could be catastrophic. An estimated 722,939 legal immigrants in California—many of whom are aged, blind, and elderly—would lose SSI, AFDC, and food stamps under this bill.

The state of California indicated by its budget that it has no ability or intention of stepping in to fill the funding gap this bill creates. Governor Wilson's state budget for fiscal year 1996-97 assumes the immigrant provisions in this legislation will pass, and legal immigrants will no longer be eligible for assistance. California's legislative analysts' report indicates that Governor Wilson's budget "assumes enactment of federal legislation barring most legal immigrants from receiving SSI/SSP benefits starting Jan. 1, 1997. The budget assumes savings of \$91 million from this proposal."

While we in Washington sit in our ivory tower and pat ourselves on the back for changing welfare as we know it, the real impact of this bill will land on real people who are too old or too sick to care for themselves, and whose families—if they have one—have no ability to help them.

Sen. Dale Bumpers (D-Ark.): I am going to vote against it because it discriminates against my home state of Arkansas in a massive way. Children in my state will get \$390 a year. Children in Massachusetts will get \$4,200 a year; in Washington, D.C., \$2,200 a year. You tell me why a child in Arkansas is worth \$390 a year and \$4,200 in Massachusetts.

Never has such an important piece of legislation been crafted in such a highly charged political environment. But there ought to be a rule against considering these kinds of bills that affect the very fiber of this nation in an election year. We are going to kick people off welfare and tell them to get a job. I would like to invite all of my colleagues to go to the Arkansas Delta. I will pick out a dozen communities for you to visit and then you tell me after you have kicked these mothers off welfare, where they are going to get a job; 50% of these mothers will be kicked off the welfare rolls after the first two years. There are no jobs.

Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.): This bill provides a penalty of a 5% cut in federal funds for the state's block grant that will be increased to a maximum of 21% cut should targets be missed in consecutive years. The National Governors' Association shares the concern that many states will have difficulty in meeting the work requirement. This will leave states with the choice of using state and local funds for education, training, and child care, or throwing more people off the rolls so it will be easier to hit their work targets, or cutting far back on benefits. The CBO has said that, over six years, this bill falls \$12 billion short of the funding needed to meet the work requirements of this legislation, and about \$2.4 billion short in child care resources.