

But, as much as we need campaign finance reform, I predict that partisanship will live and campaign finance reform will die. We don't need a Democratic bill or a Republican one—we need a workable one. The only way to do that is to create an independent commission to agree on general principles and develop a plan for a vote. Over a year ago, the Speaker and the President shook hands on it. Mr. Speaker, let's turn the promise of your handshake into the reality of a law.

**CONGRATULATIONS TO SGT. EUGENE POPE ON HIS RETIREMENT AFTER OUTSTANDING CAREER IN LAW ENFORCEMENT**

(Mr. BARR of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Sgt. Eugene Pope, who retired this week, from the Rome, GA, police force after 40 years of outstanding service.

Officer Pope began his law enforcement career in a time when officers actually walked their beats. Since then, he has held virtually every job in the Rome Police Department.

Gene Pope has served his city through an outstanding career and performed his duties as a police officer with pride and dignity. He has been acclaimed by his fellow officers as a loyal friend and dedicated policeman, true to his principles and the safety and well-being of his community.

His retirement, on July 15, 1996, marked a career in law enforcement that exemplifies leadership, courage, and devotion to duty.

He takes with him the respect and admiration of his fellow officers and leaves an example to those who follow.

On behalf of the citizens of Rome and Floyd County, as well as the people of the Seventh District of Georgia, I join in congratulating Sgt. Gene Pope, wish him well, and thank him for a job well done.

**REPUBLICANS PULL THE PLUG ON REFORM WEEK**

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, last year these Republicans promised revolution, a reformed Congress. Indeed America witnessed a year of zealotry that culminated in a billion and a half dollars of squandered taxpayer resources on costly Government shutdowns.

So this year the Republicans narrowed their focus from 1 year to 1 reform week. This week. And now that also has vanished because after weeks of Speaker GINGRICH trying to convince the American people that the solution to special interest influence in this Congress was more money and congress-

sional campaigns instead of less special interest money, and when that approach was rejected by the citizen watchdog groups and even by a few Republicans, the Speaker pulled the plug on reform week.

It seems that yesterday's arrogant cries of revolution have been replaced by this year's whimpers of partisan failure.

**TAXING EXORBITANT PAY OF MOVIE STARS, ATHLETES, AND CEO'S**

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last week we passed a cost-of-government-day resolution noting that the average person now pays half of his or her income in taxes counting taxes of all types: Federal, State, and local. This is terrible and getting worse, Mr. Speaker. President Clinton's budget estimated in 1994 that young people born that year would pay average lifetime tax rates of an incredible 82 percent. So I am no fan of higher taxes, and we need to drastically simplify our Tax Code. Yet I have come here this morning, Mr. Speaker, because of reports that a basketball player has now signed a 7-year, \$140 million contract.

This is sickening. No one could ever really deserve or earn this much money. Most people will not earn this much, even one-tenth this much, in their entire careers, \$20 million for playing basketball for 1 year.

I oppose increasing our overall tax burden, Mr. Speaker, but we need to greatly lower our taxes on middle and lower income people and make it up by greatly increasing our taxes on these movie stars, on the athletes and CEO's who are earning such exorbitant and undeserved rates of pay.

**EXPRESSION OF PROFOUND SORROW TO FAMILIES AND FRIENDS OF THOSE ABOARD TWA FLIGHT 800**

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to express my personal sadness at the loss of 229 passengers and crewmembers, as a 747 airplane bound for Paris crashed into the Atlantic Ocean last night.

It is hard to even find words for the pain and confusion and grief that I feel and that all of us feel. I am especially concerned that some crewmembers and passengers might be from my own town of St. Louis. But we do know from news reports that wherever they came from, the victims include schoolchildren, and parents with children left behind.

This is a time for all Americans to come together, and grieve together, to realize that while there may be no way

to make sense of this kind of tragedy, no way to find meaning in its loss, it is a reminder of how precious our lives and our community really are.

On behalf of the Congress, I can only say that we are committed to finding the facts that lay behind this profound tragedy. In the meantime, my heart goes out to the families and friends of those aboard flight 800, and those still waiting to learn if a friend or a loved one may have been on board. Their loss is our loss, and we stand with them in this terrible and difficult time.

**PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE**

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I, and I am sure all Members, would like to associate themselves with the very fine remarks made by the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the minority has been consulted and there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

**PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3734, WELFARE AND MEDICAID REFORM ACT OF 1996**

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 482 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 482

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3734) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997. All time for general debate under the terms of the order of the House of July 17, 1996, shall be considered as expired. Further general debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by

the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 3829, modified by the amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment and shall be considered as read. No other amendment shall be in order except (1) the further amendment printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules, which may be offered only by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole; and (2) a further amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 3832, which may be offered only by the minority leader or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill, as amended, for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this is a modified closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3474, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1996, a major reform measure. As Members know, this has twice attempted to reform welfare only to be stopped dead by a Presidential veto. It is my hope that three times will prove to be the charm and we can actually succeed in ending welfare as we know it.

This rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides 2 hours of additional general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

As Members know, a unanimous consent agreement was reached to allow Members to proceed last night with 2 hours of general debate so today's time will bring to 4 hours the general debate time.

□ 0915

This legislation is brought to the House under the procedures of reconciliation as provided by the budget resolution we adopted earlier this year. For that reason, the time is controlled by the Committee on the Budget, although I know members of the Committee on Ways and Means and agriculture committees will have time to comment on the bill's provisions.

The rule provides for the adoption in the House and the Committee of the Whole an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 3829, as modified by the amendment printed in part 1 of our committee on Rules report. This amendment makes this complex bill better and broadens its support.

It includes a review of State work requirements, limits on transfers into title XX programs, an assurance that States may spend their own money even after the 5-year Federal limit is reached, a compromise on the so-called maintenance of effort requirement that States have, and Medicaid contingent for cases where work requirements are not satisfied. These provisions are highly technical but also extremely important to the ability of our States to make the best use of these reforms.

In addition, the amendment incorporated by this rule addresses the issue of child support and the allocation of fees, ensuring that a percentage of such funds are dedicated to local child support offices.

The rule further provides that the text of H.R. 3829, as modified by the amendment I have just described, shall be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment. In that regard, the rule provides for consideration of an amendment printed in part 2 of the Committee on Rules report, if offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget or his designee, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent. This amendment shall not be subject to amendment and all points of order against it are waived. It provides for a more stringent work requirement for able-bodied adult food stamp recipients who have no dependents.

In addition, the rule provides for consideration of a second amendment printed in part 2 of the Committee on Rules report if offered by the minority leader or his designee. All points of order against this amendment, which consists of the text of H.R. 3832, are also waived.

This amendment shall be debatable for 1 hour, with the time equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent. This amendment shall not be subject to amendment. It is my understanding that this amendment reflects the bipartisan proposal put forth by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER]. Some Members know of this as the Castle-Tanner amendment.

Finally, the rule provides for a motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, it is a somewhat complicated rule, as I have just described, but it is fair, it is comprehensive, and it does the job very well. This is an extremely complicated subject. Welfare reform has been one of the most vexing issues in modern times. Our majority has made it a priority to address the root causes of the failure of the current welfare system.

I think everyone now agrees that the welfare system is, indeed, failing us as Americans. Thirty years and more than \$5 trillion after it began, welfare programs we know today have very little to show for all of the good intentions they had; they have very little to show, tragically, except a self-perpetuating cycle of dependency. We have more children and families than ever before trapped today by the very same programs that were designed to set them free from poverty.

It is a devastating fact that more than three-quarters of those folks currently on welfare will stay on for more than 5 years. In fact, the average family on welfare stays on for 13 years.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we consider today and hopefully send to the President, and receive his signature this time, is a bold break with the failed policies of welfare as we know it. This bill says that we are committed to moving people off welfare into productive jobs. This bill says we trust our State and our local officials to make crucial decisions about solving their own welfare problems.

This bill says that if you are able to work, we will help you get training and show you the way. But we expect you to go to work in exchange for cash benefits. This bill says if you are on welfare and you have more children, your benefits will not increase unless your State votes to allow it.

This bill says States can enforce some tough love policies when it comes to requiring unmarried teenagers who have children to live with an adult and stay in school. This bill cracks down on deadbeat parents and boosts child support enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize what this bill does not do. This bill does not take away the safety net for children. In fact, this bill has increased levels of funding for child care programs so parents can make the transition from welfare to work. This is not a small matter. It is in excess of \$4.5 billion, so I am told.

This bill also ensures that families will continue to receive food stamps, nutrition assistance, and health care. Even if they lose their cash benefits they will still be able to get these emergency needs met.

This bill also grants States the flexibility to exempt up to 20 percent of their caseload from the 5-year limit, to deal with those who cannot make the transition from welfare to work. And there will be some, and they are provided for.

The bottom line is that we have tried the one-size-fits-all, Washington-knows-best approach to welfare, and it has failed. It has failed tragically. It has failed miserably. It has failed pathetically. Our States and localities are asking for opportunity to do better.

Under this bill, welfare reform programs such as Wisconsin Works and Florida's WAGES initiative will no longer be derailed by the Federal bureaucracy. Under this bill States will

utilize on-target, creative solutions within a flexible and responsible Federal framework.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is also a budget saver. It does provide for an increase of \$137 billion of the taxpayers' dollars over the next 6 years as compared with what we spent on welfare in the last 6 years, but it meets our budget targets.

We are demonstrating that we can invest in our people, provide new oppor-

tunities to better deliver necessary services, and to still meet our budget targets. That is what we mean by ending welfare as we know it. We are offering something better, much better. It is true reform.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a document entitled "The Amendment Process Under Special Rules."

The material referred to is as follows:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,<sup>1</sup> 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 17, 1996]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-Open <sup>2</sup>	46	44	79	59
Structured/Modified Closed <sup>3</sup>	49	47	37	28
Closed <sup>4</sup>	9	9	17	13
Total	104	100	133	100

<sup>1</sup> This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

<sup>2</sup> An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

<sup>3</sup> A structured or modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

<sup>4</sup> A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 17, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-199; A: 227-197 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate			A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate			A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PQ: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217-202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230-189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255-156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323-104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388-2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241-173; A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304-118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344-66-1 (9/27/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued  
[As of July 17, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internat. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231-194 A: 227-192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235-184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228-191 A: 235-185 (10/26/95).
		H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237-190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241-181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216-210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220-200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220-185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 249-176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239-181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223-183 A: 228-184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands	PQ: 221-197 A: voice vote (5/15/96).
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H. Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	PQ: 230-188 A: 229-189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: 228-182 A: 244-168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	Tabled (4/17/96).
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: voice vote A: 235-175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	C	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 251-157 (3/13/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 233-152 A: voice vote (3/19/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 234-187 A: 237-183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/21/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	A: 244-166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	PQ: 232-180 A: 232-177, (3/28/96).
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	PQ: 229-186 A: voice vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	MC	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	PQ: 232-168 A: 234-162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	O	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	C	H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 418 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2641	U.S. Marshals Service	PQ: 219-203 A: voice vote (5/1/96).
H. Res. 419 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2149	Ocean Shipping Reform	A: 422-0 (5/1/96).
H. Res. 421 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 2974	Crimes Against Children & Elderly	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 422 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 3120	Witness & Jury Tampering	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 426 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 2406	U.S. Housing Act of 1996	PQ: 218-208 A: voice vote (5/8/96).
H. Res. 427 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 3322	Omnibus Civilian Science Auth	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 428 (5/7/96)	MC	H.R. 3286	Adoption Promotion & Stability	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 430 (5/9/96)	S	H.R. 3230	DoD Auth. FY 1997	A: 235-149 (5/10/96).
H. Res. 435 (5/15/96)	MC	H. Con. Res. 178	Con. Res. on the Budget, 1997	PQ: 227-196 A: voice vote (5/16/96).
H. Res. 436 (5/16/96)	C	H.R. 3415	Repeal 4.3 cent fuel tax	PQ: 221-181 A: voice vote (5/21/96).
H. Res. 437 (5/16/96)	MO	H.R. 3259	Intell. Auth. FY 1997	A: voice vote (5/21/96).
H. Res. 438 (5/16/96)	MC	H.R. 3144	Defend America Act	
H. Res. 440 (5/21/96)	MC	H.R. 3448	Small Bus. Job Protection	A: 219-211 (5/22/96).
		H.R. 1227	Employee Commuting Flexibility	
H. Res. 442 (5/29/96)	O	H.R. 3517	Mil. Const. Approps. FY 1997	A: voice vote (5/30/96).
H. Res. 445 (5/30/96)	O	H.R. 3540	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/5/96).
H. Res. 446 (6/5/96)	MC	H.R. 3562	WI Works Waiver Approval	A: 363-59 (6/6/96).
H. Res. 448 (6/6/96)	MC	H.R. 2754	Shipbuilding Trade Agreement	A: voice vote (6/12/96).
H. Res. 451 (6/10/96)	O	H.R. 3603	Agriculture Appropriations, FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/11/96).
H. Res. 453 (6/12/96)	O	H.R. 3610	Defense Appropriations, FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/13/96).
H. Res. 455 (6/18/96)	O	H.R. 3662	Interior Approps, FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/19/96).
H. Res. 456 (6/19/96)	O	H.R. 3666	VA/HUD Approps	A: 246-166 (6/25/96).
H. Res. 460 (6/25/96)	O	H.R. 3675	Transportation Approps	A: voice vote (6/26/96).
H. Res. 472 (7/9/96)	O	H.R. 3755	Labor/HHS Approps	PQ: 218-202 A: voice vote (7/10/96).
H. Res. 473 (7/9/96)	MC	H.R. 3754	Leg. Branch Approps	A: voice vote (7/10/96).
H. Res. 474 (7/10/96)	MC	H.R. 3396	Defense of Marriage Act	A: 290-133 (7/11/96).
H. Res. 475 (7/11/96)	O	H.R. 3756	Treasury/Postal Approps	A: voice vote (7/16/96).
H. Res. 479 (7/16/96)	O	H.R. 3814	Commerce, State Approps	A: voice vote (7/17/96).
H. Res. 481 (7/17/96)	MC	H.R. 3820	Campaign Finance Reform	
H. Res. 482 (7/17/96)	MC	H.R. 3734	Personal Responsibility Act	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; S/C-structured/closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, welfare reform is a very serious issue.

There is probably not a person in this country who thinks we should leave our welfare system as it is.

But there are also about a million suggestions out there as to how to fix it.

Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues have taken the wrong suggestions.

This Gingrich welfare bill, Mr. Speaker, is tough on children, weak on work, and soft on deadbeat parents.

Luckily, this rule will allow the House to vote on another, much better, bipartisan welfare bill.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have said time and time again that they want us to work together. They have said that they want us to put poli-

tics aside and work for the benefits to the entire country.

They have also said that they want to see fewer people on welfare and more people out there working for a living.

And today, Mr. Speaker, we have a chance to give the American people what they asked for.

We have a bill crafted by Republicans and Democrats alike. We have a bill President Clinton believes he can sign. And we have a bill that takes some serious steps toward helping parents find and keep work without punishing their children for their parents' poverty.

And today we will have a chance to vote for either that bill or the Gingrich bill.

It's question of priorities.

And, on the subject of priorities, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues of something I think is very very important—when we talk about welfare, when we talk about food stamps—we

are talking about children, about 15 million American children who live in poverty in this country today. And Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm concerned this Congress has no greater responsibility than to those children.

About two out of every three people on welfare is a child, Mr. Speaker. A fact that I think is too often overlooked.

So when we talk about welfare, let's remember that its full name is Aid to Families With Dependent Children—and those children are depending on us to take care of them, regardless of who their parents are or whether they have a job. For that reason, this Republican welfare proposal is woefully inadequate.

The Republican welfare bill will cut food stamps for families of three earning \$6,250 a year. Most families with children will lose \$470 a year in food stamp benefits.

The Republican welfare bill will push over 1 million children into poverty.

It will decrease the likelihood that poor children get the medical attention they need by failing to guarantee Medicaid eligibility.

The Republican welfare bill actually weakens current law and increases Federal costs in updating child support orders.

And the Republican bill has an extremely weak work program which will not help parents get jobs to support their families but will more likely leave poor children, and their parents, out in the street.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, when you think about welfare reform, remember: The majority of people on welfare are poor children who need every single bit of help this Congress and this country can give them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that apparently we have received the approbation of the minority with the rule. We may not agree on all of the exact bits and tenets of the different versions of the welfare bill, but we apparently have a good rule on the floor. I am pleased that everybody agrees with that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman from Sanibel, FL, for yielding me the time. I will not take that much time, because this is a good rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the rule and the very vital underlying legislation it brings to the floor. I concur with the gentleman from Florida, with everything he has said about the failed welfare system in this country. The status quo, Mr. Speaker, must go. This bill guarantees that it will go.

Mr. Speaker, the welfare reform issue at the national level I think is very difficult for the American people to track, as President Clinton's position seems to twist and contort with each new development that the States bring forward, the States who know how to deal with it. As many Members are aware, it is the States, our laboratories of democracy, that have pioneered welfare reform, which attempts to grapple with the problem of poverty at the local community level, and that is where we need to deal with it, not inside this beltway here.

The Clinton administration, through bureaucratic inertia, has blocked these bold efforts at the State and local levels. They have blocked it time and time again right in my own State of New York by not giving us the States' rights ability to deal with these problems.

The recent experience of the State of Wisconsin, attempting to receive Federal waivers through the Federal bureaucracy, just like my State of New York has tried to do, and the over-

whelming endorsement of this program on this floor by a vote of 289 to 136, that is overwhelming, is a compelling argument that the waiver process should be junked. The fact that imaginative and creative local officials must traipse to Washington and get down on their hands and knees and beg for approval to implement reforms that their constituents want, Mr. Speaker, is an absolute disgrace.

This bill provides local flexibility to deal with these important problems. My constituents in upstate New York want to help lower income families and single moms with kids, but they want to do it in their own communities with their own solutions, not with Washington solutions, which have failed so miserably by creating second- and third- and now fourth-generation welfare recipients.

Most importantly, this Personal Responsibility Act of 1996, the welfare bill before us, requires work for able-bodied people. It imposes time limits on benefits that recipients may receive.

Twice this week, at around midnight, I have an apartment over across the river in Virginia, and when I left here at 11 or 12 o'clock at night I went into a chain grocery store called the Giant grocery store. And as I was shopping there, getting some food to go home and eat at midnight, which you should not do, Mr. Speaker, I watched the people going through those checkout lines. They were very, very young people, I think 19, 20, 21 years old, I do not think they were parents. One fellow was drunk as a skunk and he had a whole handful of food stamps, and he could not even count them. The things they were buying were not nutritious food.

Those are the things that we deal with in this bill. In other words, we cannot let people like that continue to be second-, third-, and fourth-generation welfare recipients. We want to help them. We want to establish a work program and let them get off this welfare and become meaningful citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time for the President to become a player in this debate, especially in light of his ambitious promise on this subject in his 1992 campaign. If one were to listen to his recent speeches on this subject, one might think that he is an individual who truly supports welfare reform. A casual observer may forget that it was President Clinton, as the gentleman from Florida has said, who has now twice vetoed compassionate welfare reform in this body.

□ 0930

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, but I think we all understand the issue. We need to get this bill on the floor, we need to pass it, and we need to get it to the President's desk so that he can sign it.

I urge strong support of the bill and I urge the President to make the compassionate public policy choice and to sign this bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all hear stories about abuse of welfare, but all I want is for everybody in this Chamber to realize that 2 out of every 3 people on welfare are children. I think that is a fact that we overlook too often. We hear all the stories about food stamps and the people buying all kinds of things. I remember President Reagan brought some abuse of welfare to light and when it was investigated it could never have happened and it did not happen. Let us not look at some of the false stereotypes we fall into and just remember the full name of welfare is Aid to Families with Dependent Children. They are dependent upon us. I think we should remember that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule to H.R. 3437, a rule that is designed to protect this fatally flawed bill.

There are two main problems with this legislation as I see it. First of all, we need to separate politics and bipartisanship from the lives of children in this country. Until we do that, we will see this kind of report coming before the Congress. We were elected to represent the people and not any particular political party. Let us put the children in the middle of this and let our influence start out from there.

One is the harsh treatment of legal U.S. residents in this bill. Children are in that minority of legal immigrants you are talking about. You want to ban food stamps from these people and these children, you want to ban SSI from them, and you want to keep them from becoming what they could, and, that is, true American citizens as you have become. The bill even bans non-emergency medical care under Medicaid for new legal immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell Members a little bit about these people that the Republican majority wants to cut out in this rule. They have played by the rules. They meet every requirement of the law. They live and they work hard. They pay taxes. They serve in the military. You are going to say to me that you are not going to protect their children? This rule does that. So you want to be sure to look at these flaws.

The other one is the costs that were paid by the Federal Government for care, AFDC and welfare to these children will now be paid by the States. You keep talking about States rights but you are not giving them that much money to do the job you want them to do. All of this is going to be shifted to the counties and the States. This is an unfunded mandate, if you ask me, because what they are going to do is make the States and the counties provide the medical care which they cannot provide wholly. So we are going to

have a 2- or 3-tier system of health care for these people.

Let me give a concrete idea of how unfair this rule is in protecting this bill. My own State of Florida estimates it will lose almost \$600 million a year in Federal funds because of this bill. What are they going to do with these funds? They were designed to protect the children. Now what you are doing, and let no one fool us, this particular rule is there just to protect this bill.

The second thing it does, it takes away the earned income tax credit which is saying we are going to help you on one hand and then we are going to take it away on the other. Every time I come to this floor I talk about the earned income tax credit because it is for the working poor to protect their children. I want to say to this Congress, there is no reason why you should let this flawed rule take care of a flawed bill. The best thing to do is to vote against the rule. That will put some stops on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want the American public to know that what the Republicans are doing is taking away the safety net for children.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would just note for the record that this is H.R. 3734. I think it has been misspoken a few times this morning as H.R. 3437, for those Members who are watching and tracking. It is H.R. 3734.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from San Dimas, CA [Mr. DREIER], the distinguished vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time. Let me begin, as many of my colleagues have this morning, in extending our heartfelt thoughts and prayers to those loved ones of the victims of the tragic TWA Flight 800 crash that took place off Long Island last night.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I strongly support this rule. I do so because we have been struggling for years and years and years to try and reform the welfare system. From our side of the aisle, there have been a wide range of proposals over the past several years designed to do just that, to try and end welfare as we know it.

We were all very enthused in 1992 with the commitment that President Clinton made to end welfare as we know it, and I have to say that right after that election in 1992, I had the privilege of writing an article for my home town newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, in which I stated that I looked forward to working with the President on issues like reforming welfare, because when he said that he was committed to ending welfare as we know it, we all took him at his word.

Now I believe that we have put together a product that I hope he will be able to sign. We know that he has twice vetoed the welfare reform pack-

age that we have moved out of this Congress, and it has been very, very difficult for us to face the fact the President who wanted to end welfare as we know it would veto welfare reform legislation, but I hope and pray that this will do it.

Why? Because we are not only concerned about those U.S. taxpayers who are saddled with perpetuating the cradle-to-the-grave welfare system that we have had over the past three decades, but we are equally if not more concerned with those people who have been subjected to the welfare state for years and years and years and have seen the perpetuation of this cycle, generational cycle, of dependence.

My friend from Sanibel, Florida [Mr. GOSS] talked about the fact that we have seen the average use of the welfare system, 13 years. We also know of extreme examples where it has gone on for generation after generation. We looked at the poverty rate as it existed in the mid 1960's when the Great Society began and the War on Poverty began, and the poverty rate was about 14.7 percent.

Beginning with the Great Society programs, we started spending billions and billions of dollars, and we have now spent \$5.3 trillion on subventions combating the welfare problem. What is it that we have seen? Well, the poverty rate has gone from 14.7 percent up to 15.1 percent.

Mr. Speaker, there is bipartisan recognition, Democrats and Republicans alike. Democrats who represent constituents who are on welfare and subjected to this generational cycle of welfare, they acknowledge that the welfare system that we have today has failed. That is why I believe that we are taking a very positive step in finally moving forward with this.

My friend from Glens Falls, I am told, just mentioned a situation that he encountered last night when he was in a grocery store looking at someone who was obviously abusing the Food Stamp Program. just a couple of hours ago I was running here on Capitol Hill and I was around one of the parks, and I was over at one of the benches and had seen a number of people who obviously rely on food stamps for their survival, and what was on the ground but cracked crab legs.

It seems to me that when we have people who are abusing the Food Stamp Program and living extraordinarily well off the Food Stamp Program, it obviously is a system that has failed. That is why looking at creative approaches, as the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means have done, and allowing the amazing proposals that have come from States like Massachusetts under Governor William Weld and Wisconsin under Governor Tommy Thompson, my State of California, Governor Pete Wilson's action allowing creativity for dealing with poverty and the welfare structure, to come from those States is, I believe, a very positive sign.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the fact that we, I believe, have legislation which President Clinton will be able to sign, and I am pleased that also it is very bipartisan. I hope we will be able to move ahead as expeditiously as possible to get this measure to his desk so that we can all be part of ending welfare as we know it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, once again we all hear horror stories, but as far as the definition of food, I think crab legs is a healthy diet. It is not ketchup. I think it is something that could be bought with stamps. I think that that is not a bad diet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, for certain it is getting closer to election day. I understand that my friends on the other side of the aisle want to take credit for getting tough on welfare. But what they are really doing is getting tough on children. You see, when I look at the welfare reform bill, it leaves me asking, What about the children? Two out of three welfare recipients are children. Have they forgotten about the children? Apparently so. Because, Mr. Speaker, this bill demands that mothers go to work but fails to provide the education, the training, and the support that these mothers need to take care of their children so that they can get off welfare permanently.

When a mother is kicked off the welfare rolls, there is no safety net for her children, no guarantee that her children will receive food and shelter, no guarantee that they will have any medical care, no guarantee that they can survive. In fact, this bill says to poor children, "Don't get hungry, don't get sick and for heaven's sake, don't get cold, because your time is up and we don't think you're important enough to protect you."

Mr. Speaker, no other Member of this body knows better than I do how wrong this is. This is the wrong way to fix the welfare system. When I was a single working mother with three small children, my children were 1, 3, and 5 years old, I could not have stayed in the work force without the safety net of health care, child care, and food for my children. That safety net was provided by the welfare system.

I urge my colleagues, do not take this vote lightly. Do not vote for this rule. This bill is not about helping welfare recipients, about helping people get off welfare and into jobs that pay a livable wage. Rather, it is a vote for making poor children even poorer despite the political hoopla, despite all this rhetoric around the debate. Your vote today is a matter of life and death for millions and millions of children. Make no mistake, your vote will have consequences for children long after election day.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, we hear the tales about generation after generation of people on welfare. The statistics as I have heard them is that the average stay on welfare is 2 years, single female, white. I would just like to clarify that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because I do not believe it allows for sufficient amendments that would change this terrible Republican leadership bill. I do want to say, though, that I am pleased that the Castle-Tanner substitute is in order because I think that that does make things better, if you will, for the two major problems that I see with this Republican legislation. One is that it really does not do anything to get people to work or provide the resources so that the States can get people off welfare and get a job.

□ 0945

Second, because this Republican legislation also is very tough on kids and basically takes away almost all the protections for children that exist in the current system, the Castle-Tanner substitute would at least provide sufficient or at least more resources to get people to work and, also, I think, protect that safety net for children.

I was listening to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] said about the need for a compassionate public policy, and that that is why this Republican bill has been brought forward, but I would say this does just the opposite.

If we want to get people to work, if we want to protect kids in a situation where we are changing radically the nature of the welfare system, then we cannot move forward with this Republican bill.

I wanted to mention two things, because I listened to what some of my colleagues said on the other side. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] talked about the fraud in the welfare system. He mentioned the crab legs. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] talked about people waiting in line who he did not think needed welfare. Well, do not give us these examples, which are a small percentage of the people that are on welfare.

In addition to that, this Republican bill does not do anything to curb fraud or to end benefits for people who fail to comply with work requirements or to reduce administrative costs in the welfare program. The largest share of this Republican welfare bill's cuts or savings would come from across-the-board cuts in the food stamp benefit program.

What that means is that the average person who gets food stamps now is not going to be able to continue to have a sufficient level of food.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that if the Republican welfare bill

goes through, this pushes 1 million children into poverty, and this is from a family that already has one parent working.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was very dismayed yesterday because I thought that we were going to bring this bill to the floor and that a bill, the Castle-Tanner bill, would not be allowed to be debated and voted on, and I found out I was wrong. That is why I am going to vote for this rule and speak for this rule because it allows Castle-Tanner to come to the floor.

The Castle-Tanner bill answers the Republican demand for State flexibility at the same time that it looks to the concerns of Democrats for protecting children. Most important, the bill addresses the bipartisan desire to make welfare to work, the transition and the main point.

I am not suggesting Castle-Tanner is perfect, because no compromise is, and the men and women that worked on this bill worked very hard to bring about a bill that I think, under the right circumstance, we all could vote for. The Castle-Tanner bill would require work after 2 years and it would pose a 5-year limit, like the majority bill does. However, unlike the majority's bill, the legislation would not prevent States from helping children at the point where their parents get cut off.

Second, food stamps. The Castle-Tanner bill would reform the food stamp program, but it would not threaten the nutritional safety net established by an optional food stamp block program.

We have heard talk this morning about food stamps. Of course we all know of situations where there has been abuse of food stamps, but what many of us who come from cities know about is the need, the absolute importance for food stamps for young children and for their nutritional futures and for their health in their future.

I know, having worked with food stamps for years, that crab is nutritional and crab certainly is under the guidelines, and what gets us off the track is when we start getting into these anecdotal situations.

Third, unlike the majority legislation before us, Castle-Tanner has mandatory funding needed to make tough work requirements a reality. All of us have read the Congressional Budget Office letter that has already predicted that many States will not meet the majority's work requirement because the bill does not have adequate funding in it.

Finally, the bipartisan Castle-Tanner bill does not consider State accountability incompatible with State flexibility. The bill has a strong maintenance-of-effort requirement, and I salute the majority for increasing their maintenance-of-effort requirement just very recently, but Castle-Tanner still has the best, and that is 85 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with every policy decision in the Castle-Tanner bill, but I do commend the people for getting together from both sides of the aisle to make this bill a bill, as I said, that we can all vote for because it represents a good faith effort to find the common ground on welfare reform.

Welfare reform is an issue we all agree on. Welfare reform is something that has to be done. The status quo is not working. So I urge all my colleagues to vote for a bill that would demand responsibility, reward work, protect children, and I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for letting Castle-Tanner come to the floor.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that the CBO has said that most States cannot meet the work requirements, given the resources the Republicans wanted to vote to the cause of work. In fact, the Republicans, according to CBO, their bill is \$10 billion short of what the CBO said is needed for the work program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, welfare reform is essential. It is about getting people off welfare into work and helping, not hurting, the child; in a word, tough on work, protective of children. That is the American value.

When this process started last year, the Republican proposals were weak on work, tough on kids, not providing any additional resources to States to help move welfare recipients into work, causing people to go without health care if they went to work, providing no or inadequate day care for children, hitting severely handicapped kids, and raising taxes on low- to moderate-income working families.

The Republicans have moved away in some areas from extreme or inadequate positions, but they have considerably further to go. Castle-Tanner is much stronger on work and providing resources to the States to get people to work, in requiring States to use Federal moneys for welfare to work, not for other purposes, and in making sure that if a recession hits, people who want to work or kids who are innocent bystanders do not get hurt.

Taking food from kids is not welfare reform, whether the parent is a citizen or other legal resident. The Republican bill does far too much of this. Tanner-Castle is more protective of children.

Tanner-Castle has been the only bipartisan effort in the House. We need more, not less of such effort. The only way to achieve more is to vote for Tanner-Castle and against the Republican bill. That is the best hope that in the end welfare reform will be what it must be, not a political football but an instrument to break the cycle of dependency for the sake of parents, surely of their children, and for taxpayers who foot the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] who knows something about crab cakes.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule. It supports a very bad welfare reform bill. That is unfortunate, because in point of fact we ought to put people to work.

The welfare system should be reformed, and we ought to set time limits for people receiving welfare. The problem is the Republican bill hurts children and does not do a lot about putting people to work. It hurts innocent children because there are no vouchers in the program.

What happens at the end of the period for benefits? The children are hurt because there are no provisions made after the benefits are exhausted. Three hundred thousand legal immigrant children will be harmed because they will be ineligible for food stamps. Why is that? Why are we hurting children? Let us just put people to work; 1.2 million women and children will lose Medicaid benefits. They will not have health care. Why are we doing that? That does not have anything to do with putting people to work.

The bill is weak on work. Fortunately, we have an alternative. The Castle-Tanner bill makes provisions. It provides vouchers for when benefits are exhausted. It provides continued Medicaid coverage so children can get health care. It provides food stamps for legal immigrant children so that they will not starve.

The Republican proposal is weak on work. According to the CBO, the bill is \$12 billion short of what is needed to meet the work requirements. It is an unfunded mandate on the States. The CBO, one of their favorite authorities, also says they do not provide adequate child care. They are \$800 million short in terms of adequate child care benefits.

On the other hand, the bipartisan Castle-Tanner alternative provides additional funds for work. They provide an additional \$2 billion to provide child care so that people can go to work.

We are not debating whether we ought to reform the welfare system; we are debating what makes sense and whether we ought to punish children as the price of welfare reform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the Republican proposal.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, could you inform my dear friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and myself how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 11¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware, Governor CASTLE.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to address my comments this morning strictly to this rule, rather than either to Castle-Tanner or to the bill itself, because the rule is a little bit different than some of the rules we normally take up here on the floor, in that it has a self-enacting amendment in it that has some substantive concerns that I think we really need to at least bring forth.

Let me just say first and foremost, and I think this is vitally important, I very much appreciate the very good work which the Committee on Rules has done. They have allowed, in a free-standing way, the Castle-Tanner legislation, which is the Gephardt substitute in this rule, to come to the floor.

There will be no objections as to dollars. There is a dollar differential; it is \$53 billion versus \$60-some in the Republican bill, but it will be allowed to be considered. That was a concern of mine, and it was a concern of a number of my contemporaries on the other side of the aisle, and I am very pleased that was able to be worked out. That is important, I think, for the whole process of hearing and voting in this Chamber. And, of course, I am supportive of that legislation.

I want to point out, however, that there are some changes in the rule that we should pay some attention to, and there are five that I have singled out here that we need to look at.

One is the review of the implementation of the State work programs. It would be an understatement to say that this is going to be simple. When we require people to work for a number of hours, and we require up to 35 hours a week, when we require a percentage of the population, up to 50 percent of the welfare population, to be able to go to work, we have to keep track of that. We have to determine what work is. We have to go through definitional phases. Benefits can be lost or whatever it may be.

I think it is extremely important that we make sure that is going to be able to work. And one of the amendments here states that 3 years after enactment, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall conduct hearings and other appropriate activities to review the status of these areas. And that is before they get into the greater demands, because it is on an incremental basis. That is a very important change.

Another important change is the limitation on amounts which can be transferred to the title XX programs. This is a social service block grant. There are several block grants being set up; most of them deal with welfare: The TANF, the transitional aid to needy families, the child care, and the child welfare.

We are all for transferring to child care where necessary. It allows the 30-percent transfer. But when we get into social services, there are certain areas that are not as welfare oriented, and it also points out that all funds so trans-

ferred into the social service block grant must be services for children or their families, so that it keeps that money in welfare, so that States cannot all of a sudden fund other programs away from welfare. We thought that was a very significant change to make, and we did get it.

It also states very clearly there will be no limitations on State spending beyond the 5 years. I am not totally happy that some of the Federal benefits are going to be eliminated all together, although I am an absolute believer that welfare should cease after 5 years, but I think there are certain vouchers and other things that should be continued. They are not going to be, but I want to make sure that States would have the ability to do that with their own money, and it does state that very clearly.

The maintenance of effort has been raised by what the States have to do. I am also concerned the States are going to step back, and we have raised that to 80 percent in this legislation, or 75 percent if the States do a good job. So that what they have done starting in 1994, in terms of funding, would have to continue as far as the future is concerned.

□ 1000

We have made in the modifications to the legislation in this rule, specifically in this rule, not as a separate amendment to come up, we have made some positive changes which makes the bill more palatable even to those who might object. I understand that some may object otherwise. At least there has been consideration of various areas that I think needed to be examined if we were going to be able to support the legislation.

I think with the combination of being able to allow Castle-Tanner to come to the floor to be debated, with the changes which are here, the rule is a good rule. That does not mean you have to agree with the underlying legislation. That is up to everyone here. I happen to be very supportive.

Obviously, it is Castle-Tanner and I will support the Republican proposal, too. But it does mean that we will have the opportunity for full and open debate. I also appreciate the fact that there are 2 extra hours so that everyone's views can be aired. This is a very, very important subject. It is not simple. This legislation is not simple. The interactions with these families and these children are very complicated. Putting the programs in place in the States is also very complicated, and we need to do this very carefully. I think this rule at least gives us that opportunity. I support the rule and would urge everybody to do so.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

I rise this morning to consistently repeat what I have already said, that I enjoy and appreciate the need for real welfare reform. I would hope, however, that we as Americans would focus on ensuring that our children would fare well. The Republican bill cuts some \$60 billion from our children.

I rise this morning to support this rule because I want us to discuss on the floor of the House today a real way to reform welfare. I want the American public to understand that many times welfare goes to those families who in economic recessions or depressions lose the opportunity to work and, therefore, food stamps are a necessity for survival. The Republican plan block grants, puts a certain small amount of money for food stamps; and when a crisis occurs in a community and there is need for the bridge for those families once they can find work, we have no resources in the Republican plan.

The Castle-Tanner bill does answer that question. In fact, even when there is a cutoff time, the Castle-Tanner bill allows States to provide vouchers. The Castle-Tanner bill recognizes that legal immigrants pay taxes and they are in fact contributors to this community and they have children. It provides a bridge for those children so that we do not become a burden on local communities. The Republican bill cuts off those who work hard in this country. Then I offered an amendment yesterday evening to respect work and to respect the women in my district on welfare who have said to me: Congresswoman, we want to work. But we need child care, job training, health care and, yes, jobs.

I offered an amendment that would provide transitional child care once a parent gets a job and needs to work. The Republican bill does not offer sufficient child care. Then with the idea of Medicaid, who in their right mind would not want children to have good health care?

I will support this rule because I want real welfare. I want Americans to fare well. I would hope that we would defeat ultimately the Republican plan.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the welfare budget agreement. Once again, a far-right, out-of-touch, radical minority is pushing for welfare reform that eliminates survival programs that millions of poor children desperately depend on.

The cuts in this bill are vicious. H.R. 3734 would block grant AFDC benefits and arbitrarily throw thousands of children and families off the welfare rolls after 2 years—even if they cannot find a job.

Genuine welfare reform must help poor people gain the skills and re-

sources needed to become self-sufficient. Yet this short-sided bill includes work requirements without providing jobs. In fact, according to the CBO, most States will not be able to satisfy the work requirements included in H.R. 3734.

This bill also gives legal immigrants the shaft. Most of us here today descended from immigrant roots. Yet H.R. 3734 calls for an unprecedented denial of benefits for legal immigrants who, despite their contributions by working hard and paying taxes, fall on hard times.

I support real welfare reform, but not by hurting children, not on the backs of legal immigrants and not without real job creation. The main target of any welfare legislation ought to be poverty, not children.

This bill is an outrage. I implore my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to support fairness and basic decency and reject this heartless legislation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Americans realize that the welfare system is working neither for the taxpayer nor for those it is designed to help. But the question is not whether to change the system but how to change it.

The question is, will we provide the means to escape welfare or will we simply be plain mean to poor people? Like most every other problem that this Gingrich Congress has faced, the best way to solve the problem is with a bipartisan approach. I have not found any party or, for that matter, any individual who has got a perfect answer to this challenge.

Unfortunately, like strengthening Medicare, like trying to get a balanced budget, like trying to avert these costly Gingrich Government shutdowns, when some of us have said, let us work together and find a common moderate approach, others have replied, it is NEWT's way or no way.

That is where we are this morning. Do we pursue a bipartisan approach such as that advanced by Governor CASTLE and by the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. TANNER, and try to place the emphasis not on targeting poor kids but targeting what is wrong in this system, or do we take an extreme approach that is more designed to address the political welfare needs of those who have failed again and again in this Congress rather than repairing the real welfare reform system?

I believe we have got an approach that will work, imperfectly, to get us out of the welfare problems we have today. Let us get about adopting it in a bipartisan way.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BLUMENAUER].

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we have reached a point where there is a national consensus that is emerging that our No. 1 priority in social welfare is to protect poor children. There is a

consensus that welfare, in fact, tracts children in poverty, and the key is to allow families to work to escape.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Republican bill hinders that progress that is so critical and undercuts that national consensus.

I come from a State, Oregon, that is actually moving people off welfare into gainful employment. The bill that we have looming before us is going to undercut the progress of my State.

First of all, by having inflexible work participation requirements, you will actually penalize the successful State as it ratchets down into the next century. By having all child support in a centralized bureaucratic system, which my State tried in the 1970's, found to be unnecessary, found to be expensive and found that we had better ways, we will be forced back into that unnecessary bureaucracy, unnecessary expense.

By having a 5-year arbitrary limit on child care, we deal with the ironic situation of having some successful families who are fighting to remain employed to be forced back into poverty. This is lunacy.

I appreciate at least having the Tanner-Castle amendment being put before us as an alternative. We need to keep this progressing so that the President and the Senate can work with people of good faith to have a bill that will work so poor children do not pay the price for our inability to square rhetoric with reality.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the statement of the gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. DEBORAH PRYCE, a member of the Committee on Rules, who is unable to be here.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of this fair rule and the underlying Welfare Reform Act.

Mr. Speaker, a generation ago, President Lyndon Johnson launched his much-celebrated War on Poverty with the hope of creating a Great Society here in America. Well, here we are in 1996, 30 years and more than \$5 trillion later, ready to launch a new war. Only this time, the war is not so much against poverty itself, but against a failed welfare system that has trapped the less fortunate in our society in a seemingly endless cycle of poverty and despair.

The bill that we will soon consider under the terms of this structured, but very fair and balanced rule, takes welfare in an entirely new direction—one which replaces strict Federal control with increased flexibility and more room for innovation at the State and local level.

Instead of promoting dependency and illegitimacy, this bill seeks to replace a failed system with one based on the dignity of work and the strength of families. Most importantly, this legislation promotes creative solutions closer to home and offers a real sense of hope to the truly needy and less fortunate among us.

Unfortunately, we'll hear some complaints from those who prefer to keep the status quo in place. But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with a welfare reform plan that advocates commonsense principles like requiring welfare recipients to find work, or even cutting

off benefits for parents who refuse to cooperate with child support authorities.

And speaking of children, who are often the most vulnerable in our society, I've seen the effects of generational welfare in my courtroom, and I can say that the current welfare system takes a terrible toll on the well-being of children. That's why I am very pleased that this bill looks out for the best interests of children by emphasizing child care, protection, and nutrition.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote for this fair rule and to support putting an end to the status quo in our welfare system. It takes courage to vote for change, but change is exactly what is so badly needed if we are to transform welfare into a temporary helping hand in times of trouble, and not a hand-out that becomes a way of life. Vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the Welfare Reform Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, from greater San Dimas, CA, and surrounding areas.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

This has been a very interesting debate over the past few minutes, Mr. Speaker. My friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], said it is NEWT's way or no way. The fact of the matter is, the Democrats did not come up with any proposal whatsoever to deal with welfare reform, and we are still giving them two opportunities with, first, the substitute which they said they requested, which is the Castle-Tanner substitute and, second, a motion to recommit. So without coming up with proposals, they call it NEWT's way or no way. We are giving them two opportunities to offer alternatives to this package.

Second thing I heard during this debate is that the system, this proposal, would be vicious and heartless. I am told that my friend, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ], just said that.

Mr. Speaker, what is vicious and heartless about doing what we can to encourage opportunity for those who are at the lower end of the economic spectrum?

A few moments ago I was talking with my friend, the gentleman from South Boston, MA [Mr. MOAKLEY], who said that it is true that we so often hear about the extreme cases of abuse of the welfare system. The fact of the matter is, the average welfare recipient out there is that single mother who is struggling to make ends meet with two or three children. We do not want to do anything possible, we do not want to do anything at all that would jeopardize the opportunity for that mother to be able to benefit from this program as long as we continue to do everything possible to ensure that she has opportunity there.

We can improve this economy so that we can have the chance for that moth-

er to get off of that cycle of dependence, which has been generational, and back onto a running of that economic ladder so that she can see improvement. We want to end the cycle which has created drug dependence and alcohol abuse and the crime problem that exists. Most everybody who has looked at the welfare system has said that we have seen the crime as a byproduct of the welfare system.

We do not know that any of the proposals that we are going to be voting on are the panacea. James Q. Wilson from Harvard University has said that no one has the guaranteed solution, but we have looked at the situation that has existed for the past three decades and we all know that it has failed. We are moving ahead again with a package that I believe will create the opportunity for us to improve the system. The President should sign this measure as we move forward. I thank my friends who have worked in a bipartisan way on this.

I again thank my very distinguished friend from Sanibel, FL, for yielding the time to me.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

□ 1015

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican initiative that is being presented before us by this rule. Obviously, there are some changes in the rule, to in fact, eliminate some of the most egregious positions in the Republican bill. That is good, but I think that my Republican colleagues should be moving further to a center position on the matter of welfare reform.

In the first instance, I think if we take away the bumper strip welfare reform label and look behind it, we find much more than simply welfare reform. We find significant cuts in food and nutrition programs, we find significant, an attack really; half the savings in this bill are extracted from the legal immigrants in this country, whether it be California, New York, or my home State of Minnesota.

In my State of Minnesota in my school district in St. Paul, nearly a quarter of the kids come from Southeast Asia, families and their parents and those kids would be denied significant benefits that are today available. The legal immigrants, Southeast Asians are working, they are paying taxes. If they become disabled, if they become unable to make ends meet, they would be denied the benefits simply because they did not pass the citizenship test by the policies within this Republican bill.

Now, this bill is wrong because it does not protect kids. Seventy percent of those on welfare are children, 8.8 million persons of the 12.8 million that collect AFDC are children. That is not the way we need to deal with our budget problems; we need to protect children and the vulnerable. We ought to

empower people so they can go back to work. That costs money in terms of training and education. But this measure pays lip service to those needs.

There are other issues that need to be addressed. In our State we reduced the welfare load because we provided health care for those that needed it. That substantially reduced the need for welfare in our State of Minnesota.

We should not be targeting the legal immigrants. As and I said, half the dollar savings in this measure is cut from legal immigrant benefit programs. Illegal immigrants are not eligible for much of anything today, so let us not confuse the two.

Plus, we ought to maintain the State effort. I trust my State will maintain their effort, but I do not know, given the pressures that Minnesota will go through and be under. We should be requiring them to at least do what we are doing today. Not just 175 percent or 80 percent of the effort that the Republican bill requires.

And we need to deal with the economic cycle in terms of downtown so that we do not leave people out in the cold. Our Nation doesn't need more homeless, we do not need that type of problem in the name of welfare reform. We need to address our concerns and help State and local communities respond to the needs of the vulnerable in our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, H.R. 3734.

Instead of helping people out of poverty and off the welfare rolls, this Republican measure simply ignores the needs of poor families and children. H.R. 3734 does include work requirements, which I agree should be a part of the effort to reform welfare. However, this bill does not provide welfare recipients with essential services, such as child care, health care, education and training, that would help them down a successful path to the world of work. These expenses can devastate a poor family's income and throw them back into the welfare system, and in this bill, these types of support are grossly inadequate.

The underlying measure mandates work, however, it eliminates the guarantee to one of the key services that give parents the ability to go to their jobs, child care. While this bill does take a significant step forward regarding child care programs by adding extra dollars for child care initiatives, it eliminates the guarantee of that assistance, making these services dependent on the availability of State resources to continue funding such programs. These funds are also given to States as a block grant, a funding mechanism that would not allow funding levels to rise along with need. At the same time, the measure reduces funds targeted for increasing the quality of child care.

For many poor families, a single medical emergency or health problem can push them into poverty and onto welfare. This is one reason why access to adequate medical care is an essential element in the struggle to get welfare families off the rolls and out of poverty as well as keeping other families from entering this cycle of poverty and welfare. This Republican measure, however, ignores this logic by eliminating the guarantee

for some families to Medicaid, the main provider of medical care to the poor. With two out of every three welfare recipients being children, we cannot afford to abandon this type of assistance. Having adequate, affordable health care is also vital to parents, directly impacting their health and ability to work. At one time in Congress, we were talking about expanding health care coverage so no American would be denied adequate medical care. Now, this 104th Congress has designs to take medical coverage away from our most vulnerable and poorest residents. In fact, about half the cuts in the Republican's budget proposal are in the Federal health care programs, Medicare and Medicaid.

Conveniently, this bill simply takes the criteria of need out of welfare eligibility requirements. State budgets replace that characteristic to become the determining factor in whether our poorest families and children receive essential food, shelter, and medical assistance. The unrealistic part of this scenario is that the needs of these poor families and their children do not conveniently disappear when funding to provide such assistance runs out.

While this bill dramatically reduces spending on welfare programs at the Federal level, the bill also allows States to follow suit and reduce their funding of welfare-related programs. In this bill, regardless of need, States will only be required to spend 75 to 80 percent of the amount they spent in fiscal year 1994 on welfare programs. While I understand that States and local public officials care about the well-being of their citizens, the funding shortfall included in this bill will force them to do more with less, and that willingness to maintain the social safety net provided in current law will be greatly strained. State and local officials may benefit by the flexibility provided but this measure, but flexibility cannot make up for such an inadequate level of funding provided by this bill, which will hamper States' abilities to meet the expensive work requirements in the bill without endangering the health and well-being of America's poorest residents. The Congressional Budget Office has pointed out that the Republican bill's spending provisions fall far short of the necessary funds needed to meet the work requirements. In addition, in some instances, funds can be moved out of the program for which they are allocated and be expended on unrelated programs.

One provision in this measure, which claims big cuts and savings, would deny benefits to legal immigrants, noncitizens who pay taxes and contribute to our economy. Half the funding cuts in this bill come on the backs of these hard-working members of our communities. Such is the case with the Southeast Asians, especially the Hmong, natives of Laos who have a concentrated population in Minnesota and in other parts of the Nation. Because they have failed their citizenship test largely based on language difficulties, they would be denied essential and basic public assistance benefits under this bill.

Individuals in our society should be expected to do what they can for themselves, but policies should be careful to differentiate between those who cannot and those who will not. Cutting off assistance to those who are trying to lift themselves out of poverty and out of welfare is not sound public policy. Unfortunately, that is exactly the policy that this bill puts forth. We must help those in need help themselves. I urge my colleagues to oppose

this underlying measure and renew our efforts for real welfare reform so that those dependent can truly achieve self-sufficiency.

The Tanner-Castle substitute offers the basis for true compromise and real welfare reform. And, while I have misgivings about the measure, which would abandon the entitlement commitment, the provisions of this measure are generally funded adequately. Also, the issue of expansion of need during economic downturns is addressed. The required State commitment is greater, and children as well as other vulnerable populations are protected. This measure, the Castle-Tanner bill, isn't perfect, but it is a sound foundation and format to transition from today's welfare system to a welfare program with greater State flexibility with a reasonable prospect of meeting the problems of those who are in need in our society.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I think we are, and I sense that we are, right here in one of the finest hours of this Congress. We are taking one of the thorniest, most difficult political issues for all of the Members on both sides, and we are opening up the rule to this extent. I think it is truly remarkable and speaks very well of the leadership in this Congress and the faith that the Republicans, as the majority, has in the Democrats as the minority. We are not only allowing a second bill to be introduced and we are not only allowing the motion to reconsider, but also we are also relaxing the dollar figure because this is a reconciliation process.

Under the rules the minority party could have been absolutely shut out of this process by simply saying, "Adhere to the rules, and the rules means you've got to save \$60 billion." This was not done, and I think that is absolutely in the absolute tradition of fairness.

Now we are going to be faced with a bill that is a substitute. Interestingly enough, both the Republican bill and the substitute that is going to be offered here today in the entitlement of welfare; that is a quantum leap. It shows confidence in the States in block granting them to the States. That is a quantum leap for this Congress, and I think that it speaks very well of those that support either one of those issues.

And then those that do not really believe that the States should take over the welfare system, the Democrats are given the opportunities on a motion to recommit. So, if they want to hold on to much of the status quo and hold on to the Federal grip on welfare, they will have the opportunity to do so and put it forth in a Democrat process, and that is absolutely amazing, and it is wonderful that this is happening, particularly in these days where we see that there are so many gotchas and oneupmanships going on in this House.

So I want to compliment all of the people, to very briefly that one might say, "Well, if the Castle-Tanner bill

and the Republican bill both block grant welfare, then what is the difference?" Well, there are two, really two, basic differences that we are going to be asked to consider ourselves and to decide between. Those of us who are going to oppose the Castle-Tanner bill, those of us on the Republican side who oppose that particular bill, we do not believe that American taxpayers should simply still be required to shell out their money to pay welfare to non-citizens. This is a growing, growing area where the alien population on welfare is growing at a much higher percent than the U.S. citizen group. So we feel that Castle-Tanner is going the wrong way on that.

We also feel that in the area of time-limited welfare, to put out vouchers after the 5 years is counterproductive to what we want to do. But we are compassionate, we do say that 20 percent of the case load can be made an exception, and if the States want to go ahead and pay that amount out after 5 years, they can, and we also explicitly state in the bill that the States that want to use their own dollars to pay out after 5 years, they simply can do that too. We are not strapping the States, we are not limiting the States, in that regard.

But I look forward to a very healthy debate, one in which we will voice very honest differences of opinion today. I think this is going to be one of the finest hours that we will have in this Congress, and we are now given the tremendous opportunity to end the stagnation of welfare that has destroyed so many lives, and that is the important thing, and that is what we have got to accomplish.

And after we get through with this democratic process, I hope that the President will follow suit, not play politics, and sign this bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield all my remaining time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT], my last speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1¾ minutes.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of Congress, I have been a strong advocate of a tough but reasonable welfare reform bill that empowers rather than punishes, one that calls for responsibility rather than dependence. America was built on the principles of hard work, determination, and individual initiative. In effect these are the same values our current welfare system penalizes.

Today we are called upon to enact a meaningful welfare reform. We must not struggle to establish a Democratic or Republican reform plan, but rather we must strive for a compromise that results in an American resolution of this most difficult problem.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Castle-Tanner welfare reform bill achieves this effect as a bipartisan proposal that strikes a balance between the welfare reform plans advocated by the two parties. The Castle-Tanner alternative

provides tough welfare reform that protects children and moves able welfare recipients to work.

This bipartisan substitute provides \$3 billion in mandatory funding that States can access for work programs. Consequently, if mothers and fathers trying to escape welfare to work, they must have an adequate funding for child care. Castle-Tanner contains \$4.5 billion more than the current law for child care assistance to families that leave welfare for work. In effect, this proposal provides States with the flexibility to develop successful work programs tailored to the needs of local communities.

Support this legislation. Let us pass welfare reform this year.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and also in support of H.R. 3734, the Republican welfare reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Republican welfare reform bill before the House today. I supported it in both the Ways and Means Committee and the Budget Committee, and I am going to vote for it today.

The case for welfare reform is pretty clear. The system that we have now just does not work. Period. During the last 30 years, we have spent over \$5 trillion on antipoverty programs, but we have not reduced the percentage of Americans who actually live in poverty. In fact, the poverty rate has slightly risen during that time.

It's time for some tough love, and I think that this legislation fits the bill.

If we are going to help people escape poverty, we have to encourage personal responsibility. The welfare system that we have now is supposed to act as a safety net to help people when they need a hand, but instead it acts to trap them in poverty and ends up becoming a way of life.

We simply say that if you are able, you should work. If you are noncitizen, you should not come to the United States expecting a handout. And if you are a felon, you are going to be kicked off the dole.

All of the recent innovation in welfare has taken place in the States. They have raced ahead of Washington in attacking poverty with new, inventive approaches and we should give them the latitude they need to craft programs at the local level that really work and help people. Our bill does that.

Very important to me, our proposal also attacks the problem of illegitimacy. Welfare now actually encourages out-of-wedlock births and induces single, teen mothers to move out on their own to try to raise their children. We think that this is absolutely wrong-headed, and that's why our bill ends the practice of subsidizing out-of-wedlock births and tells teen mothers that they have to live with their families if they want to continue to get public assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I am also compelled to speak about the transracial adoption section in this bill. I deeply appreciate my Chairman, Mr. ARCHER, agreeing to add to it the base bill.

We know that many children, mainly minority kids, are left to languish in foster care be-

cause of the skin. The practice of race-matching that prevails in the adoption community is discriminatory, and we have to stop it if we are going to give these kids a chance and get them into permanent, loving homes.

In the past 18 months, the House has twice passed legislation that penalizes adoption agencies that continue to race-match, but the President vetoed our first effort and the other bill's future in the Senate is up in the air because of the gridlock in that body. By including the transracial section in this bill, we are only improving our chances at actually passing legislation this year and bettering the lives for the half a million children who are stuck in foster care today.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the bill before us today to my colleagues. It takes welfare in a new direction and I believe that it will give hope and expand opportunity to millions of Americans who are trapped in poverty.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to a few of the remarks that were made.

First of all, one of the speakers from the other side said this bill is tough on welfare. This bill is tough on welfare abuse. We all know that there is a lot and we need to deal with it. We are dealing with it.

Others have said that we have not provided enough for children. I would add that in the areas of child support, child nutrition, child care, we have added more than there is now under the existing system. In child care alone I understand there is an additional, beyond what we have today, \$4.5 billion provided for, and I frankly believe it is in both versions that we are going to have an opportunity to consider.

I also need to point out that compared to the last 6 years, which has been a time when we have been spending maximum dollars on welfare, in the next 6 years we are going to spend \$137 billion more. I do not think that means we are dodging the issue. We are targeting the money better, and we are going to take care of more people with true need and stop the waste, fraud, and abuse in this program that President Clinton has asked us to deal with.

I would also point out in the options that we have today the two that we are going to be voting on frankly are more similar than they are different. The point is they both bring substantial reform. I obviously prefer H.R. 3734, but others have spoken to the fact that there are great differences. Actually there are not that many differences.

I would point out that we are giving in this rule two bites of the apple to the other side, which has not always happened in the past when the other side was in the majority under the reconciliation process.

There was some statement made that we are having some cuts in the EITC. One of the speakers mentioned that. No; there are not cuts. There are some attempts to reduce fraud and abuse in the EITC, again as the President has asked.

Mr. Speaker, I have run out of time. I urge strong support for this rule. It is an excellent rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 358, nays 54, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

YEAS—358

Abercrombie	Combest	Goodling
Ackerman	Condit	Gordon
Allard	Cooley	Goss
Andrews	Costello	Graham
Archer	Cox	Green (TX)
Armey	Cramer	Greene (UT)
Bachus	Crane	Greenwood
Baesler	Crapo	Gunderson
Baker (CA)	Cremeans	Gutknecht
Baker (LA)	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Baldacci	Cummings	Hamilton
Ballenger	Cunningham	Hancock
Barcia	Danner	Hansen
Barr	Davis	Harman
Barrett (NE)	Deal	Hastert
Barrett (WI)	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Bartlett	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Barton	Deutsch	Hayes
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Bateman	Dickey	Hefley
Bentsen	Dicks	Hefner
Bereuter	Dingell	Heineman
Berman	Dixon	Heger
Bevill	Doggett	Hilleary
Bilbray	Dooley	Hobson
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bishop	Dornan	Hoke
Bliley	Doyle	Holden
Blumenauer	Dreier	Horn
Blute	Duncan	Hostettler
Boehlert	Dunn	Houghton
Boehner	Durbin	Hoyer
Bonilla	Edwards	Hutchinson
Bonior	Ehlers	Hyde
Bono	Ehrlich	Inglis
Borski	English	Istook
Boucher	Ensign	Jackson-Lee
Brewster	Eshoo	(TX)
Browder	Evans	Jacobs
Brown (CA)	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Brown (FL)	Ewing	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (OH)	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Brownback	Fawell	Johnston
Bryant (TN)	Fazio	Jones
Bryant (TX)	Fields (LA)	Kanjorski
Bunn	Fields (TX)	Kaptur
Bunning	Flanagan	Kasich
Burr	Foley	Kelly
Burton	Ford	Kennedy (MA)
Buyer	Fowler	Kennelly
Callahan	Fox	Kildee
Calvert	Franks (CT)	Kim
Camp	Franks (NJ)	King
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Canady	Frisa	Kleczka
Cardin	Frost	Klink
Castle	Funderburk	Klug
Chabot	Furse	Knollenberg
Chambliss	Gallegly	Kolbe
Chapman	Ganske	LaFalce
Chenoweth	Gejdenson	LaHood
Christensen	Gekas	Lantos
Chrysler	Gephardt	Largent
Clayton	Geren	Latham
Clement	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Clinger	Gillmor	Laughlin
Coble	Gilman	Lazio
Coburn	Gonzalez	Leach
Collins (GA)	Goodlatte	Levin

Lewis (CA)	Norwood	Skelton
Lewis (GA)	Nussle	Slaughter
Lewis (KY)	Obey	Smith (MI)
Lightfoot	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Linder	Orton	Smith (TX)
Lipinski	Oxley	Smith (WA)
Livingston	Parker	Solomon
LoBiondo	Paxon	Souder
Longley	Peterson (MN)	Spence
Lowey	Petri	Spratt
Lucas	Pickett	Stearns
Luther	Pomeroy	Stenholm
Maloney	Porter	Stockman
Manton	Portman	Studds
Manzullo	Poshard	Stump
Markey	Pryce	Stupak
Martini	Quillen	Talent
Mascara	Quinn	Tanner
Matsui	Radanovich	Tate
McCarthy	Rahall	Tauzin
McCollum	Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
McCrery	Reed	Tejeda
McHale	Regula	Thomas
McHugh	Richardson	Thornberry
McInnis	Riggs	Thornton
McIntosh	Rivers	Thurman
McKeon	Roberts	Tiahrt
McKinney	Roemer	Torkildsen
McNulty	Rogers	Torricelli
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Trafficant
Metcalfe	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Meyers	Rose	Vento
Mica	Royce	Volkmer
Millender-	Sabo	Vucanovich
McDonald	Salmon	Walker
Miller (FL)	Sanford	Walsh
Minge	Sawyer	Wamp
Moakley	Saxton	Ward
Molinari	Scarborough	Watts (OK)
Mollohan	Schaefer	Waxman
Montgomery	Schumer	Weldon (FL)
Moorhead	Scott	Weldon (PA)
Moran	Seastrand	Weller
Morella	Sensenbrenner	White
Murtha	Shadegg	Whitfield
Myers	Shaw	Wicker
Myrick	Shays	Wilson
Neal	Shuster	Wise
Nethercutt	Sisisky	Wolf
Neumann	Skaggs	Zeliff
Ney	Skeen	Zimmer

## NAYS—54

Becerra	Hinchey	Roukema
Beilenson	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Jefferson	Rush
Clyburn	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Coleman	Kennedy (RI)	Schroeder
Collins (IL)	Loftgren	Stark
Conyers	McDermott	Stokes
Coyne	Meek	Thompson
DeFazio	Menendez	Torres
Dellums	Mink	Towns
Fattah	Nadler	Velazquez
Filner	Olver	Visclosky
Flake	Owens	Waters
Foglietta	Pallone	Watt (NC)
Frank (MA)	Pastor	Williams
Gibbons	Payne (NJ)	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Pelosi	Wynn
Hilliard	Rangel	Yates

## NOT VOTING—21

Collins (MI)	Martinez	Pombo
de la Garza	McDade	Roth
Engel	Miller (CA)	Schiff
Forbes	Oberstar	Serrano
Hall (OH)	Packard	Taylor (MS)
Hunter	Payne (VA)	Young (AK)
Lincoln	Peterson (FL)	Young (FL)

## □ 1045

Messrs. SOLOMON, CUMMINGS, and BONIOR changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WELFARE AND MEDICAID REFORM ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. KOLBE]. Pursuant to House Resolution

482 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3734.

## □ 1047

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3734) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, with Ms. GREENE of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ORTON. Madam Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against consideration of H.R. 3724.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ORTON. Madam Chairman, section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act prohibits us from considering legislation which would create an unfunded mandate upon the States. The Congressional Budget Office has ruled that H.R. 3734 falls \$12.9 billion short in funding necessary to fund the work requirements of the bill. Also the National Governors Association has stated: We are concerned that the bill restricts State flexibility and will create additional unfunded costs.

This bill clearly creates an unfunded mandate, violates section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, and I would further point out that section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act prohibits this House from considering a rule which would waive section 425. So that in any event we would have a vote and a determination as to whether or not a bill does in fact create an unfunded mandate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would respond to the gentleman's point of order as follows. Points of order against consideration of the bill H.R. 3734 were waived by unanimous consent on July 17, 1996. Further, a point of order against consideration of House Resolution 482 would not be timely after adoption of that resolution.

The gentleman's points are not in order.

Mr. ORTON. I thank the Chairman. I think it is clear to the House and the country that in fact we are violating the first bill we passed in this Congress with the adoption of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 17, 1996, all time for general debate pursuant to the previous order of the House had expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 482, there will be 2 additional hours of general debate. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will each control 1 hour.

Mr. SABO. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] be allowed to

control the time for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] temporarily and be allowed to yield time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. ARCHER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, since 1965, roughly 30 years ago, government in this country has spent \$5.5 trillion on welfare programs, more than has been spent on all of the wars fought in this century. Yet people are poorer and more dependent than ever. Despite our best efforts, despite the expenditure of these massive amounts of money, we have lost the war on poverty.

Madam Chairman, today, we stand on the threshold of a new effort, an effort that can win the war.

With the vote we take today, we recognize that the Great Society's welfare programs have not helped people. They have destroyed people. They have not kept families together. They have torn them apart.

These policies haven't turned urban areas of America into shining cities on a hill. They have made them into war zones where law-abiding citizens are afraid to go out at night.

They have led to the creation of two Americas. One marked by hope and opportunity. The other by despair and decay.

In short, the welfare state has created a world in which children have no dreams for tomorrow and parents have abandoned their hopes for today.

The people trapped in welfare, the mothers, the children, the fathers, are our fellow citizens, one and all. We have a moral obligation to them, as Americans, to lend a helping hand.

For the people on welfare aren't abusing welfare, as much as welfare is abusing them.

We are on the threshold of improving America by fixing our failed welfare state. We're improving America for the children on welfare, for the parents on welfare, and for ourselves.

Our reforms are based on five pillars. The pillars represent the values that made America great.

One—we think people on welfare should work for their benefits. A welfare worker I spoke with told me the biggest beneficiaries of work aren't the moms or the dads. Yes, they benefit. But she said it's the children who watch their parents get up each morning, go to a job, and return home at night who are the big winners. These children get better grades in school, have fewer problems with crime, and are less likely to end up on welfare because the values and virtues of work, not idleness, are instilled in them at a young age.

Two—Time limit benefits. Welfare should be a temporary helping hand, not a way of life.