

study towards a master's degree in theology. His career goal is community service. He wants to work to make life better for the less fortunate of our brothers and sisters.

The accumulation of material goods has never been an objective for Ted. He worked hard on construction jobs and other jobs to earn his way through college and last year, to help pay his graduate school cost, Ted worked at a summer youth job program funded by one of the programs the Republicans propose to cut or eliminate with their cuts last week and those yet to come.

I want to take a close look at this program. He worked with 160 disadvantaged young people, 40 special ed children with learning and developmental disabilities, providing them with academic enrichment and physical development help. He also worked with another group of 120 kids who test below a grade level, are out of school and out of work. His job, teach them how to fill out job applications, how to interview on the phone and in person for jobs, and work with them to improve their basic academic skills.

If the Republican cuts prevail, there are going to be 161 losers this summer. The next group of 160 kids and Ted.

Society will be victimized because these young people will be denied an opportunity to become productive members of our economy.

By the way, Ted's wife Julie, who teaches children with learning disabilities, was planning to do her masters thesis on this project to demonstrate how such a program can be a model curriculum for special ed student's enrichment and move them to jobs and work.

I raise this personal story because I think it is important to put flesh and blood on the statistics we deal with, to put a face on the numbers and to translate the issues into tangible reality. And sometimes that reality hurts personally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BEREUTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TEENAGE PREGNANCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, throughout the welfare debate we have argued about just about everything. And when I came in tonight and heard a little bit of discussion about religion, I realized just about how far crazy it had gone.

We have argued about how much the school lunch program is supposed to go up, at least it is going up, and we have argued over whether Federal programs work better than the local ones. But

we are not talking about cutting them out, just who controls them.

We have even argued about who understands compassion better. But if there is one thing that we have agreed on, without exception, is the fact that our welfare system is failing. The intent of the system was always a noble one, because Americans are kind, loving, noble people. And it was to help those people that were down get back up on their feet and become independent and help those that could not help themselves because of severe handicaps or they were too young until they did not need help any longer.

And for awhile, that is what it was. But then like so many other government bureaucracies, it began to grow. People started taking advantage of it and using it, a practice that has hurt taxpayers. But I want to tell you something, if it only hurt taxpayers, it would not be so bad. But you know, welfare has spawned a social disease that is suddenly destroying our society. And that social disease is illegitimacy. It is babies being born without daddies.

Today the number of illegitimate births in our country is 30 percent. In some major towns, it is 50 percent. That means that we have a major, major problem in our society.

Now, this would not be too bad if it were not that we could look to the inner cities and see that it is worse. Inner city poor, there are 80 percent born out of a married family in the black inner city poor neighborhoods.

It is interesting that we have been so compassionate as some of us were marching liberals in the 1960s that we said it did not make any difference if a baby was born out of wedlock. But I want to stand here tonight and tell you that I was wrong when I was a marching liberal in the 1960s with long ironed hair, because now we see what has happened in this society. We see little girls having babies in their own apartments, where older guys are fathering, not teenagers, folks, they are fathering half of those children, a moral decay, a loss of life for those young teenagers.

But what I want to talk about briefly is those children that we are talking about being so compassionate to as we fight to keep their mothers in poverty by giving them welfare when they are teenagers.

Do you know that these little girls that are born are three times as likely to be little girls that become teenage girls that also go on welfare and have babies when they are still babies?

Did you know these little boys are multi-times, depending on the cities, more likely to go into gangs if they do not of a mommy and daddy at both home? Do you also know that they are born weaker, lower birth weight? Do you know that?

I think that that is what we are addressing with this welfare reform. We are talking about a new world that says no to the liberal 1960s and some of us are going to stand here and we are

going to apologize for what we did when we thought telling those young girls yes was okay. We are going to say, we know that was wrong, that the most compassionate thing we can do for these little kids and their kids is to not give them cash grants, to not go on and reward the wrong decisions, to not reward sometimes their mothers who encourage them in some tenement house to go get pregnant so they can get the welfare that they have learned to live on.

The Republican welfare bill does some wonderful things that we can see in the future and be proud of. It says we will take care of these kids and that we will make sure we take care of their babies but we will not lock them into poverty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WYNN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SCHOOL LUNCH CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to remind our colleagues and the American people that what we are really talking about tonight in this so-called welfare reform debate, what we are really talking about is really politics. And it is really the politics of the rich and the poor.

Some of you may remember that book, the Politics of the Rich and Poor. It was written by Kevin Phillips. He was President Reagan's economic advisor.

And this politics of the rich and poor that we are talking about tonight goes against children, the nutrition program. The savings that you hear so much tonight that is going to come forth from the Republican proposal is not going for the deficit. It is not going to reduce the debt. It is going to go to the tax breaks in two weeks on this floor for the big corporations and for the wealthiest of this country. So let us talk about little bit about the poor.

The poor tonight are the people in Michigan, the working folks who are sending their kids to school. And after this bill goes through tomorrow, and it will go through because they have more votes than we do, 7,100 children in Michigan will be denied the nutrition program. Michigan will lose \$1.5 million for nutrition programs. These are the poor in Michigan who will lose tomorrow afternoon underneath the nutrition program.

But who will win? Who is going to win in this whole program? AFDC. I do not mean Aid for Dependent Children. I mean aid for dependent corporations, the rich. If you look at it, in the fiscal

year that we are in right now, \$167.2 billion will be given to corporations as tax breaks, \$167.2 billion. For each taxpayer out there listening tonight, that is \$1388 is going to support corporate tax breaks, and all these dreaded programs you heard about tonight, what is it going to cost us as a country, \$50 billion, \$1415 for each taxpayer, three times less.

But if this bill goes through and the cuts that we are going to talk about the next day or two, and we are going to turn around the savings and give it for another tax break for the rich, where does the money go? Why are we giving millions of dollars to McDonald's Corporation to sell chicken nuggets overseas as a tax break but yet we are going to cut \$7 billion over five years of the school nutrition program and all these students will be denied? Why do we give Campbell's Soup millions of dollars to sell soup overseas but yet we are going to cut our children \$7 billion over five years.

It is the politics of the rich and the poor all right. Today we had a chance to try to correct it with Mr. DEAL's bill, the Democratic bill on welfare reform.

Yes, we have to do some things differently. Mr. DEAL put forth a proposal that made a lot of sense and was defeated by party lines, 205 to 228, one Republican joined us.

What did the Democratic bill say? It was a welfare reform bill. That means requiring and assisting people to move out of the dependency of welfare and into self-sufficiency, work. Democrats believe in tough and fair work requirements, something their bill, which is right here, 1214, never had until yesterday.

At least they are learning from us. What else did the Democrat bill have? We believe that individuals need education and job training to become self-sufficient. You just do not cut them off and say, go get a job. Individuals need the opportunity to find work.

Welfare needs to be linked to work. That is what the Democratic proposal meant. That is what we believe in.

Unfortunately, it was defeated, strictly on party lines.

So as we do this debate tonight, remember, it is the politics of the rich and the poor. The poor are those who will be cut. Their cuts will go to pay for the tax breaks for the rich. AFDC, not Aid for Dependent Children, it is aid for dependent corporations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BILBRAY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MORE ON WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed listening tonight to many different viewpoints. I listened with great interest to my good friend from Illinois who could no longer stay with us on the floor.

Let me pause at this juncture to yield to my friend from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] who I think wants to read into the RECORD a couple of items of great import with reference to our friend from Michigan who preceded me in the well.

Mr. HOKE. I just want to point out that from the CRS report with respect to Michigan, there is a \$10,489,000 increase in the block grant program from 1996 over fiscal 1995. And in the state of Illinois, we have got a \$14 million increase. In the state of Texas we have a \$33 million increase. So as those flags go up, we see that in fact CRS has shown very clearly that there are increases.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

My friend from Illinois raised a valid point, and I think it is one we should all remember, that good people can agree to disagree, that good people can interpret in different manners the statistics available and the implications of various policy decisions, and, in fact, we can disagree on holy scripture.

I celebrate religious and spiritual diversity in this country. I thank my Creator that we live in a country where we are free to engage in the exercise of religion as we see fit.

□ 2215

But I would simply point out to my friend from Illinois, when he quoted Christ and the Gospel according to Matthew, Christ said when you do this to the least of these, you have done it also to me. He did not say when government does this for the least of these.

And then again there can be a legitimate difference of opinion about that. Perhaps some interpret the "you" to be a universal you, to be a government so powerful, so all encompassing that we would leave for government the responsibility to change the hearts of man, that we would leave for government the responsibility of charity and compassion, that it be the sole province of the Federal Government to provide the same according to its own definition. And that is a legitimate policy difference.

That is fine. Good people can disagree. But, Mr. Speaker, again, and I visited in a moment of almost levity with one of our distinguished colleagues on the other side today who looked at me with a wink and smile and asked me to calm down, and I nodded. But I will tell you, when people on the other side do as they did yesterday, comparing those of us in the new majority to members of the Third Reich or those of us involved in legitimate policy differences with a different

vision for America to slaveholders of the Civil War days, you wonder what is really at stake. Have we so perverted legitimate policy divisions and discussions that we are willing to engage in reckless name calling?

My friend from Michigan salutes the Deal bill. That is his right. I would simply point out, Mr. Speaker, to those assembled and to our audience gathered beyond this hall via television, that we have a different interpretation of who would have gone to work or who will go to work under our resolution as opposed to the work requirements in the Deal bill. Good people can disagree.

My friend from Minnesota came to talk about the personal nature of the so-called cuts, and I think that term is inaccurate, but he is entitled to that term because I believe he assumes that there is a vacuum into which his son is stepping and which there is no escape. But I know when I heard him speak of his son that his son has the where-withal and the ability to take a detour in plans. It may not have been what he intended, but he will find another way to help. That his daughter-in-law, so intent on teaching children with learning disabilities, does not rely solely on the province of the Federal Government to do the same.

And I would invite my colleagues to come with me to the Sixth District of Arizona, to the small town of Holbrook, and visit a single mother who has battled the odds to open a restaurant and who time and again offers to the welfare-collecting youth of that city employment, and she tells me invariably after three weeks time the youngsters employed there leave. Why? Because it is simpler to take a check and a handout instead of a hand up.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The other side said that Michigan would actually gain money. That is only if the bill is not revised, and your CRS report, page 1, says that is subject to a base assumption you make as long as you do not revise it.

But you have revised it. Go to your bill, H.R. 1214. Go to page 122. And what do you do on the nutrition, the food block grants for these kids? You cut it 20 percent and put it in other programs. You have \$6.6 billion, take away 20 percent. It is \$1.3 billion.

You increase the administrative costs from 1.8 percent to 5 percent, add another \$334 million for administrative costs. The first year alone you cut \$1.6 billion from the nutrition program. Michigan gets nailed by \$1.5 million.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues tonight to talk about the Republican's mean-