

license denials. Under this multilateral arrangement, denial notifications received from MTCR members are honored by other members for similar export license applications. Such a coordinated approach enhances U.S. missile nonproliferation goals and precludes other member nations from approving similar transactions without prior consultation.

MODIFICATIONS IN CONTROLS ON EMBARGOED DESTINATIONS

- Effective August 30, 1994, the Department of Commerce restricted the types of commodities eligible for shipment to Cuba under the provisions of General License GIFT. Only food, medicine, clothing, and other human needs items are eligible for this general license.
- The embargo against Haiti was lifted on October 16, 1994. That embargo had been under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Treasury. Export license authority reverted to the Department of Commerce upon the termination of the embargo.

REGULATORY REFORM

- In February 1994, the Department of Commerce issued a Federal Register notice that invited public comment on ways to improve the Export Administration Regulations. The project's objective is "to make the rules and procedures for the control of exports simpler and easier to understand and apply." This project is not intended to be a vehicle to implement substantive change in the policies or procedures of export administration, but rather to make those policies and procedures simpler and clearer to the exporting community. Reformulating and simplifying the Export Administration Regulations is an important priority, and significant progress has been made over the last 6 months in working toward completion of this comprehensive undertaking.

EXPORT ENFORCEMENT

- Over the last 6 months, the Department of Commerce continued its vigorous enforcement of the Export Administration Act and the Export Administration Regulations through educational outreach, license application screening, spot checks, investigations, and enforcement actions. In the last 6 months, these efforts resulted in civil penalties, denials of export privileges, criminal fines, and imprisonment. Total fines amounted to over \$12,289,000 in export control and antiboycott compliance cases, including criminal fines of nearly \$9,500,000 while 11 parties were denied export privileges.
- Teledyne Fined \$12.9 Million and a Teledyne Division Denied Export Privileges for Export Control Violations: On January 26 and January 27, Teledyne Industries, Inc. of Los

Angeles, agreed to a settlement of criminal and administrative charges arising from illegal export activity in the mid-1980's by its Teledyne Wah Chang division, located in Albany, Oregon. The settlement levied criminal fines and civil penalties on the firm totaling \$12.9 million and imposed a denial of export privileges on Teledyne Wah Chang.

The settlement is the result of a 4-year investigation by the Office of Export Enforcement and the U.S. Customs Service. United States Attorneys offices in Miami and Washington, D.C., coordinated the investigation. The investigation determined that during the mid-1980's, Teledyne illegally exported nearly 270 tons of zirconium that was used to manufacture cluster bombs for Iraq.

As part of the settlement, the Department restricted the export privileges of Teledyne's Wah Chang division; the division will have all export privileges denied for 3 months, with the remaining portion of the 3-year denial period suspended.

- Storm Kheem Pleads Guilty to Nonproliferation and Sanctions Violations: On January 27, Storm Kheem pled guilty in Brooklyn, New York, to charges that he violated export control regulations barring U.S. persons from contributing to Iraq's missile program. Kheem arranged for the shipment of foreign-source ammonium perchlorate, a highly explosive chemical used in manufacturing rocket fuel, from the People's Republic of China to Iraq via Amman, Jordan, without obtaining the required validated license from the Department of Commerce for arranging the shipment. Kheem's case represents the first conviction of a person for violating section 778.9 of the Export Administration Regulations, which restricts proliferation-related activities of "U.S. persons." Kheem also pled guilty to charges of violating the Iraqi Sanctions Regulations.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from August 19, 1994, to February 19, 1995, that are directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to export controls were largely centered in the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Export Administration. Expenditures by the Department of Commerce are anticipated to be \$19,681,000 most of which represents program operating costs, wage and salary costs for Federal personnel and overhead expenses.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 21, 1995.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF REVIEW PANEL PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 7, RULE LI OF HOUSE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable VIC FAZIO, ranking minority member of the Committee on House Oversight:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT,
Washington, DC, March 10, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to House rule 51, clause 7, I have appointed the Honorable William J. Jefferson, and the Honorable Ed Pastor, to serve on the review panel established by the Rule for the 104th Congress.

Best Regards,

VIC FAZIO,
Ranking Minority Member,
Committee on House Oversight.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 117 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 117

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the text of the bill (H.R. 1214) to help children by reforming the Nation's welfare system to promote work, marriage, and personal responsibility, and shall not exceed five hours, with two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and three hours equally divided among and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] 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. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 117 is a rule providing for general debate on H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995.

The rule provides 5 hours of general debate, with 2 hours allocated to the Committee on Ways and Means and 1½ hours each to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Committee on Agriculture.

Debate must be confined to the bill and the text of H.R. 1214, which the Committee on Rules intends to make in order as original text for amendment purposes in a subsequent rule—which we will put out of the Committee on Rules at about 5 p.m. this afternoon. After general debate, the rule provides for the Committee of the Whole to rise without motion.

No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except by subsequent order of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Personal Responsibility Act that the full House will begin debating today is an extremely complex and important piece of legislation.

The House has considered this bill to date in a detailed and thorough manner.

House Republicans promised a comprehensive reform of our Nation's abysmal welfare system, and we have delivered.

H.R. 4 was introduced on January 4, 1995, the opening day of this session.

Three House committees—Ways and Means, Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Agriculture—held extensive hearings on welfare reform. All three committees conducted grueling marathon markups, often deliberating late into the night.

Chairmen ARCHER, GOODLING, and ROBERTS then merged their versions of the package into one new bill, H.R. 1214 before us now. The Committee on Rules intends to make this new bill in order as original text for amendment purposes on the floor.

The committee is scheduled to meet at 5 p.m. this evening to report a rule providing for the amendment process for the bill.

The Committee on Rules held a 7½-hour hearing on Thursday, March 16, and took testimony from no less than 60 witnesses.

Members on both sides of the aisle suggested constructive amendments and there was an excellent debate about the many issues the bill addresses head-on.

Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate the importance of this legislation to the American public, the Republican leadership has set aside an entire week on the House floor for consideration of this bill.

If anyone should claim that this welfare reform legislation has been hasty or ill-conceived, I would ask—"Where was the welfare reform legislation when the Democrats held both Houses of Congress and the White House?"

Mr. Speaker, we certainly do not have the time to recount the President's many broken campaign promises, but the Clinton administration's failure to make good on its pledge to

reform the welfare system has been outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 tackles some of the most difficult issues of our day directly and head-on.

The bill makes fiscal sense by consolidating numerous major programs into block grants directly to the States, and that's the way it should be. Layers of bureaucracy in Washington will be made unnecessary.

The savings will be phenomenal—and the States will maintain maximum flexibility to help the poor in their areas, and they know how best to do it, not us inside the beltway.

The bill requires welfare recipients to work within 2 years, and bars receipt of benefits for more than 5 years.

Reasonable restrictions are applied to recipients on AFDC to encourage self-sufficiency; in other words, to stop them from being second, and third and fourth generation beneficiaries of welfare.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 makes badly needed reforms to the Federal food stamp program, to the Supplemental Security Income program and family nutrition and child nutrition programs.

Mr. Speaker, as the House debates welfare reform this week, the public should take note of which of these proposals honestly addresses the problems of poverty in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, the American people will be asking, and Members had better be asking ourselves, which alternative defends the status quo. That is the question right here tonight, which alternative defends the status quo that has failed so miserably, and which alternative wrestles with the issues of illegitimate births, welfare dependency, child support enforcement, and putting low-income people back to work.

Mr. Speaker, the Personal Responsibility Act will prevail when scrutinized in this manner. I ask my colleagues to do this. During the recent debate on cutting spending I asked this House what is compassionate about adding another trillion dollars to the debt on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. Is that compassionate? The answer was no then. I ask my colleagues today now what is compassionate about continuing failed welfare programs that encourage a second, and third and fourth generation of welfare dependency? I say to my colleagues, "You know, and I know, the answer is 'nothing.'"

Mr. Speaker, that is why we must not defend the status quo. We must make the changes that are so necessary today. We can do it by voting for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule was voted unanimously out of the Committee on Rules on Thursday afternoon on a bipartisan basis. The House is eager to begin this debate. We should do it now and get on with it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we support this first part of the rule providing for consideration of the Personal Responsibility Act. The 5 hours of general debate times it provides are essential for the thorough deliberation that is required for legislation as comprehensive and as drastic as this.

□ 1500

As has been true of most of the elements of the Contract With America, this legislation was hastily drafted and has been sent to the House without the benefit of thorough and public discussion or debate. We hope these 5 hours of debate will help clarify the controversies surrounding this overhaul not only of AFDC, the program most of us think of when we talk about welfare, but also of the entire child welfare system, of disability benefits for children, and of all the major nutrition programs our Nation has provided for many years.

The Committee on Rules heard a full day of testimony from Members of the House, Democrats and Republicans alike, about the need for substantive changes in the legislation before us. There was bipartisan support for changes in several parts of the bill, including the paternity establishment section, which is so restrictive in nature that even if a mother fully cooperates, she and her child could be punished by the denial of cash aid, if a State dragged its feet on establishing paternity.

There was also bipartisan support for amendments to strengthen the child support enforcement section, and for amendments to provide more funding for child care for welfare recipients so the mother is able to work or to get job training.

Unfortunately, the Personal Responsibility Act fails to deliver what the American people want: A welfare system that expects parents to work to support their families, but that also protects vulnerable children.

We need to pass legislation that ensures parental responsibility while also protecting children, encourages State flexibility without totally abdicating Federal oversight, and protects taxpayer resources by applying fairness and common sense.

Not only is the Personal Responsibility Act weak on work requirements, but it contains no requirement for education, training, and support services. If we want poor parents to work, they will need these services. They will need child care and transportation, for example.

The goals of the bill include preventing teen pregnancy and out-of-wedlock births. Unfortunately and incredibly, family planning services, the key to reducing out-of-wedlock births, the vast majority of which are unintended, are not even mentioned in this bill, which

does away with the 30-year-old requirement that States offer family planning services to all AFDC recipients.

Meanwhile, in just the past decade the percentage of all children born in the United States out of wedlock has doubled, more than doubled, to 32 percent. Thirty-two percent of all the babies born in this country are born out of wedlock, and there is nothing in this so-called reform bill that even tries to deal with this enormous problem.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons and many others, the Personal Responsibility Act requires the lengthy debate that this rule provides. We support the rule and urge our colleagues to approve it so that we may proceed with consideration of this important and controversial legislation today.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the fine gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the chairman of the committee.

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

This is probably the most important debate and perhaps the most important issue that we will face, perhaps during my lifetime, certainly the most important since I have been in the Congress of the United States.

What is at stake? Well, basically, what is at stake is this: What do we do to free millions of Americans from the shackles that the Federal Government has placed them in? All of the programs were well meaning. Over the years I sat behind several chairmen, one who used to say, "Bill, these programs just aren't working the way we had intended them." And that is true. So year after year, generation after generation, we have enslaved these people, so, unless we make a change, they will never have an opportunity to get part of that American dream. That is destructive to them. That is destructive to our society and to our country.

Making changes is very, very difficult. Change is something that people fear, and that is true in no place worse than in the Congress of the United States. But if we do not change, then, of course, we are going to continue to enslave the very people we have sent over \$5 trillion to try to help. Year after year we will be doing this, and it is totally unfair to those people in our society.

So it would be my hope that we get away from the rhetoric and pay a little attention to the facts and see whether we can do better than we have done in the past. I think those people that we have tried to help are depending on us to make that change.

The first thing we have to do is admit that we failed. That should not be so difficult. It does not matter which side of the aisle we sit on. Just passing more programs and more programs and adding more money and more money has not worked. It has disadvantaged the disadvantaged. So it is time to make that change. An alco-

holic has to admit that he has that problem before we can ever do anything to help him or for him to help himself to a recovery. It is true of any other drug addict. It is equally as true with the legislation we are dealing with today.

So I would call on my colleagues to listen carefully and participate intelligently. Let us not get up and give a lot rhetoric that has nothing to do with the facts. We know the facts. We know the facts of how we failed, and we know the facts of what it is we are trying to do to see whether we can help the most vulnerable in this country receive a portion of the American dream that we on the Federal level have denied them from receiving all of these years.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN].

Mr. Speaker, the first thing we should do in starting the debate on as serious a subject as this is to puncture the myths that surround this debate. The first myth I would like to puncture is that the Democrats support the status quo. That is absolutely not true.

As recently as last year, I introduced and held hearings on a very substantial welfare reform program. Unfortunately, it ran into a hurricane of Republican filibuster, and it got nowhere. But it was not that we did not try.

Second, the myth is that the Democrats have held control of this since 1935 and we have done nothing except perpetuate poverty and the miseries of welfare.

That is not so. In the Johnson and Kennedy eras, we made substantial reforms in the welfare program, and we created such programs as Head Start and Upward Bound and the Follow Through Program and programs for aid to college-bound students and for those who should be bound for college but unfortunately could not go.

As recently as in the 1970's, a Republican President, President Nixon, sent us a comprehensive welfare reform bill that unfortunately we rejected. It came to us at a time when President Nixon was encumbered by the Watergate scandal, and the bill got polluted in that environment. At that time, it is important to note, the President suggested that we federalize welfare, that we not dump it on the States as our Republican colleagues would do today, and that we take the entire responsibility because he thought, and I think, that every child is a citizen of the United States and every child should have a government that cares for him in a humane way. That was the thought of President Nixon, and we unfortunately did not adopt it.

Well, as we all know, Reagan was elected in 1980, and so we did nothing

for 8 years. We could not even get a squeak out of him about making any changes in that program. But during the Bush administration, in 1988 we made substantial reforms to the welfare program and crafted in it the requirement of work. But it was put in there in a workable manner so that if the woman needed a job and was able to work and had to have child care because she just could not leave her child or her infant at home unattended, she could get that, or if she needed training, she could get that. So the myth that we in the Congress have done nothing except perpetuate this is, I hope, punctured.

Let us look at the bill before us. This is a cruel piece of legislation. It punishes the children, the innocent children, because of the errors of their parent or parents. It punishes them not just at birth but it punishes some for a lifetime, and certainly it punishes others through all of their childhood era. It will deprive them of the basic necessities for food, of clothing, of housing, of education, of love. That is what this bill does.

There is a better way, a far better way, and we have put that forward. We will have alternatives for this program on the floor here, but they will receive scant notice. They will have perhaps an hour or so of debate time, and then it will all be over. But this bill will never become law. There is hope out there that something sensible will become law.

Mr. Speaker, let us get on with the debate.

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

Mr. Speaker, of course, I take strong exception to the comments about the Republican filibuster in the last year. There is no filibuster in the House of Representatives. Rather, it is the Republicans who are taking the bull by the horns.

Furthermore, as to the bill, the punishment to our children is, if we do nothing, if we maintain the status quo, that is where the real punishment to our children comes from. Frankly, I think it is somewhat baloney when they say this bill takes away love from children and will leave children out there hungry, and so on, and so forth. I think that is political rhetoric, and we need to get beyond that to the meat of the bill.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. GOSS].

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], a new and hard-working member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are today indeed launching a very historic debate on welfare reform, as Chairman GOODLING has outlined. We are going to be struggling with some of the most vexing and

challenging issues of our time that confront our country and, more importantly, confront the people of our country.

One thing is very, very clear: In this most important comprehensive reform on welfare programs that we have ever attempted in the House, there is no ultimate wisdom. There are going to be disagreements.

No one has all the answers, and it is likely that we will not get it exactly right on all fronts the first time we go through this, but we have got to start because we owe it to our children and others in need to make the best possible attempt to fix what is broken. And what is broken is the system that we have now. It is clearly broken, and it is failing. Doing nothing is not the right answer.

As the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] said and as many others are going to say, doing nothing only leads to more grief for more Americans, because we can see that we are running out of money and we can see that we are not succeeding in what we are trying to do.

This rule allows 5 hours of general debate to get the process started, and I look forward to a truly deliberative and productive process, bringing together the best judgments of every Member of this institution.

But first, let us review the facts. Mr. Speaker, in the early 1970's the United States declared war on poverty. That was the cry, and despite the best intentions and \$5 trillion of taxpayer funds, we just about have to say that we lost the war, that it is time to surrender and do something different. Illegitimacy rates and welfare rolls continue to soar and as everybody knows, more people live in poverty today than when we started the war and before we spent the \$5 trillion.

□ 1515

Worse still, the current system hurt some of the very people it was intended to help. The Republican welfare reform bill focus on three important things. First, it consolidates programs to minimize bureaucracy, fraud, and hopefully gets rid of some of the waste we have got, in order to ensure that our finite resources, and they are increasingly finite, reach those who truly need the help. In other words, we are not going to deal with the marginal cases. We are going to deal with the needy.

Second, the Republican plan is legislation that allows States the flexibility to enact programs that are best suited to their individual needs while at the same time providing accountability at the local level. It is not exactly the same in New York City as it is in Alaska, Florida, or someplace in the Midwest. We need that flexibility.

Finally, the bill does away with many of the destructive disincentives that have helped to perpetuate generations of dependency, and we all know that.

Although this bill is estimated to save taxpayers tens of billions of dol-

lars over the next 5 years, we have managed to increase spending for important programs like WIC and school lunches, despite the rhetoric to the contrary we keep hearing, and we have changed the carrots and sticks to move people off welfare roles and on to pay-rolls.

Mr. Speaker, I spent a good deal of time this weekend meeting with people in southwest Florida in my district who are right on the front lines, people working within the current system who know the issues, who have the expertise to redflag possible problems with this reform. And there are some serious and legitimate concerns, especially about the block grant approach and the potential for abuse and unfair distribution of funds within States.

We have to make sure we build this into the block grant approach, some kind of safeguard to make sure dollars flow to the areas where they are most needed. And I support that. That is just one area that we need to explore through this process.

But we have so many opportunities to make improvements and do things better. I sat at a Headstart luncheon yesterday with youngsters in the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten program. This is a program that works. We are keeping it. We make sure it is funded.

The things that work, we are trying to save. It is the things that do not work we are trying to excise and replace with something better. I think the authors of our proposal have done yeoman's work in bringing us to this point. Obviously, it is not a finished product, but it is a place worthy of beginning debate. Let the debate begin and support the rule.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule for the 5 hours of general debate on the Personal Responsibility Act of the welfare bill, but I must rise in strong opposition once again to the Personal Responsibility Act because when we see how cruel this particular bill would be to children in this country, and Republicans are saying that Democrats really do not want a welfare bill, that they have had all of these years in order to pass one. But I have chaired this subcommittee for many, many years, and we have tried to work with the Republicans in the past to structure a welfare reform system that would respond to the human needs of people in this country.

I think when we see the Family Support Act of 1988, which was brought on by the Democrats, or we have seen certain things put in place, and even under the Clinton administration, when he was elected President and he campaigned on the fact that we wanted to end welfare as we know it, and I

think we tried to fashion legislation and we tried to get Republicans to come around.

But even if you think not, I would say to the Republicans that it is a time that what we all want to accomplish in this is to try to make sure that we move people off welfare into the private sector workplace, if possible. That is what we all want to accomplish in this welfare reform bill, and the Personal Responsibility Act, it does not address that.

The work requirements are such that people can just roll off of welfare, move into no jobs at all, and therefore, under your work requirements, that will be counted. We have not placed people in the workplace. We have not identified a link between welfare to work at all. I think Democrats have said all along that we want work first.

If Republicans, we could sit down with Chairman SHAW and others and do that. But just look at one thing. When we reported this bill, the formula has changed four times on the allocation of the \$15.4 billion. We see now that under the changes that have been made from what we reported from the subcommittee, we see Speaker GINGRICH'S State of Georgia gained \$45 million in the back rooms of the Committee on Rules. His State is picking up an additional \$45 million. We see that those same private deals reduced California's block grant funding over a 5 year period by \$670 million. In every public discussion on this subcommittee, it was very clear that California's share was higher.

Look at the other ways under the Committee on Rules, in the back room of the Committee on Rules, we see New York will take a hit of \$275 million. But we see the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] took care of himself. He added an additional \$20 million in the back room of the Committee on Rules. Not the subcommittee, not the full committee, but in the back room of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that we are in the protecting the children of this country. We see the first State allocation of allocation formula being changed, just in back room dealings by the Republicans. You too are ashamed of this bill you are bringing to the House floor today.

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

Mr. Speaker, while I am a little baffled by the gentleman from Tennessee's allegations about the back room drafts on this, the rule has not even been reported. The Committee on Rules meets at 5 o'clock. I invite you to come up and see about the back room thing. There is going to be media there. There is no back room drafting.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss this bill. I am in support of the rule which we have before us. I do disagree with those who would say that this bill is cruel, and I would hope that our debate through the general debate and through the amendment process which we are going to undertake will be one which is constructive. Because maybe this is not the final bill, and I think there are some very good ideas. Lord only knows there are a lot of people here who have worked in this particular area, and we need to work with them as well.

But welfare as we know it today has basically continued people in poverty. There has been a sense of hopelessness attached to it. No real opportunity to leave or really to improve your life unless you are so self-motivated you can do so. Frankly, it has been generational to some degree.

In Delaware, we put together a program in 1987 under a blueprint for change and it became one of the model States for the Family Support Act of 1988. We developed an employment and training program to target the needs of hard-to-employ long-term welfare client. We developed a case management approach to service delivery. We raised the case assistance standard of need to bring benefits in line with neighboring States or the national average, and we developed indigent medical care programs and other programs to help people off of welfare.

The statistics are interesting on that. Since 1986, over 5,600 clients have benefited, with 2,779, and that is about one-half, of course, working full-time and 2,075 leaving welfare all together. Additionally, child care for families and work education and training has been increased substantially. We dealt with the problem in the State of Delaware, and I was pleased to be able to be the Governor during that period of time, and I think we dealt with it successfully.

Now we look at this program and we look at what we have. We are going to have a lot of rhetoric about it. The truth of the matter is the President of the United States of America, a good proposal by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], which we are going to hear about, and this bill are not as different from each other as we are probably going to hear about.

They essentially call for an end of welfare at some period of time for all families. They all call for work after a couple of years so people would have to go to work. It is a big-bang solution to solving the problems of welfare.

The Republican bill does call for block grants and gives more State flexibility. But today the House does begin consideration of some very important changes in our Personal Responsibility Act and a dialogue with the American people and our welfare recipients on replacing that failed welfare system with one based on work, individual responsibility, family, hope, and opportunity.

This bill does represent fundamental and dramatic change. We are going to have to talk about it. In its best light this bill could provide opportunity for those who have none. Democrats and Republicans, all agree by removing welfare recipients into work we can help place welfare recipients on the road to self-sufficiency, opportunity, and hope for their future, where currently frankly there is none. And this is not mean-spirited Republican philosophy, but American values.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention to the gentleman, you have not only been a tremendous and a very valuable member of the team which has been working over the last year to craft the bill and to get us where we are today, but your model, the Delaware model, which is continuing now under the present Governor, but from the seeds that you planted in Delaware, you have set the pattern, as a few other Governors have in this country, in what welfare should be, and taking it from a program of dependence to a program promoting independence. I would just like to compliment the gentleman in the well for the great work he has done as a Governor and a Member of this House in reforming this very difficult task of reforming welfare as we know it today.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for his compliments, unsolicited, I might add. I might just say with respect to that, I think we as Republicans have a responsibility to make sure as we monitor this bill to make absolutely positive that the kinds of programs we want are being put into place in the States, with the child care, the training, the education which is necessary; that we make sure there is no hardship, and we are trying to do something about rainy day funds. But that we give people that opportunity.

I think that is what this is all about. I think there has been some misrepresentation, all the way from the food nutrition programs, which has been I think misrepresented as to its potential growth, through a lot of other things that are happening.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, as this day wears on and as the next few days wear on, that that story comes out. If there are amendments we should adopt, so be it, we should adopt them. But when it is all said and done, I hope we will have a welfare system in place in this country that will allow people to look at it and know this is giving us hope, it is giving us sustenance, it is going to carry us through, we are going to be able to take care of our families, but at some point we are going to have the hope to be able to grow through it, to be able to be employed, if one is employable, and take care of those who are not employable, and be able to ac-

tually make progress for many people in America.

I look upon this in an optimistic sense, not in the pessimistic sense that this is a bill to suppress people. I realize there is a different point of view on that. But I hope we listen to each other and balance this and carry it out before the week has ended and we actually can adopt a piece of legislation that all of us can be very proud of.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague who is in the well now, one who has worked on the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means and one who has been in the forefront of the work component of the Democratic piece for welfare recipients in this country. I thank our colleague from Michigan, who has worked so hard with the full committee ranking member and the ranking member of the subcommittee. So I just wanted to first commend the gentleman.

I want to refer to my colleague from Colorado by saying what I am really afraid of in all of this is if the formula allocation was changed four times from the subcommittee, what bothers me is what the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] talked about earlier.

Surely, I want to say we Democrats want to work with the Republicans, talk this out, work it out, craft a welfare reform package that will put people to work and put work first. But what we do not want to do is to see when we go back to the Committee on Rules that we are going to continue to bring a bill to this floor that will constantly change in the allocation formula, and other things that will change in this bill, that we did not report out of the full Committee on Ways and Means. It was a bad bill that we reported out. It is tough on kids, it is cruel to kids in America, and I think we have to continue to discuss this. The Personal Responsibility Act is a bad bill for kids in America.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, let me just talk about welfare reform for a few minutes.

Look, the status quo is dead. The only issue is what is going to replace the present welfare system, and here is the quandary before the Committee on rules. We have only a partial rule, but they are faced with a bill that is extreme. It is extreme.

The school lunch program was just the tip of the iceberg. Then over the weekend we heard complaints about the provisions on mothers under 18, kids being punished if they are mothers under 18, or if they are the second kid

in the family, forever. Well, now there seems to be kind of a retreat from that extreme provision.

Then we also heard over the weekend about day-care. The troops are a little restless over there on the Republican side with the extreme provision. We had urged in committee and subcommittee, make welfare reform work, have day-care. Now maybe you are beginning to get the message.

The trouble is that you have many other extreme provisions in your bill. For example, there is no linkage of welfare to work. States can meet the participation requirements simply by knocking people off the rolls. Period. There is not one more dollar, in fact there are dollars less, for work to give States the ability to link welfare with work.

SSI, there is a potential of knocking 700,000 kids off the SSI rolls. There is some abuse in the program, but do not punish truly handicapped children because of the abuse of some families.

□ 1530

That is harsh. Foster care, we put a provision in the bill so you could not divert moneys from foster care to some other program and you delete that.

Legal immigrants, this bill takes billions and billions, about \$15 billion under some estimates, in terms of benefits from legal immigrants. There needs to be reform, but there does not need to be a drastic, drastic kind of measure here.

The bill that was presented by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], unlike the GOP bill, in my judgment has attempted to face these issues fairly and squarely. When it was urged that they fell short, their sponsors had an open mind, rather than a deaf ear. The Republicans, in contrast, have it backwards. Weak on work and tough on kids.

The only hope for a bipartisan response now is to set aside this bill and see if we can put together one that will truly put into effect workable welfare reform. We owe it to our constituents to do that. The bill before us miserably fails.

We Democrats stand ready to work with you. The problem is, you have been totally unwilling to work with us.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to commend my colleagues for working so hard to develop a welfare reform proposal which takes great steps in reforming the welfare system. I support H.R. 4 for many reasons.

One of the main reasons is that H.R. 4 reforms the welfare system by providing incentives that move people off welfare into work. Many States have already developed welfare to work programs that have experienced high success rates, my State of Illinois included.

In the 16th district of Illinois, which I represent, Project Prosper is enjoying fantastic success and job training and placement of their welfare recipients, and Project Prosper uses no Federal funds. Why? Because the developers of that project work day to day with the welfare recipients and are able to concentrate on individual needs of particular circumstances.

I stand firm with my colleagues here in Washington, my constituents back home and many people across the nation in my conviction that the States are in a much better position to create and operate welfare programs that best suit their constituencies. These local programs provide the necessary incentives that move the welfare recipients in the direction of financial independence.

The welfare reform debate continues, and it is important to keep in mind that since 1965, when it first began, the Federal program has spent a total of \$5 trillion. For cash welfare programs alone, the Federal Government has spent \$1.3 trillion; for medical programs, \$1.8 trillion; for food programs, \$545 billion; and for housing assistance, nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ trillion dollars. With all the money plowed into the programs, what do we have? The same poverty rate in 1966 as we do today, 14 percent.

We want to change the system, give children of this country an opportunity and incentive to enjoy the American dream, to get off the welfare system, to know what the free enterprise system is about. That is the purpose of H.R. 4, to imbue that sense of personal responsibility back into the welfare system.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], the ranking minority member on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and 5 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, if Attila the Hun were alive today and elected to Congress, he would be delighted with this bill that is before us today and proud to cast his vote for it. H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act is the most callous, coldhearted, and mean-spirited attack on this country's children that I have ever seen in my life.

You know, I cannot help but wonder how that could be? How people could be so insensitive to the needs of kids. Now, this bill is touted as welfare reform. It is intended to move Americans out of the welfare system. Well, if throwing children and low-income people in the streets is reforming the system, then I guess this bill succeeds at what it purports to do.

What the bill really succeeds in doing is something that is not discussed. It creates \$69.4 billion in savings to pay for tax cuts for the rich folk of this

country. That is what the Republicans are eager to do.

The first fundamental flaw of this bill is that H.R. 4 ignores the very basic reason that most Americans become welfare recipients and stay on welfare. They cannot find jobs. There are very few low-skill, entry-level jobs nowadays that pay a living wage, but instead of improving our job training program or increasing the minimum wage, or providing affordable child care or creating jobs or offering a possible alternative to poverty, this bill, which is a hatchet act, punishes Americans for being poor. This bill fails to create a single job and still creates a whole list of reasons to cut Americans and their kids off the welfare rolls.

This cut and slash bill guts our current system of a safety net for the needy by carrying a bad idea to the far extreme. It just wipes out the critical entitlement status of most of our current systems and replaces them with State block grants and Federal funds with no strings attached. Anybody in the State could do whatever they wanted to with these things. There are major problems with completely abolishing the Federal Government's most successful programs, such as the School Lunch Program, the Breakfast Program, the WIC Program and so forth, and putting them into State funds that are already inadequate or will be inadequate because they are already going to be cut and monitoring or establishing no kind of quality standards or no kind of monitoring standards by which the States can be held accountable.

Let us take the School Lunch Program. I mentioned earlier today that I had gone to the Henry Suder School in my district. In that school, 488 kids out of 501 are on the School Nutrition Program. I see some of my Members on the other side of the aisle laughing.

I ask this question, how many of them have ever been hungry? How many of them have ever known what it was not to have a meal? How many of them have ever known what it was not to have decent shoes, decent clothing, a nice place to live? I will bet most of them have had a nice room of their own, not shared with any brothers or sisters, maybe five or six, have always been able to get their shoes if they wanted, the clothing that they wanted, food that they needed, et cetera. They do not know about poverty.

So I challenge them to come to the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, in my district, and walk in the path of these children that they are cutting off on welfare. Walk in the path of the truly needy people who live by welfare because they have no other means by which to live. Not everybody stays on welfare eternally. We all know that. Some people do get off. Occasionally people get off of welfare because they do find a job, because they are able to get a GED, because they are

able to get their education. And it happens more than once. It happens time and time again.

There are some people, of course, who have been on welfare for a long period of time, but that is not the norm. And we all know it is not the norm, and why we stand here and say that it is does not make any sense at all to me.

Let me tell you, I have to wonder when I see young bright kids who have every opportunity to learn in this country but who are not able to do so because they live in hunger, because they live in poverty, because they have no real life, no real life, if you will, that we are accustomed to denied the opportunity to live to be full Americans because of their lifestyle, because of what they do not have, because of the things that are not given to them, because of the enrichment programs that we send our kids to but that they do not happen to have because they are poor and because they are on welfare. I dread to think of the time when a child of mine or yours, in fact, would be denied an opportunity to feed your grandchild or my grandchild or anybody else's because they have not been able to find a job, because they have been laid off from their job for a small period of time, a short time.

These are the things that we are talking about today. We are not talking about welfare forever. We are talking about welfare as a gap, a bridge, a bridge over troubled waters.

If you have never been there, do not knock it. You might drown.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, as to the gentlewoman's comments from the State of Florida, I take strong exception to her comments that there is laughter on this side of the aisle. While we may disagree with her point, her comments are taken with respect.

I rather suspect that her comment about laughter was probably written into her speech.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

(Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Republican welfare reform bill.

Our welfare system has failed us. Everybody agrees on that. Since President Johnson launched the War on Poverty in the 1960's, America has spend over \$5 trillion on welfare programs.

But, over the last 30 years, the poverty level has actually increased, and America's poor are no better off now than they were then.

When you spend \$5 trillion on anything, you are bound to get something back. And there have been some cases where people on welfare managed to climb out of poverty.

But, as a whole, the welfare system that we have now deserves nothing less

than a complete overhaul. It traps recipients in poverty, it denies them opportunity and it has directly contributed to the moral breakdown of the family.

It is time to end welfare as we know it.

Recent Federal attempts to reform welfare have gone absolutely nowhere. So the Republican welfare bill takes the logical step of giving more authority to the States so that they can shape effective programs that really work.

Everyone acknowledges that the States have taken the lead in proposing bold changes to welfare. The real innovation in welfare has been going on in the State capitals, not in Washington.

The Republican bill acknowledges this by taking away power from Washington bureaucrats and giving it to local officials who actually have to make assistance programs work on a day-to-day basis.

This is a practical solution to a practical problem.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress had their chance to reform welfare and did nothing. Talk about cruelty to children. In 1992, the President campaigned hard on a promise to end welfare as we know it. But it was not until last June that we finally saw his proposal, and then the Democratic Congress sat on it and every other welfare reform bill. It did nothing to change the status quo.

Now the Democrats are still talking a pretty good game, and in the next couple of days they are going to complain a lot about the Republican proposal.

But the fact is that it is the Republicans who are moving ahead and reforming welfare. If it was not for the Contract With America and the November 8th electoral earthquake, I am sure that we wouldn't be having this debate today.

The Members on the other side of the aisle had their chance on this issue and they dropped the ball. And now that they are behind the curve, they are resorting to distortions and false attacks like the bogus charge that the Republican welfare bill cuts funding to the Student Lunch Program.

By now, everyone on Capitol Hill should know that this bill *increases* funding for child nutrition programs by 4.5 percent per year for the next 5 years, and increases WIC spending by 3.8 percent per year over the same period.

But the cold, hard fact is that since Republicans have stepped up to the plate on welfare reform, the Democratic leadership's only response has been to respond with misleading, partisan attacks like the school lunch issue since they were unable to pass welfare reform when they had the chance.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to move past all of this and face the fact that the time for real welfare reform has come,

and that the Republican welfare bill is going to pass.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4 and to help end welfare as we know it.

□ 1545

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL].

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

First of all, I would like to thank the Committee on Rules on both sides of the aisle and their staff for allowing a substitute that I have proposed to be considered and hopefully we will have the opportunity to debate that and proceed with determining where we stand on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is somewhat ironic that we come here to discuss a system that we call well-fair. Recognizing that my comments are a play on the phonetic pronunciation of that word rather than its literal spelling, nevertheless I would suggest that it is a system which is neither well nor fair. It is not well in that it has placed actually a plague on our society that has condemned many generations to repeat and to fall into its prey. It is certainly not fair, in that it does not reward work. In many cases it does exactly the opposite. But I would concur with the comments of our colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], earlier today in which he said that we do not need to spend our time with rhetoric discussing the failures of the current system. I do not come here to justify the status quo. I come here to change it. Our efforts in this debate should be focused on how do we best change the current system to secure for ourselves and for our constituency the kind of system that is humane, the kind of system that rewards work, and a system that moves people out of this cycle of welfare.

I have offered as I indicated a substitute that is the work of many of my colleagues that has grown out over a 2-year period. We will propose this substitute and I would briefly like to address some of the areas that I think its strengths are embodied in it.

First of all is that we emphasize work. We think that work should pay. That the only true way to break welfare is to put people into work. But we recognize that for many mothers with dependent children that there are two critical ingredients that are presently disincentives that we need to change into incentives. First of all, they need child care. Second, they need to make sure that by going to work, most of which will be at low-paying jobs, that they do not lose health care coverage for their children. Our bill significantly addresses both of these.

First of all, CBO has estimated that if we truly wish to move people out of welfare and into work, that the cost for child care alone will be increased by

approximately \$6.2 billion. We provide the funding in our proposal for doing that. We also consolidate our child care programs into one particular and single program.

Second, we recognize that we need an additional year of transitional Medicaid so that these mothers will not lose all health care benefits for their children. We likewise recognize that if you are going to move into the work force, you must have training. We have a 2-year time period for a work first program. We make those programs truly tailored to the needs of citizens who are going to be trained to go into the work force. At the end of that 2-year period if an individual has not found a job in the private sector, States will have two options. One is a private voucher that can be taken to a private employer to be used if they hire a welfare recipient. Second is to place them in a community service program where they can likewise learn job skills and later move into the private sector market.

Another important distinction is that we think we can pay for a change of the welfare system within the welfare system itself and we do not need to reach outside into nutrition programs, and we do not.

We also in the process of doing this cut the programs by about \$25 billion within the welfare system. We spend \$15 billion of that making the changes for additional child care and additional training, with a net of approximately \$10 billion which will be used for deficit reduction, and our proposal will be the only plan that will apply the savings to deficit reduction.

As I said, we do not tamper with the children and elderly and WIC food programs. We think that they are working and that they are working well and do not need to be brought into this net. We do strengthen child support enforcement provisions. Currently it is estimated there are about \$48 billion in child support payments out there, only \$14 billion of which are actually collected. We have a very tough provision for a registry for enforcing child support. We likewise recognize that teen pregnancy is a big problem. We devote much of our attention to that. We think it is an issue that we should not mandate but give States the flexibility.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are demanding dramatic change in their welfare system. They know it is broken and they are calling upon us in the House of Representatives now and later in the Senate to fix it. Unfortunately, I do not think we are doing it in exactly the right way. I do not think it is dramatic enough and I do not

think there are enough changes in certain areas that we all know need changes.

The American people want people who are on welfare and can work to work. They want more responsibility for the individual. They definitely want to strengthen the family, and they want to protect children.

When I look at this bill that we are going to have in front of us by the majority, some of these things are being done, but some are very definitely not. I listened to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] asking us to listen to each other. We have a rule in front of us today that is only partial. There was something like 130 amendments upstairs at the Committee on Rules. I am convinced we can make some good changes. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], the chairman of the subcommittee that did welfare, accepted child support enforcement as part of welfare reform, and that was a very good move. So I would hope that before we finish we could accept amendments, that could make this a better bill. We need to improve the work section so that it helps people really go from welfare to work. We should accept amendments so we really protect children. To take away the minimum standards for safety, Federal standards for children is absolutely wrong. We know in our own States, every State, these systems are overburdened, we need this last safety net for abused children, Federal oversight. So I would hope that as we look at this bill now, as we talk about the rule, that as the day goes on, we have improvements we can all agree on.

When I say they are not dramatic, let me tell you block grants are not dramatic. What they do is take everything together, send it back to the States and say, "Now it's your problem." I think we can do better and I hope as the process goes on in the next couple of days we will.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very tired of hearing the Democrats talk about cruelty to children. I think we have got to get squared away on just where this debate is going.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that what I consider cruelty to children is that \$34 billion owed to these children by deadbeat parents, who have not paid up and who have not been checked in recent years. In this Republican welfare approach, we have taken a long, hard look at deadbeat dads and moms and how to get those \$34 billion back into the system because that is \$34 billion that could be used to keep these children out of the welfare cycle, out of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, of that amount, \$11 billion leaves the system as deadbeat parents leave the State to evade their re-

sponsibility. What they end up doing not only is not supporting their children but also with their irresponsibility requiring that these kids stay on welfare. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but they also end up requiring that the Government take responsibility as the parent for these children.

I support this rule because I think we need to have open debate on this issue. Title VII is the child support enforcement part of this bill. The plan that we have put before the Congress and will be debating in the next few weeks requires a Federal parent locator service to be set up at the Federal level that will allow the States to access information and locate where those parents are to make them pay up. I think it is very responsible, Mr. Speaker. A lot of the information in this title VII has come from work between the parties. So this can be our bipartisan core of this bill that we all agree on to force these parents who have given up all responsibility for their supporting their flesh and blood children to get back in the system and keep these kids off welfare. That to me, the ultimate cruelty is something we can take care of in supporting this bill this week.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN].

(Mrs. LINCOLN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, today we will prove to Arkansans and to all Americans that we have heard their frustrations and are finally prepared to take action on welfare reform. Since I came to Congress in 1993, I have talked almost daily with constituents who are tired of sending their tax dollars to Washington to give people something for nothing. I join the people of the First District of Arkansas today in enthusiastically saying, "It's about time for welfare reform."

It has all been said, just everyone has not said it, but I will say it again here today. Welfare was intended to be a safety net for widows and children, but it has become a hammock that has encouraged laziness and idleness. Less than 12 percent of the people who receive welfare benefits today are actually working and that is why we focus our intentions on work.

We have been paying the other 88 percent to sit at home and watch their mailboxes. The Federal Government has been making bigger promises than Publishers Clearinghouse. But after this debate ends and the votes are counted, I am confident that the House of Representatives will have sent a message to their home districts, "No more something for nothing."

Over the next few days, we will talk about several proposals for changing our welfare system. I challenge all of my colleagues to look beyond their party identification and listen closely to the merits of each plan, to check their party affiliations at the door and

look to program reform that is both realistic and puts principles and values back into our families.

The Deal substitute, which I helped to write and cosponsor, puts more people to work than the current system, while making it possible for people to find a job and stay in it. We offer more job training and more child care than the status quo, and for the first time we set a lifetime limit of 2 years on welfare.

Your choices are simple, if you look beyond party lines. Put more people to work in less time, or put fewer people to work over more years. Put these options with another favorite theme, greater State flexibility, and you have an even easier choice.

The substitute that will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], myself, and other conservative Democrats allows States to tailor welfare to fit their needs. We give States the option of denying benefits to teenage mothers, we let the States decide whether to continue giving more money to mothers who have more children while on welfare. We also let States decide whether they want to keep people in welfare programs for a additional 2 years under community service. And we give them the option of recycling a few needy people back into the welfare rolls after their time limit has expired.

We are also the only plan that dedicates the moneys that we save to deficit reduction. You will hear more about our plan and the differences between the Deal substitute and the other welfare reform plans that are offered. I encourage you to think of your constituents before your party identification and to look at the reality of our plan and what it does for the future not only for us, for this country but for our children and our children's children.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time remaining to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. DOOLITTLE). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debate from this side of the aisle, you would think that one of the words that really sticks in my head was one of the speakers, the gentlewoman from Illinois, for whom I have a great deal of respect, referred to our idea as something having to do with Attila the Hun. I hear the gentleman from Tennessee refer to us as mean. And I hear the other speakers refer to us as being tough on children and weak on work.

I would notice, however, a resounding silence in this Hall when it comes to anybody defending the system that we have today, defending the system that we were unable and unwilling to change while the Democrats controlled this body.

You look back at some of the good welfare proposals that have come down the pike, some that really helped. Take the earned income tax credit. That was a Republican proposal. Take the child care that has been put in place. And remember the great fight that we had with the committee, and we worked together on that particular bill. That was bipartisan in nature, and it was signed into law by a Republican President.

Now the time has come to change the balance of the program, to change, truly change welfare as we know it today. For the Republicans to carry forward, to fulfill the 1992 platform pledge of the Democrat Party.

□ 1600

This is the Republicans carrying through on the pledge of the Democrats because of the Democrats' failure to do this. We are going to, I hope and pray that we do pass a welfare bill, that we get rid of the cruelest system that has ever been known.

The cruelest system that is out here on the floor is existing law and we must change it, we must work together, we must move this process forward.

We have worked long and hard on the Republican side in order to change welfare. The bill of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], which will I understand be offered as a substitute sometime later this week, that bill itself comes a long way from where the Democrat party was just a few short months ago when we could not get a bill to the floor, when we could not reform welfare.

A few short months ago in the last years when the Democrats were in charge, we would have been glad to come forward and work on a bill such as that. But I tell all of my colleagues to read it carefully; come in with specifics. The Republican bill is weak on work? Read the Deal bill. The Republican bill is the bill that stands for work. It stands for real reform and it stands for the empowerment of people.

Let us break the chains of slavery that we have created with welfare in this country and let us work together for a better America.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, does the rule we have just adopted make in order general debate on H.R. 4 or H.R. 1214?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule makes in order debate on H.R. 4.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the committees of jurisdiction reported out three other bills, none of which is before the House today. Am I correct that H.R. 4 has not been reported out by any committee of jurisdiction?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, continuing that inquiry, is it true that the Budget Act points of order which are designed to assure that the budget rules we established for ourselves are adhered to apply only to measures that have been reported by the committee of jurisdiction?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair observes that sections 302, 303, 311, 401, and 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 all establish points of order against the consideration of bills or joint resolutions as reported. That is, in each case the point of order against consideration operates with respect to the bill or joint resolution in its reported state. Thus, in the case of an unreported bill or joint resolution, such a point of order against consideration is inoperative.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we had followed the regular order and reported either H.R. 4 or H.R. 1214 from the committees of jurisdiction, several points of order would have applied. To get around those rules, the majority has instead put before the House an unreported bill making it impossible for those of us who believe the House should be bound by the rules it sets for itself to exercise those rights.

Mr. MCINNIS. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House has just adopted House Resolution 117.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. It is my understanding that we went around the rules because we did not follow the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCINNIS. A point of order, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was a parliamentary inquiry, not a speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995.