

with the aspect of who are the recipients who most, in most instances, actually benefit from welfare, Mr. Speaker, Well, a lot of people have promulgated and propagandized this notion that it is all of these lazy, shiftless welfare mothers, and they are bilking the system, and they are exercising all kinds of schemes, and fraudulent schemes, in order to sustain themselves. But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of education and edification, that 70 percent of all recipients on welfare are children. So, when you start taking out the cleaver, and we start talking about cutting welfare, and we start talking about eliminating welfare, let us, first of all, understand that we are talking about America's children.

A lot of people think that welfare is a matter of African Americans who predominate the welfare rolls. That can be no further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. The majority of those who are recipients of welfare are actually white Americans. So, when we talk about welfare, we have to be honest, and we have to be clear about what the fact are.

Now we talk about America's children. There have been proposals that say that if a mother is under age, under the age of 18, that she should not receive any welfare benefits, or therefore her children should not receive any welfare benefits. She could be 17 years, and 11 months, and 28 days—29 days, and under the age of 18, and still she and her children will not receive any benefits. But when she becomes 18, the children still would not receive any benefits for the rest of their lives. These are the kinds of proposals that we have to be very careful about because obviously these children are the ones who bear the brunt of that kind of a policy. The children are at stake.

We have heard things like, "Let's have orphanages because we need some type of a controlled setting by which these children can be raised," but, Mr. Speaker, those kinds of policies are antiquated. Those types of policies are archaic. They are outdated, and they are inefficient.

We do not need to take the baby and throw it out with the bathwater, if you will. What we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is we need to be very careful about trying to rehabilitate and trying to provide some social support for American families. We need to get away from the monikers of illegitimacy and realize, yes, that we have a high incidence of this country per capita of out-of-wedlock births, but that does not make a child illegitimate. That should not cause us, as Americans and as a country, to put some type of disparaging association on some child because that child's mother did not choose or did not happen to, for whatever reason, marry.

There are many, many outstanding leaders and citizens of our country and our communities who are products of broken homes. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as we look more and more, we realize that

one out of every two American families now evidence a broken home or a single parent family, and usually that single parent is a mother.

So what we have to do is we have to start now reeducating ourselves and resensitizing ourselves to the new America. This is not the America of Wally Cleaver, and "Leave It To Beaver," and Ozzie and Harriet. This is the America of the 1990's, and we have to be realistic about what family values mean these days, and family values these days to me mean that we should adopt that adage of the old African proverb that says it takes a whole village to raise a child. It does not mean that the village should be called an orphanage. I mean we should look at things like group homes, but group homes where the parents or parent in this case, a single parent, can still be with their children. We should not be trying to separate the parent from the child. We should be trying to keep them together, and if, in fact, we are going to employ the basis of a group home, then let us make sure that we do it in a way where we can give social skills to the parent as well as help to the children.

#### AN UNINTENTIONAL MISPRONUNCIATION OF MY FRIEND'S NAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I mispronounced the name of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], in a way that sounds like a slur. Let me make this absolutely clear. The media and others are reporting this as if it were intentional, and it was not.

I repeat. This was nothing more than the unintentional mispronunciation of another person's name that sounded like something it was not.

Mr. Speaker, there is no room in public discourse for such hateful language, and I condemn the use of such slurs.

After I heard about how the story was being covered, I called the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and I told him of my stumbling over his name, and I apologized for the perception created by the press that I would even think of such terms.

It was not an attack. It was not even a Freudian slip.

I have worked with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] in the past. I consider him a friend. I am disappointed that the media and others would take this incident and turn it into a firestorm, a firestorm. I take strong exception to the airing of the tape and even the transcribing of a stumbled word as if it were an intentional personal attack.

□ 1510

I take strong exception to the airing of the tape, and even the transcribing of a stumbled word, as if it were an intentional, personal attack.

I take strong exception to the airing of the tape, and even the transcribing of a stumbled word, as if it were an intentional, personal attack, and I take this exception especially in light of the fact that I went to the press who had the tape and explained to them in the best humor I could that I had simply mispronounced a name, and did not need any psychoanalysis about my subliminals or about my Freudian predilections, especially from people who are obviously not trained in psychological analysis.

With all of the issues the new Republican majority are bridging to the floor of this House, it is regrettable that a unintentional mispronunciation of a name in a way that would be clearly offensive had it been intentional should shift the public debate away from issues like balancing the budget, cutting taxes, and reforming our failed welfare system.

Can we not get back to real issues? Cannot the press report real events?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to for a moment thank my friend and colleague from California, Mr. BILBRAY, for allowing me to proceed ahead of him in this order. I would like to thank the indulgence of this body for allowing me these moments. I would like to thank my diligent, fair, responsible friends in the press for 10 years of what I believe to have been a good relationship with decent people doing their job.

Mr. Speaker, I have a family. I have raised five children. I spent a lifetime telling my children the rules of decent discourse, teaching them how to be respectful of other people. We have a long list of words we don't use, of names we don't call, of sentiments we don't express. We have another long list that comes under the general rule of my mother and father's precious teaching about good manners, decent discourse, real respect for other people. And to have my five children, or anybody else's five children, turn on their TV today and see a transcript of a mispronunciation on the air, as if I had no sense of decency, cordiality, respect, or even good manners, is unacceptable. It is an act in itself that is indecent. It is an act that is unkind, at least to myself, hurtful to my children, and clearly indifferent to the feelings of my friend, BARNEY FRANK. And, yes, I have a word for that act. You will find that word in the singular word to the song "Cotton-Eyed Joe."

#### GET TOUGH WITH MEXICO REGARDING CAR THEFT

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

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of Mexico again this week,

a lot of talk about the bailout of the Clinton administration when it comes to Mexico. I happen to represent the city of San Diego, the proud home of the championship San Diego Chargers. But sadly we happen to be the home of one of the biggest car theft rings in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of San Diego County have to put up with their vehicles being stolen and shipped to Mexico and sold on Mexican markets. This is not the kind of free trade, Mr. Speaker, that we support in San Diego. In fact, in the treaty of the 1920's and in 1981, it specifically stated that stolen cars that were inappropriately exported to Mexico would be returned within 45 days, 45 days, of the time that they were recovered.

Well, Mr. Speaker, not only are the vehicles not returned within 45 days, but they are actually held, used by Federal and State Mexican officials for their personal and public use. And, Mr. Speaker, here is a photo of a Mexican agent driving a United States stolen car.

What is the issue here, Mr. Speaker? The issue is that there is a fine line between being a nice guy and being a patsy. And frankly I am not so sure that the Clinton administration knows where that line is when it comes to foreign policy.

In San Diego we strongly support cooperative efforts with our neighbors to the south. And when I say neighbors, I mean neighbors. I live on the border with Baja California, and I am proud of the way we have been able to work with them. But this administration sent a letter 6 months ago, Mr. Speaker, asking the Federal Government to address this atrocity against the private property rights of the people of San Diego. It has been 6 months, and all this administration has said is that "We'll talk to them."

Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration wants us to approve a loan guarantee, that they will be rough and tough in case Mexico doesn't come across. Well, we have treaties today, and these treaties are being thrown away and discarded by both governments. And frankly, I have to say to the President and his administration that if they do not have the guts or the wherewithal to be able to recover our stolen cars when they are being used by Federal agents in Mexico, my God, how do they expect us to be able to trust them with a \$40 billion-plus guarantee?

Mr. Speaker, I spent 20 years working with Mexico and 20 years working with the Federal Government, and it is sad to say that this administration shows me no ability to do what is right for the people of the United States when it comes to representing us in the world outside our boundaries. This administration has sold us down the river and refuses to stand up for the rights of our citizens.

I know that there are those in Mexico who will not want to hear this, but

frankly I don't blame the people of Mexico and I don't even blame their Federal Government half as much as I blame the Government that my citizens have not only elected, but they pay the salaries of to represent them and fight for them.

The fault does not lie with Mexico. It lies with a Federal administration that does not have the guts to stand up for its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we look forward to good cooperation with Mexico. We want to see free trade, the right kind of free trade. We want to see the great social and economic and political bonds that are possible with our neighbors to the south. But if this President and his administration does not understand that before we can harvest the crop of economic and social prosperity with the NAFTA free trade and other relationships, if they don't understand we must first pull out the stumps and the boulders out of the field of environmental problems, of uncontrolled crime along the border, then this administration just does not get it. It is taking short cuts that are leading to a dead end.

□ 1520

I stand here today to call on the administration to tell the people of San Diego County when they can expect to have their cars returned. And it does not take very far to look, Mr. Speaker. All you have to do is go to the federal agencies in Baja California, and you can find American cars with California licenses still on the car, still on the car driven to official raids by the federal agencies. That is not a hidden agenda. That is a public agenda, and now it is up to the President and the administration to make sure this agenda is addressed and the property of the citizens of the United States is returned to its proper location. Maybe then we can talk about what kind of guarantees we can work with. But only after they have taken care of the existing treaties.

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

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

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO GOVERNOR DON SUNDQUIST

(Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, Tennessee inaugurated as its 47th Governor a man who has been a friend and colleague to many in this House, Don Sundquist.

It was a gratifying and meaningful occasion for me, because Don Sundquist has been a close friend and a wise mentor, and because the people of Ten-

nessee's seventh district chose me to succeed him in Congress.

Over 12 years and parts of three administrations, Don Sundquist served his constituents honorably and diligently, holding true to his convictions and staying in touch with those who sent him here.

All of us should be encouraged to witness the success of a former colleague. And all of us who hold the sincere desire to shift responsibility back to the people and away from Washington can only be encouraged to think that we will be turning over those responsibilities to activist Governors like Don Sundquist of Tennessee.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DELAY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. BISHOP (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of family illness.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

#### 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. TUCKER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TUCKER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARTINI, for 5 minutes, on January 31.

Mr. BILBRAY, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEWIS in two instances.

Mr. DORNAN.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mrs. SEASTRAND.

Mr. MARTINI.

Mr. GILMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TUCKER) and to include extraneous matter:)