

That is why it is extreme to stand up here and talk about it in this bill. What Members of Congress should focus on is the shell game that this does. It takes away that guarantee of that school lunch for an authorization and maybe an appropriation, maybe.

In the amendment today we had a chance to vote on the school lunch program in Mr. DEAL'S amendment. The school lunch program would have been protected in current law. But we saw on a party line vote who wanted to protect the school lunch program, and that voted failed on the Deal substitute.

Current law provides that school districts are reimbursed for every meal and the Republicans' promise of an increase again depends on what will happen in their Committee on Appropriations.

Let's take for example what happened last week in the rescissions bill. We have a track record already in the first 100 days of cuts in summer jobs programs for students, and I would hope the U.S. Senate would take that out. I would be glad to pin my label on there for the State of Texas, because our comptroller estimates we will lose \$35 million in school lunch funding.

HOUSTON, TX.

Hon. GENE GREEN,
Longworth House Office Bldg.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR GENE GREEN: My name is LaDeirdre C. Lane and I am an 8th grade student at Kentwell, Aldine I.S.D. In my history class our teacher gave us an assignment to write a government official talking about an issues that we feel very strongly about.

I feel strongly about the welfare reform. I feel that this one proposal that shouldn't get past Congress. For one, it would take money out of our school lunch plan. Many of the students in my school already eat free or reduced lunch. For some of these students it might just be the only hot meal that they get all day. Secondly there are people out there who abuse these government fundings, but for every one who abuses, there are two who really need it. Without welfare many families would end up starving and in poor health.

Also another reason is stated in the preamble of the Constitution that we the people must promote the general welfare and in this one saying that must take effect. I would appreciate if you would take my ideas into consideration.

Thank you for your time, and I hope that my ideas have begun to turn the wheels of progress. I will be waiting to hear a response from you.

Sincerely yours,

LADEIRDRE C. LANE.

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

[Mr. COLLINS of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MODERN WELFARE SYSTEM HAS NOT WORKED

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

tleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the issue before us this evening is what has worked and what has not worked in the modern welfare society of America. Clearly the current system has not worked. It has encouraged dependency upon the Federal Government; it has encouraged illegitimacy; it has discouraged self-reliance and the basic idea of work.

In short, it has promoted many of the behaviors and values that are exactly opposite of what every single Member of this body would raise their own families by.

Mr. Speaker, the original intent of the welfare system has been lost. What was intended to be a compassionate provision to help people has turned into a destructive and permanent fixture of dependency for many who are entrapped within it. Sadly, many of these people have chosen to make their living for themselves and their families without working by choosing to take AFDC, food stamps, and countless other programs which cost over \$300 billion annually. This is wrong and unfair for them and taxpayers, and it must stop.

What the Personal Responsibility Act aims to do is to require individuals to look to themselves and their families and not to Washington in order to become productive members of society.

I cannot help but consider it worthy of mentioning a couple of startling facts about a county in my home State of Tennessee, one that I partially represent, the county of Shelby, which includes Memphis. According to the Commercial Appeal, the local daily newspaper in Memphis and Shelby County, one out of every four families with children under the age of 18 draws monthly welfare checks. According to the same publication, when Federal welfare dollars are combined with State welfare dollars, that total amount is the single largest source of money for Shelby County, TN. Not the payroll of Maybelline, not the payroll of Schering-Plough, not even the payroll of Federal Express; not the payroll of any single business or industry can match the welfare dole of the government in Shelby County, TN. That is what welfare is doing for one of Tennessee's most populous counties. And while maybe not to such a large degree, that is what welfare is doing to all the rest of the country, and that is what we are trying to change.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened in recent days to the inappropriate charge that children are going to be hurt with our bill. I sat here and listened as we have gone about our Contract With America and attempted to make those changes we said we would make in our contract. On the balanced budget amendment, I have heard about poor children there. In tort reform, I heard about poor children being hurt there. In regulatory reform, I heard about poor children being hurt there. Unfunded mandates, the

same thing. The crime bill, the same thing. Even in the national security bill, I heard about poor children being hurt.

I am most eager, as we begin to talk about term limits next week, to see how they are going to say poor children are going to be hurt by that. But we are not going to hurt children by term limits.

Just as we heard from the other side that Republicans do not have a monopoly on Christianity, and I agree on that, the Democrats do not have a monopoly on love of children. We have got some fathers and some grandfathers on this side, and to do that you have to have children.

We are not going to hurt children. What is hurting children is the current system of welfare. It encourages kids to have kids, and fathers to abandon their responsibilities, and families to set poor examples for their children by not working. The Republican welfare reform plan requires work and other responsibility. It changes the status quo. It encourages dignity, and it gives hope to all who may use it to succeed.

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

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

VICTIMS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, last Friday in Duluth, in my congressional district, I met with a group of people I can only describe as victims of the Republican contract: College students who will lose their financial aid; poor, elderly people who will lose their home heating assistance; elementary school children who will lose their school lunch and school milk programs; and foster grandparents who work with disadvantaged youth.

□ 2200

Then at the end of the day, late that evening I got a phone call from my son Ted, A graduate student in theology, saying he would lose his summer job if the Republican cuts are enacted.

Let me tell you about Ted. He is a Notre Dame graduate with a double major in theology and great books.

Following graduation, he committed a year to volunteer service at a job placement center for the homeless, Saint Joseph the Worker in Phoenix, AZ, living with five other Notre Dame graduates on \$60 a month. And on weekends he volunteered in youth ministry at a neighborhood parish.

Ted then spent 2 years in campus ministry at Sacramento State University and is now in his second year of

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