the American people, in spite of the ABM treaty, which allows the Russians to have the only operational ABM system in the entire world right now, which surrounds Moscow and which is in fact operational.

□ 2250

What we are saying in the contract is we want the Secretary of Defense unlike what we heard from one of our colleagues on the other side today say that we want immediately a space-based system. That is not what the contract provision says. It says that we want the Secretary to come back and tell us what kind of national ballistic missile system we can deploy now.

In conversation with General O'Neill who heads ballistic missile defense last week and a follow-up meeting I am having this week, he says that at the basic we can install a program within 2 years that would cost no more than $5 billion over 5 years. So the figures we are going to hear on Wednesday and Thursday are going to be way out of line and are going to be more rhetoric than they are substance.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for reminding us that the Secretary of Defense did say he could build a system for the type of attack that he expects in the context of expecting some type of an offense against the United States, what he calls a thin attack. He said he could do it for $5 billion in a couple in years, and I think that the gentlewoman who propounded that question, our friend Mrs. SCHROEDER from Colorado was a little bit shocked at his low number, because I think she came back and said, ''Wait a minute. What's it going to cost total?'' And he said, ''$5 billion total.''

In the context of the 5-year defense plan, that is roughly .004 of the total defense numbers, .004 of the budget. So that is not a number that is going to crowd out readiness or modernizing our military. The only thing that is going to crowd those things out is the President's budget itself. And the President himself has cut $9 billion just between FY 1995 and FY 1996 in modernization. So the President is doing the cutting. One slap of the pen by the President cutting $9 billion in modernization had doubled the impact on the modernization budget of building what Secretary Perry himself described as doable, that is, a missile defense nationally that will defend against the thin attack.

So if we are asked would you rather have a defense that will defend against a thin attack or nothing, but absolutely naked, I think the American people say, give us something, give us some missile defense against that accidental launch or that third-world terrorist attack.

I would be happy to yield to the fine gentleman from San Diego, my seat mate, Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman from California.

I think another important factor, and gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] brought it up. When we brought this bill up in the committee, we had 41 Republicans and Democrats vote for it. Only 13 voted against it. I want to tell you, those 13, their politics would go good only in a small island off Florida.

I would also like to remind the Members, Mr. Speaker, that the contract talks about not having U.S. troops under U.N. control. Very, very important. We lost 22 Rangers and 77 wounded in Somalia. Because, for example, it took 7 hours for our troops to get to all those Rangers that lost their lives and were wounded because the U.N. control had never used night goggles, it was at night, many of them did not speak English, some of them could not even drive the equipment. We want to eliminate that, and that is another reason for bipartisan support.

The part that I am upset, the liberals that have done everything in their power to cut national security, to cut defense of this country now stand up and object at the majority when it is a bipartisan bill that is coming out of the committee itself, what same minority. We are glad that that leadership exists. Let them talk.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 33 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the Speaker for affording us this opportunity to address a subject which is extremely important and critical.

We have seen this week the opening of the markup in the subcommittee on the House Committee on Ways and Means of the welfare reform bill. We have had a lot of discussion about the issues surrounding welfare reform. Last week we saw the Republican version of their Contract With America with regard to family responsibility, and we saw also the response on the Democratic side with respect to what they would like to see in terms of a reform measure.

We are here tonight because we believe that voices of the women and children who will be primarily affected by what this Congress does in reforming welfare have not been heard and probably will not be heard from during the course of this debate. It is imperative that as we consider this legislation, we think of it in terms of the women and the children.

I am very happy tonight, at this very late hour, to be joined by my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], who has been a great leader on this subject and whose voice continues to be heard for the women and children of this country. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii for yielding me the time and thank her for arranging this special order.

I would just like to enter into a discussion with you and raise a couple of concerns that I have and perhaps have you to explain your knowledge of the Personal Responsibility Act.

If the block grant goes, and it appears that we are going to have that structure for a number of programs that are going to be put in a basket called welfare reform that will allow different ways of providing services. I am particularly concerned about the nutritional part.

Let me first say, I support welfare reform. I think our welfare system does not work well. It does not encourage self-sufficiency and we need to make sure the system works well for the recipients as well as for the government itself. So we need welfare reform. But we do not need welfare reform just for change sake itself. We need it for a better system, for a system that is improved, a system that is obviously going to serve people better.

In the areas of nutrition, we are not necessarily perfect but those are areas where we help people. We have food stamps, the school lunch program, we have the WIC program, the commodity program, the senior citizens program, all of those programs which speak to the needs certainly of people who are in need but also speak to needs of people who may be working.

For the food stamp program, 20 percent of the food stamp program is received by persons who are working families. My concern is if we block-grant that program, not only do we drastically reduce the amount of moneys that will be available but also we put the States themselves into the business of setting national nutritional standards. These programs have worked well to make sure children are fed and are prevented from disease.

If now we block-grant it, does that not mean that each State would have the responsibility of setting nutritional and dietary standards for the implementation of those programs.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct. Not only will the States be given the responsibility of setting up the criteria and the eligibility standards, but indeed they could move the moneys around within that category and, as I read the legislation, even take out 20 percent from one block grant to put into another program.

Mrs. CLAYTON. So it is possible that all that money would not go to feed the hungry, feed children or seniors, they could do other things with it.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Exactly. They could do other things with it. It seems to me that in the area of nutrition in particular, Congress has been very, very careful in looking at the needs of specific groups of individuals in our society, children in the schools for school lunch, senior citizens in their centers, in congregate dining programs and

meals on wheels and for the tiny infants, the women-infant-children's program has been established for that specific targeted group of people.

□ 2300

And the commodities program has been a kind of a consolidated farmers' surplus interest program together with matching up the needs of the poor in our society, and food stamps, we all know, has been a Godsend to millions of families whose nutrition for their families has been supplemented because of their ability to exchange their earnings or money in exchange for a greater value of food coupons.

So of all of the block granting that has been recommended under the Contract With America, it seems to me the one that is least justified is the suggestion of putting all of these groups together and allowing the States to pick and choose which programs they want to support and which ones they do not. I think it would be a real tragic mistake, and I hope that the committee ultimately will not do that.

Mrs. CLAYTON. One of the things we want to emphasize is that those nutritional programs are not only there to speak to the need, because people are poor, but also to speak to their dietary deficiency and, as a result of that, they have found that they have opportunities to address diseases, they have opportunities to address deficiencies of growth and development, and if you remove that, some of the nutritional achievements we have made, WIC, for pregnant women and mothers who are nursing, those achievements, I think, will be lost. We will retrogress; rather, we will have a system, one system in North Carolina, another in Mississippi, another in Hawaii. Now we have some uniform standards where we are moving all Americans to a standard that perhaps can improve their health.

For one thing, I think that is a tremendous benefit that we can move in that area.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Our reluctance in not supporting the block grant is not because we do not have confidence in local officials in their being able to perceive what the needs are of their constituents. Their constituents are our constituents.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Absolutely.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. So I have full confidence in my State and local elected officials to know what is appropriate for our community. But I also believe that the Congress of the United States has an important responsibility in establishing the priorities, understanding what the needs are of Americans all across the country, and coming up with programs that match surplus commodities and requirements of our farming communities. That is how the Food Stamp Program got started.

I was here when it happened. Congresswoman Lenore Sullivan was the one who put it all together, from the great State of Missouri, and it has worked, and it has been a boon to the farmers of this country, and it has met a tremendous need in all of our poorer communities.

So it is tragic that in formulating this concept of welfare reform that they have sought to pool this money and disregard the initial intent of Congress in formulating these targeted special programs. Our concerns are concerns, I am sure, that are shared by most of the Members on the minority side, and I hope that when this debate reaches the floor, we will have opportunities to debate this issue fully, to offer amendments to correct this major oversight.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I am receiving a tremendous amount of mail both in the areas of school lunch and in the areas of senior citizen programs.

We know the value of having it with young children and pregnant women in terms of those areas, so I would hope, as we debate that, we will have people on both sides of the aisle seeing the value of this deliberation and trying to salvage this program and protect the nutritional value of this program as well as the integrity of these programs, because the nutrition programs by and large have worked, and we ought to celebrate those things that have worked, correct those things that have not, and reform where we are improving the system.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from Hawaii for her fine work and leadership.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the gentlewoman for participating this evening in the special order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], who is the ranking member of one of my subcommittees, the Educational Economic Opportunities Committee of the House.

Mr. KILDEE. I support the gentlewoman on her position on nutrition. School lunch, school breakfast are extremely important programs. They will all be apparently put into this nutrition block, although we have not been given the information as to how this will be done. They say it will be somewhat separate, but we know we have so many needs in that School Lunch Program. We have different students, those that get the free lunch, the reduced lunch, the paying students, and we have just finished and completed a deep study of the nutritional values of those lunches.

I am afraid this will be lost in this block grant also, because they have not shared with us yet what they intend to do with the School Lunch Program.

THE PERSIAN GULF WAR: WE VOTED OUR CONSCIENCES

But I came over here tonight primarily to speak on another subject very briefly, and I really appreciate the fact that the gentlewoman has yielded to me.

While I was sitting in my office listening to the monitor, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], my good friend, and he is a very good friend of mine, I have great respect for him, from San Diego, stated that the Democrats, the majority party, had turned their back on our troops in the Persian Gulf. That really hurt me, particularly coming from a friend like the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and I voted differently on that war. We both voted our consciences. The position I took was shared by Gen. Colin Powell, a great American. I voted my conscience, as the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] voted his conscience, and by voting my conscience, I was not turning my back on our troops.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when the war began in Iraq, the first person who stood at that podium right there the following morning, the first person was DALE KILDEE from Michigan saying that while we had disagreed on policy, now that the war had started we should give our troops our full and complete support. We were not turning our backs on our troops.

I took particular offense, because that statement came from a friend of mine, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. I took another offense, too, Mr. Speaker. I have two sons who are lieutenants in the U.S. Army. My one son is beginning Ranger training. When he finishes that, he will go to Korea.

My votes on the policy of how we deploy our troops do not make me less concerned about the safety of our troops, and I would hope that in the next 2 days as we debate the defense of this country that we not question the patriotism of one another or the support of our troops.

The 440 Members of this House, 435 voting Members and 5 nonvoting Members, are loyal Americans who want nothing to happen to our troops. I want all the sons and daughters of America who serve in the Armed Forces to be treated as I would want my own two sons to be treated, with full support.

But because we may disagree, as we disagreed on the Persian Gulf war, does not make one less loyal or less American or less supportive of our troops.

Now, I know the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] did not realize the full ramifications of his statement, but that debate we had was one of the best debates, no, not one of the best debates, the very best debate that I have heard in my over 18 years in the Congress of the United States, and that is why this is a deliberative body.

Because someone may vote one way and another another way should not call into question the patriotism or loyalty or support of the our troops.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the gentleman for his very strong refutation of our colleague from California, because I was here on the floor and heard those statements likewise.

Resuming my special order, which is to bring to focus some of our concerns

about the welfare debate, I do so tonight even though the hour is late, because tomorrow is a very special day. There is to be a special program on the Hill, Welfare reform with a heart, children speaking for themselves.

□ 2310

This will occur on Capitol Hill. It will be first initiated by a press conference at 9 o'clock in the morning in the Rayburn Building, followed from 10 o'clock until 2:30 with children and youth from the District of Columbia coming in and participating during those several hours, and what they will be doing is reading letters and speaking out, presenting testimony about their own experiences as children in a welfare family.

One of the real tragedies in a very esteemed institution like the Congress of the United States in the hearings that we call in our various committees, and this is not unique to the current majority because it was also a situation when the Democrats were in the majority, that we have these hearings called, and experts from various fields are called: economists, professors, physicians, doctors, psychiatrists, lawyers, whatever, are called to testify, and we very seldom ever have the opportunity to hear from the very persons who are affected by the programs that we are debating, and in this case we are talking about welfare families and the children, about 5 million adults and 9 million children, and I am here tonight to speak specifically for the women and children.

There are 49 women Members of the House of Representatives, but very few of us are on the committees that will be making these decisions, and therefore it is important to focus our attention on some of these matters.

Today there was a press conference which was called by the Council of Presidents, which is a bipartisan coalition of the leaders of approximately 100 national groups, and they have formulated a position on welfare which I would like to take the time tonight to read and explain. Heidi Hartman, who leads the Institute for Women's Policy Research, was the guiding force in putting together the coalition on this subject. We heard from the NOW Legal Defense Fund. We heard from Eliza Sanchez, who was the president of Manna, an organization that has been working pay equity. There was a representative from Planned Parenthood, from the National Women's Law Center, and from Wider Opportunities for Women. These were some of the groups of the 100.

And this is important because women have come together to put together what they believe ought to be the central points of any discussion having to do with welfare reform, not the myths, not the stereotypes, not the punitive aspects of trying to moralize and change human behavior, but what is truly the responsibility of the Federal Government with respect to poor families. Poverty in America is a condition which affects all peoples across the country, and we need to focus this issue on the question of poverty.

Let me read for my colleagues what the Coalition of Presidents said today at the press conference. It said, and I quote:

NATIONAL WOMEN'S PLEDGE ON WELFARE REFORM, PRINCIPLES FOR ELIMINATING POVERTY

We support welfare reform that will do more than maintain families in poverty. It should help them make a permanent escape from poverty. The vast majority of adults who receive assistance from AFDC are women. As leaders of women's groups in the United States, we state unequivocally that women who receive welfare benefits have the same rights as all women and have the same goals for their families. We cannot allow their rights to be curtailed because they are poor, nor their values impugned because they need help to support their families. Welfare has served as an essential safety net for poor women and their children. Many women use welfare at various points throughout their lives because they have few other resources to tide them over during one-time or recurring events such as illness, unemployment, childbirth, domestic violence, or divorce. We cannot allow the guarantee of minimum survival assistance to be removed or reduced by caps on spending, time limits, child exclusion policy, or other means. We cannot allow the Federal Government to abandon its commitment to a basic safety net for poor mothers and their children. We oppose punitive measures that assume the behavior attitudes and value of women on welfare are the problem. Welfare mothers have not abandoned their children. They are struggling to hold their families together with extremely limited resources. Many are already working or looking for work in order to raise their families' incomes. We believe the problem lies rather in the labor market where the women face enormous barriers, including gender and age-based discrimination that limits their opportunities, unstable jobs that pay low wages and the lack of health and retirement benefits, inaccessible jobs, and no jobs at all. In addition, lack of educational opportunity, inadequate support services and benefits, lack of child support from fathers and punitive welfare regulations have made it impossible for poor women to get ahead.

That is the end of their opening paragraph outlining their principles for eliminating poverty and the basis upon which the debate on welfare reform, in their view and mine, should be considered.

I think it is very important to recognize that, when this debate started over a year ago, and the Republican Party offered their proposal, and the President offered his, we were not in this debate to try to find ways to cut the funding, to address the issue at another level in terms of deficit reduction or trying to reduce the debt. As a matter of fact, the Republican proposal at that time for welfare reform included some $12 billion of additional funding which in their program was required in order to meet the requirements of education, training, counseling and, most importantly, child care provisions in order for women to go to get an education or training, and, in the final analysis, to hold a job child care is essential.

The President's proposal also had very strong ingredients of funding, I believe at the level of around $7 billion to provide for education, training, counseling and the important element of child care.

The strangest thing happened over the last year. Now we are looking at proposals which eliminate the concept of Federal responsibility for providing educational opportunities and training, counseling, helping to find a job, and when they do, to have the necessary child care provisions in the programs. The Republican proposal leaves it out. The Democratic proposal has not yet formulated exactly how they are going to fund the additional needs. They have said, well, the States say they can do it all, and, therefore, let us see what the Governors can come up with. It seems to me that, unless we deal with the subject of welfare reform with the seriousness and earnestness of trying to help these families and not punish them and push them off as if they do not exist, then there is no possibility that we are going to be able to reduce funding as is currently being proposed by the Republican bill in the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 2320

What is required is an honest, deliberate decision, that women on welfare first of all want to work. There is all kinds of evidence and empirical statistical studies that show that women on welfare want to work. The problem with the system right now is that when they are in need and apply for welfare, there is no one there to meet them at the door and to help them try to solve their family situation, find them a job, take them into training or education. They are simply accepted into the system, given assistance, and more or less left to their devices.

Furthermore, the system also punishing women on welfare, because if they have the initiative to go out to work, to find a job, then they are immediately cut off from cash assistance, frequently they have to lose food stamps, and perhaps even get off of Medicaid health care.

So the burdens on welfare families are tremendous and the government, the State, and Federal Government has not offered them the support.

Now for the first time it seems to me at least a year ago that both sides of the aisle looked at this honestly and said we are going to change the welfare system, we are going to change the way that the Government deals with welfare families by initiating an offer to help for education and training and job counseling, and we are going to provide child care. And this has to be done with an understanding it is going to cost additional sums of money in order to implement.

So what do we find today in the Republican proposal? We have a notion

that they will also do away with entitlements. There will no longer be a requirement that the Federal Government will guarantee some level of cash assistance to a child whose parent is without work and in poverty.

Under the current system, for the past 60 years Congress and this country have said no poor child should be left hungry, without food and shelter and clothing and medical care. A country as great as America cannot afford to let a child die in starvation and in ill health and in disease. This is a fundamental responsibility of the Government.

So 60 years ago we established this program of aid to dependent children, and we guaranteed that every child in America that met the eligibility criteria of poverty and being in a family where there was no person able to work, that the Government would find same way to assist that family with a cash assistance and other supportive programs.

We do not have a national program under which a set figure of money is given to every family pro rata for every child in America. It is instead a collaborative program with the States, with the States participating in a 50–50 matching situation.

So we have States like mine that come up with a cash assistance program well above most of the other States in the country, somewhere around $600 per family of three. At the lower end of the 50 States is Mississippi, where the contribution by the Federal and the State is $120 for a family of three. So there is this huge range of difference in terms of what the welfare program means in the different States.

The States have provided this range of difference. So we are not saying at this juncture that the Federal Government ought to require a certain set figure. I wish we could. But certainly we should not at this juncture be removing the entitlement assurance guarantee that every child in this country has from the U.S. Government. But that is precisely what the Committee on Ways and Means subcommittee is now considering, and I think that that is a very, very grave mistake.

If they adopt this block grant approach, taking the average of spending for the program back to 1991 to 1993 and averaging it out and saying this is the amount of money that the States are going to receive based upon the prior experience, then it makes no adjustments for increases in numbers of families or changes of the economy, recessions, greater unemployment, closures of companies and major corporations in a certain area that would increase the numbers eligible for assistance.

So I think that one of the fundamental issues that this House will have to face is the question of whether we retain the idea of an entitlement or whether we go the way of a block grant, which will create enormous burdens upon the States, and eventually I think come back to the Congress for supplemental support and supplemental assistance.

It seems to me we ought to decide right now that one of the basic virtues of the current program is the fact that there is this entitled notion and it ought to be retained.

There are other proposals that are in the wind with respect to the Committee on Ways and Means proposals. They have to do with cutting off families after 2 years if they are not able to find work. There is no support program to help individuals find a job, no support program for education and training that is specified in the legislation, and I think that it would be very, very harmful for many thousands of families who will find themselves without assistance unless we provide that kind of help.

There is this notion that is very, very difficult to refute, and I hear it from my constituents, as I am sure most of my colleagues do from theirs, and there is this impression that people on welfare stay there for enormous lengths of time and that this is a problem that must be rooted out, and one way of doing that is to make a work requirement that is short, as in this 2-year proposal by the Republicans, and on the Democratic side, where they are required to come in with some sort of a work strategy.

But I think that what is so difficult to deal with is this impression that people have that people on welfare are in for enormous lengths of time.

The truth of the matter is, and when you look at the data and statistics, persons that come on welfare are out of there, at least half of them, are out of welfare after only 11 months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The time initially allocated to the gentlewoman from Hawaii has expired. However, because the majority leader has not designated a person to be recognized for the balance of the time remaining, the gentlewoman from Hawaii may proceed for up to 27 more minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. The statistics are there. The census data has been evaluated. All the records of the department have been researched, and we find the outstanding conclusion that the majority of parents who come into welfare are there less than a year. Eleven months is the average. This means they are there for temporary assistance, the vast majority of them. And if the Government had been more ready to assist them, provide them with some assistance in locating a better job that paid higher wages or helped them with medical care, which in many cases is the reason for families coming on welfare, the place that worked that provided perhaps just a bare minimum wage salary did not include health care provisions, so the moment when a child became sick, they had to quit work and come back on the welfare system. But the moment that the illness passed and the family was together again, that parent would be out there looking for work.

The idea that is out there which is so pervasive that people on welfare are unwilling to work simply is not true. So I therefore support the idea of a work oriented system, because I believe that that truthfully meets the needs of people on welfare. They need assistance, they need education, they need training, they need job counseling. Somebody has to go out there to help them obtain a job which can support their families beyond what they were getting on welfare in terms of cash assistance.

□ 2330

We see that the vast majority of families, actually 80 percent of the families on welfare, are out of the welfare system in a 2-year period, more than 50 percent in 11 months and 80 percent in the 2-year period.

Therefore, we are dealing with a highly transitional group of individuals. There are some that find it very difficult to find a job, or because of their lack of education and training and having no job skills, have extreme difficulties in locating work. However, the vast majority of individuals on welfare, roughly about 80 percent, from the figures that I have seen, are in the system only for a short period of time, 2 years and less, and have, on the average, 4 years of work experience.

Because that is the reality, it seems to me that the Federal Government, with a strong, integrated, personally adaptive work training, work counseling kind of strategy, can help these families get off of welfare even faster and into a job that pays more than the welfare support check was paying them.

Mr. Speaker, this leads me to the other issue, and that has to do with the minimum wage question. It is vital, Mr. Speaker, that we deal with the minimum wage issue part and parcel to the welfare discussion. I know that the Republican leadership has discarded the whole idea of getting into minimum wage. However, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to be realistic in terms of doing something to change the whole system of welfare, we have to be willing to look at exactly what the minimum wage situation does. It just oppresses single-family situations far greater than families that have two working parents. But in the single family situation, working for a minimum wage dooms that family to perpetual poverty. That is the tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the statistics, we find that over 60 percent of the people who are working today for minimum wage or less are women. There are about 4 million persons in America that work at $4.25 or less, and of that number, 2,603,000 are women; 1,000,078 of these women are wives or single-parent heads of families. Therefore, increasing the minimum wage by 90 cents over a 2-year period will help

tremendously the women and children of these families, well over 1 million families where both parents work, or the single family situation.

Mr. Speaker, of the total number of women who work for minimum wage or less, 80 percent are white women. Twelve percent are black women, and 8 percent are Hispanics. Contrary, again, to the myths of most of our thinking, Mr. Speaker, the families that would be most benefitted by an increase in the minimum wage are the white, Caucasian families in this country. Eighty percent of the total number of women are white, as I said.

Mr. Speaker, if we raise the minimum wage from $4.25 an hour, where families now only earn $8,000-plus a year, the increase of 90 cents an hour would raise the annual earning to $10,300-plus dollars, an increase of $1,714. That is a tremendous increase. Forty-five cents each year for 2 years, raising the minimum wage from $4.25 to $5.15, will lift millions of families out of poverty, and will be one of the important steps that we could take to help ensure that families on welfare will not come back onto welfare because their earnings are insufficient to sustain their family.

Mr. Speaker, one of the ironies is that in the early deliberations of the whole welfare discussion, we adopted the notion that if a welfare family went out and got a job, they would immediately lose all their benefits. It was a disincentive to work.

We want to make sure now that when we are talking about welfare reform, that such disincentives are removed. We want to make sure that there are enough incentives there to make it attractive for women in particular to go out and hold a job, and to support their family on this self-sufficiency model which has been discussed.

I am all for that, Mr. Speaker. I want to see opportunities made possible to these families all across America. That is what this debate ought to be about, enlarging opportunities, not in punishing and establishing all of these negative restrictions in terms of who can receive a benefit and who cannot.

Mr. Speaker, the AFDC has also another very, very difficult myth out there. A lot of attention has been placed on the factor of women coming onto welfare and having another child while on welfare.

One of the punitive suggestions is to deny that child born to that parent while she was on welfare from any cash support whatsoever. I cannot think of anything more cruel and inhuman than a suggestion to punish a child.

The statistics reveal again, from the Census Bureau, from the Department of Health and Human Services, from all the people who collect data, that the number of children born to these families on welfare is no different than the average family in America.

As a matter of fact, most families on welfare have two children, and that is it. Very, very small numbers of persons on welfare have more than two children. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, an even smaller percentage of individuals on welfare have a child while on welfare.

The suggestion that welfare mothers will be encouraged to have another child because they can increase their cash benefits is ridiculous, because the average additional cash assistance ranges around $45 to $65 across the States. I cannot imagine any person deliberately deciding they should have another baby for that amount of money. In point of fact, that does not occur.

Mr. Speaker, the other aspect which is in the Republican plan is to make it impossible for teenagers who have children to receive any welfare assistance unless they live at home with their parents or with another qualified adult, or if they subsequently get married to the father of that child.

Such a prohibition of cash benefits aimed at the child, because it was born out of wedlock, is simply a concept and principle that I cannot understand or accept.

□ 2340

Furthermore, in looking at studies, many of the lawyers and others who have studied this issue maintain that it is unconstitutional because it creates a category within a benefit situation which clearly has no justification whatsoever.

And so I am hopeful that even if the Congress should put such a provision in, that the case will be taken to courts and the Supreme Court decisions which have been rendered on this subject, starting from 1973, case in New Jersey, the New Jersey Welfare Rights Organization versus Cahill held that the denial of such rights was a violation of the 14th amendment, the equal protection clause.

The court in 1972 in Webber vs. Aetna Casualty said,

> The status of illegitimacy has expressed through ages society's condemnation of irresponsible liaisons beyond the bonds of marriage, but visiting this condemnation on the head of an infant is illogical and unjust. Moreover, imposing disabilities on the illegitimate child is contrary to the basic concept of our system that legal burdens should bear some relationship to individual responsibility or wrongdoing. Obviously no child is responsible for his or her birth.

There is a series of other cases that relate to this point.

So I feel quite confident that the legal scholars who have brought this matter to the attention of the Congress know what they are talking about, and so if this provision which denies a child from birth to age 18 from receiving any benefits whatsoever under the welfare system, then surely someone will take it to court and will prevail and such a harmful provision will be stricken from this bill.

Let me in closing call the Members' attention to a very important report that came across my desk. It is produced by the Center on Hunger, Poverty and Nutritional Policy at Tufts University. I believe all Members received this booklet. It is appropriately in lovely pink color for Valentine's Day. It was published by J. Larry Brown and it is a review of evidence on welfare reform.

He points out in his book that they collected a very large number of people to collaborate on this study and made some very, very important conclusions which I would like to briefly outline.

The 1995 Tufts University center report which is entitled ''Key Welfare Reform Issues, the Empirical Evidence.''

The report presents scientific data that, one, welfare benefits do not cause the growth in single parent families and single parent families are not the major factor of the growth of poverty in America. It urges that Congress avoid the tragic mistake of adopting pseudo-reforms that stem from political ideology rather than empirical evidence. It advises that if we wish to break the cycle of poverty, we not be guided by the wish to punish poor women whose behavior we wish to chastise.

In 1994, 76 researchers and scholars in the field of welfare issued a policy statement regarding the empirical facts that they found in their research which challenged the political leaders in terms of the assumptions that they were making in presenting their legislation.

Fact No. 1. Growth in the number of single parent families has been primarily among the non-poor.

From 1970 to 1990, the number of female-headed households increased from 6 million to 11 million, mostly among the non-poor. Sixty-five percent of the increase in single parent families were not living in poverty. For instance, in 1993, there were 3.5 million unmarried non-poor couple households and one-third of them had at least one child. This family would fall under a single parent definition. Changes in welfare laws will not affect the mores and lifestyles of these families. In fact the Contract of America will give these families a $500 tax credit for each child regardless of their marital status.

Fact No. 2. The Census Bureau found that economic factors such as low wage jobs accounted for approximately 85 percent of the child poverty rate. A 1993 Census Bureau study showed that the poverty rate was due mainly to changes in the labor market and the structure of the economy. Bureau of Labor statistics data from 1973 to 1990 revealed that the proportion of persons employed in service industries grew from 70 to 77 percent. And this is the lowest wage sector of our economy.

Between 1960 and 1980, the proportion of women in the labor market increased from 40 to 61 percent ages 16 to 34.

The desire to have women work is limited to only poor women with dependent children to teach them responsibility. For non-poor women, the need to remain in the home to nurture their children to wholesome maturity is still

the social ethic of our times. Forcing women to work is destructive of family values.

That is the essence of the report of the Tufts University which I commend to my colleagues to read. It has been delivered to your offices sometime in late January.

There are many issues that need to be discussed. One that I have championed almost my entire political career is the need for child care. When I was in Congress in the 1960's and 1970's, we did put together a comprehensive child care bill which passed both the House and the Senate, but it was vetoed by President Nixon. Since that time, there has not been a major effort to insist that there was a government responsibility for child care. But now that we are again debating this issue of welfare, it seems to me that we cannot succeed in this area of welfare reform requiring work as a criteria for continued participation in the system unless we systematically and with full intent and knowledge subscribe to the understanding that women cannot be asked to go to work if they have small children unless we have child care provided to that family. It is unrealistic, it simply is unworkable.

And so the idea of work for welfare is a great concept. The idea of education and training in order that people could work to get off welfare is a marvelous idea. But none of these things can work unless that family has support in terms of someone to take care of their children while they are at work.

Women's work at home is a valuable contribution to our society. Women's responsibility in the home has always been accorded a place on the pedestal of our society at large. It continues to be debated as to whether some women ought to work or ought not to work. But the issue has always been a matter of choice. Women choose to work. Women ought to have equal opportunities to work. And when they do work, they ought to be accorded the same privileges of advancement, promotions and so forth and their pay ought to be the same, and there should be no gender discrimination. That is the ethic which has evolved up to the present time.

But when we are dealing with the welfare community, we are adopting a new frenzy of requirement to work. I can support a requirement to work, but it must always be in addition and connected with a concept of child care.

That brings me to the final concluding thought that I want to leave. Welfare reform is about children. It is not about punishing adults. It is about how this Nation is going to care for its children. It is going to provide the support, health care, housing, food, nutrition, clothing and a loving family environment. That is what poor children should expect as the policy and principle that guides this government.

□ 2350

And so as we look at this legislation, I prevail upon this House to put aside all of these myths, all of these things that have brought us to this point of discussing welfare reform, and never forget that the people on welfare that were thought of, that created the AFDC program in the first place 60 years ago, were the children.

America was concerned about the fate of these children in poverty, and they established the entitlement program where every child could at least have some assurance of care and food and nutrition and a family environment, and I hope that as we move on this debate that the children will be the primary concern that we have.

If we are successful in keeping our eye on focus on the children, I believe that the legislation that we will put through will be of benefit to these families and will lift them out of poverty and will make their situations far better than what they are enduring today under their current conditions.

I urge this House to remember tomorrow is Valentine's Day and that the welfare children will be here, will want to have someone to talk to. Please, stop by the give them your loving attention and concern.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WATT of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, on February 15.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COBURN, for 5 minutes, on February 15.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today and on February 14.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WATT of North Carolina) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, in 2 instances.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. OWENS, in 2 instances.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. BECERRA.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. EVANS.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. CARDIN.

(The following Members (on request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. BARR.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. FOWLER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 14, 1995, at 9:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

362. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of February 1, 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 104–32); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

363. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the quarter ending December 31, 1994, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2167(e); to the Committee on Commerce.

364. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

365. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a copy of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution's ''Annual Proceedings of the One Hundred Third Continental Congress,'' pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 18b; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

366. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of the December 1994 issue of the Treasury Bulletin, pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a); to the Committee on Ways and Means.