

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