

Nation's welfare system to what it was meant to be: a hand-up, not a hand-out.

Almost everyone I talk with understands that our current welfare system is inefficient, unfair and damaging to those it is supposed to help. We all agree that helping those who by no fault of their own have fallen on hard times is the right thing to do. But the current system doesn't do that. It traps families in a cycle of hopelessness and despair—destroying initiative and responsibility.

The historic welfare reform bill we passed today is based upon the principle that welfare should not be a way of life and that we should promote work instead of welfare. It also recognizes that we in Illinois are better able to help the poor without the interference of huge, inflexible, Washington bureaucracies. We need a plan based upon Illinois values and Illinois needs, not on a Washington bureaucrat's regulations.

Can any serious person argue that the federalization of poverty by Washington has worked? The idea that just spending more and more money and handing people government checks is the answer to poverty is a cruel hoax on both the needs and the taxpayers who are trying to help them. We have spent \$5.4 trillion dollars since Lyndon Johnson began the 'War on Poverty.' Despite this enormous commitment by the American people, an amount greater than our entire national debt, the result has been more broken families, exploding illegitimacy, a drug epidemic that is destroying generations, rising crime rates and schools that are war zones. By creating a culture of poverty, we have destroyed the very people we have sought to help.

The welfare reform package provides \$4.5 billion in increased child care funding which will enable parents to return to work, and attacks the unacceptable 50 percent illegitimacy rate for families on welfare by strengthening efforts to identify fathers and force them to pay child support.

This legislation is an important acknowledgment that the moral health of America is no less important than its military or economic strength. We cannot have a healthy moral environment to raise children in our communities when 12-year-olds are having babies, 15-year-olds are killing each other, 17-year-olds are dying of AIDS, and 18-year-olds are graduating without diplomas. Our accomplishment today helps restore the moral health of this great Nation.

Eighteen months ago, the new Republican Congress set out to reform the destructive welfare system. We asked ourselves whether we had the courage to tackle this difficult issue and give our children hope, rather than an endless cycle of dependency. We knew we would face a chorus of special interests who benefitted the status quo and would accuse us of being cruel and heartless. But we listened

to the common sense of the American people who see through the misinformation and distortion and we kept our promise. I am pleased that President Clinton finally joined our cause today and agreed to sign this long overdue reform.

INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2823) to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes:

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, When Congress considered NAFTA, this Congress received the unqualified assurance from Ambassador Kantor that U.S. environmental laws and standards would not be lowered if Congress approved the agreement.

Well—here we are—about to do just that as we consider the Gilchrest bill and its changes to the "Dolphin Safe" label.

After an outcry from Americans, many of them school children, U.S. tuna companies announced in 1990 that they would not buy tuna caught while harming dolphins. The U.S. tuna fleets moved to the waters of the western Pacific nations where the tuna do not swim with the dolphins. The Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act, 1990, codified that tuna harvested with large scale nets is not "Dolphin Safe."

H.R. 2823 lowers our labeling standards and misleads the American consumers. It would allow tuna to be labeled "dolphin safe" even though it was caught with encirclement techniques that we know killed and injured hundreds of thousands of dolphins before environmental laws and industry practices changed fishing techniques.

H.R. 2823 would allow tuna to be certified "dolphin safe" merely if an observer didn't see any dolphins die. However, nothing in this bill would preclude severely injured dolphins to be dumped back into the sea to die.

American children deserve "dolphin safe" labels that they can take at face value—one that means what it says. We have a labeling system that consumers requested and have come to rely on. Altering the meaning of the label is nothing short of fraud perpetrated on America's kids!

I urge you to support the Studds amendment which would protect the "dolphin safe" label.

H.R. 3924, THE STATISTICAL CONFIDENTIALITY ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Rep. HORN and I introduced the administration's bill on statistical confidentiality. This bill is the culmination of years of work by both Republican and Democratic administrations. The Statistical Confidentiality Act is the foundation for moving the Federal statistical system into the 21st century.

Two independent forces join to make this bill timely—balancing the budget and the National Performance Review. Federal spending on statistics has grown steadily over the last two decades. Over the next 5 years that trend is likely to be reversed. At the same time, there is a general belief that the Federal Government should be smaller and less intrusive. This idea was given life in the Clinton administration through the National Performance Review which has the goal to create a Government that works better and costs less. It is clear that our statistical system must develop new ways of providing the information we need that are less expensive and less intrusive.

At the same time the statistical system is being asked to do more with less, it is criticized as no longer providing an accurate reflection of our society or economy. Economic statistics are routinely criticized because they emphasize the manufacturing sector, and pay little attention to the service sector. The 1990 census was roundly criticized as a failure, and for some communities it was a disaster. In May the Wall Street Journal reported on a Kansas town that lost 84 percent of its population because of an error in the census. That error, acknowledged by the Census Bureau last year, will not be fixed until next year.

More objective indicators also point to increasing expense and declining quality. Survey response rates have declined steadily since the early 1980's making them more expensive and less accurate. Nowhere is this more evident than the decennial census, where every 1 percent of the public that does not mail back the form costs an additional \$25 million.

While the statistical system is being asked to do more with less, and criticized for declining accuracy, it is also subject to greater scrutiny than ever before. The 1990 census was

notable, in part, because of the intense media coverage—more intense than ever before. Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, pushed the Consumer Price Index to the front pages when he testified before Congress that errors in that index were costing the Government billions. Last month on the Mall, citizens demonstrated to get the Government to change the way it measures race.

This confluence of social and political currents pushes the Federal statistical agencies to find new ways to measure our social and economic indicators, as well as define new measures. In short, these agencies need to find new ways of doing business. But to do so, they need new tools.

The administration's Statistical Confidentiality bill provides the opportunity for agencies to begin charting new ground. This bill provides the framework for the research and experimentation that will define the statistical system for the new millennium.

The stated purpose of the bill is "to provide uniform safeguards for the confidentiality of information acquired for exclusively statistical purposes, and to improve the efficiency of Federal statistical programs and the quality of Federal statistics by permitting limited sharing of records for statistical purposes under strong safeguards."

In short, this bill allows statistical agencies to share information collected from the public to improve statistical measures. It also provides strong safeguards that the privacy of those individuals will be protected, and that the information, once drawn together, will be used only for statistics.

This bill will enable agencies to redesign surveys to incorporate administrative records from other agencies. It will permit agencies to develop joint surveys and share the resulting information. It will make the development of samples more accurate.

But not all of the advantages of this bill are speculative. Just this year we passed legislation transferring the authorization for the census of agriculture from the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Agriculture. The major difficulty in writing that legislation was crafting language that would allow these two agencies to share information. If the Statistical Confidentiality bill were law, that effort would not have been needed.

The administration has put together a bill that lays the foundation for developing new, less burdensome, and less expensive ways of developing statistical information. This bill, for the first time, begins to take a system-wide view of Federal statistics. I congratulate my colleague Rep. HORN for introducing this bill, and I look forward to working with him to make it law.

A TRIBUTE TO THE MILWAUKEE COMMUNITY JOURNAL

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1996

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute today to one of the most widely read and respected African-American newspapers in the United States. As the Milwaukee Community Journal celebrates 20 years of hard-hitting, thoughtful, and award-winning

journalism this week, I would like to take a moment to reflect on the rich history of this outstanding news operation.

The Milwaukee Community Journal was founded in 1976 to provide a voice for Milwaukee's rapidly expanding and influential African-American community. From its humble beginnings in an apartment complex on Port Washington Road with a tireless and dedicated staff of six people, the Community Journal has today grown into Wisconsin's largest circulated African-American newspaper. Today, the Community Journal's offices on Martin Luther King Drive have come to represent much more than a news center. Indeed, it is a vital nerve center of our community, where scores of neighborhood revitalization efforts are initiated.

During the past two decades, the Community Journal has highlighted and championed many issues of critical importance to Milwaukee's Central City. From education reform, to economic development, to civil rights, the Community Journal is truly Milwaukee's voice of conscience. Furthermore, the paper plays a critical role in chronicling and preserving Milwaukee's rich legacy of African-American history and progress.

The Community Journal has received dozens of awards and accolades over the last 20 years for its courageous reporting and commentary. Most recently, the paper won a National Newspaper Publishers Association award for publishing an extended magazine devoted to crime fighting in Milwaukee. Last year, the paper was honored with the prestigious A. Phillip Randolph Messenger Award for its ongoing reporting on the educational reform movement in Milwaukee.

Staying true to its name, the Community Journal remains a strong voice of the people of the Central City. Through school partnerships, scholarships, and the sponsorship of educational campaigns, the Community Journal has introduced hundreds of Milwaukee students to the field of journalism. The paper also actively sponsors book give-aways to promote reading among Milwaukee youth, and has been a main proponent of job creation in the Central City.

Mikel Holt, editor of the paper, is one of Milwaukee's most respected editors and social commentators, and is one of the Nation's most tenured African-American journalists. Mr. Holt is widely known to Milwaukee television viewers for his regular work on the WTMJ Television show "Sunday Insight With Charles Sykes". He has also received many awards and citations, including the National Newspaper Publishers Association Best Columnist Award, which he has won twice. Mr. Holt's regular column "Signifyin'" poignantly focuses on the direction of Milwaukee's African-American community, and is one of the most popular and provocative commentaries in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Mikel Holt and the Milwaukee Community Journal continued success on this special anniversary. May the next 20 years be as productive and fruitful for this outstanding newspaper which has truly worked to make a difference in Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin, and the entire Nation.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3734,
PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND
WORK OPPORTUNITY RECONCILI-
ATION ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1996

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act.

In charting the course of welfare reform, we have come a long way since the introduction of welfare reform legislation in the 103d Congress. The Congress passed a bill 16 months ago that would have hurt children, allowed States to abdicate their responsibility without any maintenance of effort requirement, and cut funding for job training, child care, child nutrition, and work programs. I voted against the original House-passed bill because its cuts were too extreme. The bipartisan bill before us today incorporates the improvements of the original conference report, the Governors' recommendations, and the most critical improvements contained in the castle-tanner bill that I helped to draft. For too long families have been discouraged from working by our welfare system. Unlike the original bill, the bill before us today will help welfare recipients and their children build a better future because recipients will be working, equipped with the training, and child care they need to be successful.

I support welfare reform that moves recipients from welfare to work and encourages personal responsibility. This legislation does that, allowing States to try new approaches that meet the needs of their recipients. States are already experimenting with welfare reform. Forty States have waivers given by this administration, and the results are encouraging.

In giving leeway and dollars to States, however, we must protect children. This legislation does that by maintaining the current child welfare and foster care entitlement for children. Previous versions of welfare reform had converted this critical safety net into a block grant, and I strongly encouraged my colleagues to retain the entitlement status of child protective services. This bill also contains kinship care language modeled after legislation that I have introduced. This language insures that State plans for foster care and adoption assistance protect families and use adult relatives as the preferred placement for children separated from their parents when such relatives meet child protection standards.

This legislation also includes the original Women's caucus child support enforcement provisions. We will soon be able to finally crack down on deadbeat parents by enacting penalties with real teeth and establishing Federal registries to help track deadbeats.

This legislation also maintains the link between Medicaid and welfare. The children of any family eligible for AFDC as of July 1, 1996, will remain eligible for Medicaid whether or not their family continues to receive welfare benefits, and States may also continue Medicaid eligibility for parents who are no longer eligible for AFDC. This legislation also provides families with Medicaid coverage for a year after they leave welfare for work.

This legislation does not convert child nutrition programs, the WIC Program, or the food