The panel from the Committee on Commerce, consisting of Messrs. BLILEY, OXLEY, and DINGELL, is also appointed for the consideration of section 3174 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference.

The panel from the Committee on Science is also appointed for the consideration of section 1044 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about welfare reform, because the action today taken by the House I think is very significant. In both bills that were debated today there were common elements.

Both bills created a single welfare block grant, a cash block grant, to replace the traditional AFDC, aid to families with dependent children program. Both bills limited the spending for the block grant at $16.4 billion for this next fiscal year. Those bills created a $2 billion contingency fund for States to use to meet their needs in time of recession. Both bills require work of welfare recipients, and both bills have a cutoff from welfare after 5 years.

So what is the difference between the Republican leadership bill and the bill that I supported, the bipartisan Republican and Democrat compromise, the Castle-Tanner bill? The difference in the bills is very, very important.

I supported a bill that requires work for all welfare recipients. I supported a bill that would limit the spending for welfare. I supported a bill that provides help to States in times of recession. I supported a bill that was better for kids but strict on their parents. And I supported a bill that met the Republican budget requirements to cut $53 billion from the existing welfare program.

While the Republican bill and the bill that I supported both had common elements of work, of limitation of spending, of assisting States in time of recession, there are some important differences in these bills, because the Republican bill requires work but does not provide the resources. Indeed, the CBO estimated that many States would not be able to comply with the work requirements. That becomes very important in a State like West Virginia with rural areas with high unemployment, where we want people to work but if we cannot provide the jobs for them, they are not able to work.

I also supported a bill that says that after they cut somebody off—because the bill that I supported has a lifetime period, they can only collect welfare benefits during their entire lifetime for no more than 5 years—the bill that I supported, though, would still say that the children in those families could receive vouchers for their most important needs: diapers, for instance, nutritional supplements, those kinds of things. The Republican bill would not do that, would not permit the Federal funds to pay for that.

The bill that I supported had help during a recession far more than the Republican bill, so that if this country goes into a recession and they have their caseload pickup, they are able to deal with it.

Also, the Republican bill had an unfunded mandate estimated to be as high as $12 billion. That is saying to States, ''This is what we want you to do but we're not providing the resources.'' The bill that I supported put in resources for work, put in resources for job training, put in the resources necessary for child care.

In West Virginia there are almost 37,000 families presently receiving aid to families with dependent children, the monthly check. There are 115,000 people receiving food stamps who are on public assistance. There are another some 190,000 that are not on public assistance but receiving food stamps, for a total of 308,000 out of about 1.8 million.

The fact is that in the Republican bill there were not adequate resources for the work requirement that everybody agrees ought to be in there. And for a rural area with high unemployment, requiring work but not supplying the resources so that people can work I think is not fair.

There were no vouchers in the Republican bill. That means that when a family that has been on welfare for as long as 5 years, and that is the cutoff period, when that family has been on welfare for 5 years, there is no assistance for the children afterward and there is no help in a recession.

Mr. Speaker, I supported a bill that very simply says that they have to work, requires work for welfare recipients. I supported the bill that says that they receive benefits for no more than 5 years, and after that they are cut off. I supported a bill that provides help to States in recession. I supported that bill that is better for kids, because it says that yes, they can continue to get vouchers even after their parents may have been cut off. And I supported a bill that meets the Republicans' own budget requirements that we cut $53 billion out of welfare.

All of this was done in our bill. The only difference is, in our bipartisan compromise bill we were much kinder on kids, we were stricter on parents, we were tougher on requiring work. We actually put the resources in there. We saved the same amount of money that the Republicans said they wanted to save, but we did it in such a way that we were not being unnecessarily mean.

I think that people want reform in welfare, I think that they want people to be working whenever possible, but I do not think they want this to be a war on children, either. So I hope that those issues come back to this House and we have another chance to vote again another day.

TWA FLIGHT 800

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today has been clearly a day that will cause many of us to reflect, one, on the goodness of America, but as well the sadness of some of what has occurred today.

Let me first of all start my remarks by acknowledging the tragic loss of life of TWA Flight 800, gratified of certainly the astounding and outstanding search-and-rescue effort of the Coast Guard and others and as well recognizing the many individuals that will be needed to be able to determine the cause of this great tragedy.

I know personally that the people of Houston, the State of Texas and this Nation will be saddened by one who was a member of our community, Pam Lynchner, a co-founder of the victims' rights organization, Criminal Justice Reform. She and her 10-year-old daughter Shannon and her 8-year-old daughter Katie were on this flight. Many times we have seen such tragedies occur in America. I can only be grateful to God that Americans will always rise to the goodness of what we represent. We will join in and embrace each other. We will give comfort to

those who have lost loved ones, and we will seek information and determine to find justice without a punitive, despotic and dictatorial type of government. I am grateful for that.

I can only hope to that we will find a solution to the pain that has been given to these family members.

I would offer to say that we should not stop until we determine the cause. We should not prejudge, but if in any way this matter has criminal and terrorist overtones, we must move swiftly. We must also respond with the appropriate government agencies that must ensure the future safety of Americans.

I started with that, because as we proceeded today on the House floor, I knew many of my fellow colleagues were overwhelmed with this morning's news, and I simply wanted to say to Americans, I wanted to thank them for the kind of people that they are when tragedy strikes, when people are in need. And to the family of Pam Lynchner, let me simply say that we hope to have remembered by you the fact that Pam did serve this Nation and, in fact, was someone who cared about others.

Mr. Speaker, as the specter of the tragedy of the crash of TWA flight 800 settles over us, I want to extend my deepest sympathies to the surviving families and friends of the 229 passengers who were on board the flight. We empathize with your loss and will grieve as a Nation for your loved ones who have perished.

State and Federal officials, including the National Transportation Safety Board and the FBI are now on the scene and as speculative scenarios are flying everywhere, let's let cooler heads prevail. As a former member of the Houston Aviation Committee, I have learned that the experts will tell us soon enough how this mishap occurred. Experience has taught us that premature judgments can often be wrong. However, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee. I will certainly monitor this situation closely.

The people of Houston, the State of Texas, and this Nation has lost one of our most dedicated citizens in the crash. Pam Lynchner was the cofounder of the victim's rights organization, Criminal Justice Reform. She and her 10-year-old daughter Shannon and her 8-year-old daughter Katie were on their way to Paris. Shannon had drawn a copy of a painting by the famous French artist Claude Monet and they had planned to see the original together in Paris. Pam was not only a devoted mother but was a tireless advocate and worker for the victims of crime. She would come to the aid of whomever called her—day or night. She was an inspiration for us all and our condolences go out to her husband Joe.

I call on people of good will and members of the community to remember Pam in their prayers. She will not be soon forgotten.

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. Speaker, this day was historic in the U.S. Congress, for in fact we, too, as Members of Congress were responsible for changing the course of history. I am gratified in this debate on welfare reform again that Americans who cared about people rose up and supported legislation of which I supported, the Tanner-Castle welfare reform bill that in fact will do the job, the job that the legislation by the Republican majority that passed will not do, and, that is, of course to ensure that there is a bridge for those who have joined together to change this welfare system so that we do not create a scenario where people remain on welfare against their will; for the constituents in the 18th district in Texas have always told me, we want to work, we want our children to be proud of us, but we must have work, we must have child care, we must have health care.

The Tanner-Castle bill requires States to provide vouchers for the needs of the child, for families that are eventually cut off. That means it cares about children. I cannot imagine that in this debate it could get so ruckus that those who were listening would not understand that sometimes you have to stand up for what is right. You have got to understand that you will provide unfunded mandates to local communities when you cut off Medicaid, health care, for those who do not have any other resources. You will increase childhood diseases if you diminish the opportunities for those who are indigent to have immunization and to have health care. At the same time, many people are casting accusations against immigrants. We are all a country of immigrants. Some of us came here in the bottom of a belly of a slave boat.

I heard one of my colleagues compare welfare recipients to slaves. I might venture to say that no one can compare what happened in slavery to anyone's status now. But I do know that Americans want welfare reform that is caring and responsible and responds to people in need but provides them with an opportunity, not a hand-out but a bridge to independence.

□ 1700

UNDEREMPLOYMENT THE REAL PROBLEM

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, like the previous speaker, I would first like to start by expressing my very great sympathy for all of those who lost loved ones in this terrible explosion and crash of the TWA Flight 800. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Aviation, I can assure the previous speaker and all the Members of this body that we will be doing everything possible to look into this terrible tragedy and to take every step possible to make our aviation system and airport security the very highest priority in this country and do all that we possibly can to solve this horrible situation that has occurred.

The U.S. aviation system is by far the safest in the world. We have had approximately 12,900 deaths in all U.S. aviation accidents combined since the Wright Brothers flight in 1903. Unfortunately, that many Americans are killed every 4 months on the highways of this Nation. But our goal is to have no fatalities whatsoever, and certainly we are going to be doing everything we possibly can to achieve that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I previously requested this time to talk about another subject.

I have previously mentioned on this floor my great concern about certain trends I see in regard to our economy and employment in this country.

We had a trade deficit that cost us 3 million jobs last year alone, and that trade deficit is continuing at a rate of several billion dollars each month.

Leading economists tell us that we lose, conservatively, 20,000 jobs per billion.

We have had at least 1½ million jobs lost due to corporate downsizing in the last 3 years.

One recent report on the network news said that unlike the eighties, people who lost their jobs in the nineties were having to take replacement jobs at much lower pay and after being out of work for a much longer period between jobs.

We have several million college graduates who cannot find work in the fields for which they trained, with huge surpluses of lawyers, teachers, and now even doctors with the possible exception of in very rural areas.

There is certainly nothing wrong with working as a waiter or waitress, but we are now ending up with the best educated waiters and waitresses in the world.

Our unemployment problem is relatively low, but our underemployment problem is terrible.

It is really sad when parents and grandparents bring their college graduate children and grandchildren to me because they can't find good jobs.

And then we have many thousands of young people who have incurred large debts to gain these degrees, and oftentimes these are debts they are going to be unable to repay or at least have great difficulty in doing so.

Robert Sammuelson, the columnist for Newsweek and the Washington Post, wrote a few days ago concerning our $34 billion in Federal student grants and subsidized loans: ''Arguably the easy availability of so much Government money is one reason that college costs and tuition have skyrocketed.''

In other words, it is entirely possible that the main reason college costs have gone up so much and so fast in recent years is because of the Federal Government.

These tuition rates have gone up far faster than the rate of inflation.

We should restructure the Federal Student Loan Program so that the most favorable loans go to the students at schools that are decreasing or at least holding down the great increases in college tuition.