

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 wherewithal 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-

spirited welfare plan. A plan that will gut the welfare system and shred the safety net for over 15 million children.

I know firsthand about welfare and the importance of a safety net because 27 years ago, I was a single, working mother receiving no child support. I was forced to go on welfare, even though I was employed, in order to give my three small children, ages 1, 3, and 5, the health care, child care, and food they needed.

My colleagues, that experience never leaves me.

My ideas about welfare do not come from books or theories. I know it \* \* \* I lived it. And I am continually amazed that any of you presume that you know what it is like. Make no mistake, I also know the welfare system is broken. It doesn't work for recipients or for taxpayers, and it needs fundamental change.

Unfortunately, the Republican ideas for change are weak on work and tough on children.

The Republican plan does nothing, absolutely nothing, to prepare welfare recipients for jobs that pay a livable wage, or to help recipients make the transition from welfare to work.

There's no job training; there's no education; there's not nearly enough child care.

All the Republicans care about is reducing the welfare rolls, and if that means putting families on the streets, then so be it!! The Chair of the House Budget Committee, JOHN KASICH, told us last week that these cuts will be applied to the Republican plan to cut taxes \* \* \* the great majority of which apply to the very wealthy.

And their bill literally takes food out of the mouths of our kids.

In my district alone, Marin and Sonoma counties in California, almost 7,000 school children will be denied a school meal under the Republican's mean-spirited plan.

If the Republicans think their plan doesn't punish children, they should talk to some of the wonderful children I ate lunch with when I was back in California earlier this week.

When I asked these kids why they liked their lunches so much, they told me that they can not learn or pay attention in class when they are hungry.

One of their teachers told me that when she asked her students to make a list of wishes for their families, over 50 percent of the kids wished for food. I remind you, these are children who live in one of the most affluent counties, in one of the richest Nations in the world.

After meeting these kids, I have only one thing to say about NEWT's pea-brained plan to wreck child nutrition programs: "States don't get hungry, NEWT, children do." and, starving our children is not the solution to the welfare mess.

Democrats, on the other hand, know that we can fix the welfare system without punishing poor women and children.

Democrats offer welfare recipients a fair deal!!

Democrats invest in education; job training; and child care in order to get families off welfare and into jobs that pay a livable wage.

Mr. Speaker, the choice comes down to this: we either punish poor children, as the Republican bill would do, or, as in my case, we invest in families so they can get off welfare permanently.

Let us do what is right for our children. Let us defeat the mean-spirited Republican welfare bill.

#### WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, as I stand before you, we have got to realize that America has been at war, and that war has been called a war on poverty. America has spent 30 years in this war, and we have spent over \$3.5 trillion.

You know, it only cost America \$21 billion to win World War I, but that war that we are losing now is the war on poverty at great expense, not just taxpayers' dollars expense but expense to a whole class of people that have been held in bondage for generation after generation and cannot get out of the bondage.

If we were at war, what would you expect the generals to do, Mr. Speaker? What would the American people expect the generals to do? The American people would expect that the generals would come together and plan a new strategy. And that is exactly what the Republican majority is doing, planning a new strategy to free a whole class of Americans.

Unfortunately, this class of Americans has not been able to see the light at the end of the table or at the end of the tunnel. This class of Americans have never really been able to realize that unique gifting that our Creator has given them and them alone to be all they can be in this society.

You know, I stand here before you, Mr. Speaker, as a woman who raised two teenage children when I was found to be a single parent, and my income was at the poverty level. But sometimes to get through life it takes a bit of a struggle and sometimes to realize all you can be takes a bit of a struggle.

And, you know, what our new program will do will be able to free people up to begin to realize what their level of self-esteem is. Because you can only find your self-esteem by being able to produce something in the workplace and the home. This is the most compassionate of all programs that we have seen in the last 30 years.

You know, my father told me that one of the best things that a person can do for another friend is not to give them a fish that would feed them for just 1 day but to really help them understand how to craft a fishing pole

and then be able to feed himself for life.

Yes, the Republican plan is tough love, but it is a plan that will free people, free them to be all they can be in this great Nation.

#### WELFARE REFORM AND JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased this evening to rise to discuss the issue of welfare reform and jobs and perhaps looking at it at a different perspective than some of my colleagues who have stood today. It is amazing what people do not say on this issue, and I think far too many Members of this body are looking through the wrong end of the telescope on opportunity.

There is no question that America's families and America's welfare families often fail to remain whole because America's job-producing machine is failing.

In my own home district of northwest Ohio, half the people, I repeat, half the people on welfare are working people. Half the men, half the women are not unwilling to work. They work everyday. Some work two and three jobs. But they still remain on welfare.

Half the people on welfare in my home district are there for one reason only, and that is to receive the health benefit. Half cannot receive a health benefit through their private sector employment and so they fall on to the welfare rolls as the only hope to receive health insurance.

About 15 percent of the people on welfare in my home region are blind or disabled or elderly, and the remaining 30 percent, adults and children, are really what most of this discussion has been focused on.

And we are all for moving able-bodied people into the work force, but I want to concentrate on the half of the welfare rolls that nobody talks about, and those are the people who are out there hustling everyday, and they do not earn enough to buy the basic necessities.

And I have found it rather ironic that, as the House has labored through this welfare reform discussion, it has been interesting to read the newspaper headlines today. In the Washington Post, the lead story, U.S. trade gap soared in January, economists warn of weaker dollar, and the economic growth of this country over the next year dropping a full percentage point because of difficulties we face in our trade and economic policies.

The Wall Street Journal, major story today, United States trade deficit widened in January to a record \$12 billion as peso woes and the problems with NAFTA and the Mexico bailout have a terrible impact inside our own economy. And for every billion dollars of