

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has concluded its legislative business for the week.

We will meet on Monday, July 22, at 10:30 a.m. for Morning Hour, and 12 noon for legislative business. Members should note that the House will postpone any recorded votes until 5 p.m. On Monday the House will first consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules before turning to the District of Columbia Appropriations Act. Mr. Speaker, I will not read through the list of suspensions now, but a complete schedule will be distributed to all offices.

On Tuesday, July 23, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for Morning Hour, and 10 a.m. for legislative business. We hope to consider the following measures: H.R. 2779, the Soft Metric Conversion Act, on the Corrections Day Calendar; H.R. 3564, the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act, as a suspension; and H.R. 3814, the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill, which will be taken up under an open rule.

For Wednesday, July 24, and the balance of the week the House will consider the following bills: H.R. 3814, the Energy and Water appropriations bill, under an open rule; H.R. 3760, the Campaign Finance Reform Act, under a modified closed rule; and H.R. 2391, the Compensatory Time for All Workers Act, which will be granted a rule next week.

Due to the full agenda next week, we may have to work later on Tuesday and Wednesday nights. However, we will finish legislative business by 2 p.m. on Friday, July 26.

I would also like to remind the Members that on Thursday, July 25, the annual congressional baseball game will be held, and I believe we can finish the votes that night in time for batting practice.

It is my personal hope that the Republicans' stellar one-game winning streak can be extended, although I understand that the Democrats have gotten themselves an unusually good left field this year and that may cause us a problem.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that having just come from practice today, I can assure the gentleman that the Democrats are very strong up the middle, and I would also say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, on the way to practice this morning I went by the field that the Republicans were practicing on and I noticed everybody shagging fly balls along the right field line, so we are looking forward to the game, and we are pleased that we will be out on time to enjoy that evening next Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, I have a comment or a question to raise to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He mentioned late nights next week on Tues-

day and Wednesday, I believe. How late is the gentleman anticipating that we might be those evenings?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would say to the gentleman that we are going to proceed under open rules on the appropriations bills. I think the Members could expect that it could go until 9, 10, or 11 o'clock on those two evenings.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman for that information.

How about Friday? Are we certain to have votes on Friday, and if so, does the gentleman anticipate a certain specific bill coming up on Friday?

Mr. WALKER. We have a very full legislative calendar. If we could get through some of this expeditiously and complete the schedule, including not only the appropriations bill but the compensatory time bill and some of those, it is possible, this gentleman would love to think personally that it could take place that we would not have a session on Friday, but we would intend to complete the schedule, and I think now Members should plan on a Friday session being over by 2 o'clock.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we were all very disappointed to see that virtually all of the items on reform week were pulled from the schedule this week. We hate for all of these reform measures to die in this Congress. Is the gentleman sure we are going to deal with campaign reform next week?

Mr. WALKER. That is certainly our intention. We believe it will be up on Wednesday if the time for the appropriation bills allows that. If not, it would probably come on Thursday.

Mr. BONIOR. Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and to others on the other side of the aisle who may want to comment on this, Members on this side of the aisle and the public in general have been reading conflicting reports from the Republican leadership about the continuing resolution and a possible early adjournment date in this Congress.

On the one hand we are hearing that. On the other hand, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], has said that we have more than 85 more bills to finish before we adjourn in this Congress.

We have so much unfinished business, including all the appropriations bills, the health care reform bill, the minimum wage bill, the welfare reform bill that we passed today that has to be processed, and so many others, we are on our side very concerned that it appears that Congress will fail to pass the regular appropriation bills again this year, and that we may have to consider another continuing resolution.

Can the gentleman advise us over here what the possibilities are of another CR, and when in fact that might happen?

Mr. WALKER. We will complete our appropriation bills in the House next

week. Of course, we cannot predict what the gridlock in the Senate may produce in terms of bills reported from there, but it is certainly our intention to complete as many of the appropriation bills as possible, if not all of them, before the House adjourns.

The gentleman is correct that this House does have much other business to be done, and it seems to me that we are going to want to complete our work before settling on an adjournment date.

Mr. BONIOR. That is good to hear. I thank my colleague for his comments. We will look forward to finishing our business before we leave this Congress.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 22, 1996

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 491 of the Higher Education Act, as amended by section 407 of Public Law 99-498, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance on the part of the House: Mr. Thomas E. Dillon of California and Mr. William A. Irwin of Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

□ 1645

MODIFICATION IN APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON of Texas). Pursuant to clause 6 of rule X without objection, the Chair announces the following modification to the conference appointment to the bill H.R. 3230: Delete section 724 of the Senate amendment from the panel appointed from the Committee on Commerce.

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 conference.

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 gentleman 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 gentleman 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