

work on this bill. Representative FRELINGHUYSEN has done an excellent job in ensuring our State's needs were addressed in this bill, and I look forward to working with him on these issues in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "aye" on H.R. 3861.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3814, the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations for the upcoming year. This bill is particularly important among the measures we consider each year, because it funds what more and more Americans identify as their top priority: fighting time.

This bill increases funding for the Justice Department at a time when hard choices have been made across the board. Nevertheless, we've committed to funding Law Enforcement Block Grants, which will help local public safety officials develop the kinds of programs they most need to prevent crimes and to solve them when they do happen.

We've also fully funded the popular Community Oriented Policing Service [COPS] program. In my own community of Milwaukee and its metropolitan region, this program has had a significant impact, enabling us to hire 30 new police officers this year, and 500 statewide since the program began in 1994. This is something tangible that has a real impact on the cities and towns that we represent, and I am happy that the COPS program continues to receive congressional support.

I think the American people will also be happy that we've funded the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund that was included in last year's anti-crime bill. In addition, the Violence Against Women grants will receive a boost—helping stem domestic violence and strengthening police effectiveness in dealing with this national scourge.

I'm pleased that the Congress was able to restore some of the funding for the Legal Services Corporation, which provides our Nation's poor and badly needed legal service. While the funding level is lower than last year, it will allow the Legal Services Corporation to fulfill its important mission.

There is, however, much to support in this bill. I commend the committee for reporting strong legislation.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 3816, the fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

As you may know, part of my district lies along New York's Atlantic Coast. Like coastal areas in many parts of the country, the barrier islands along the coast in my district have been hit extremely hard by the storms of the past few winters and remain in a delicate state, vulnerable to breaches and overwashes from future storms which could be devastating to the mainland of Long Island.

The barrier islands protect Long Island in the same manner that the levees on the Mississippi River protect the river towns. A vulnerable barrier island system cannot protect Long Island's south shore, which has a multibillion dollar economy and significant public infrastructure. The barriers afford protection to the freshwater wetlands and waters of the back bays, thus nurturing the clamming and fishing industries. Furthermore, Fire Island, Jones Island, Long Beach Island and the rest of Long Island's barrier system provide recreation for the citizens of Long Island and tourists from all over the world. As the tourism industry is the largest employer on Long Island, loss of this

vital resource will mean loss of jobs. Long Island's rich commercial and recreational fishing heritage would also be affected if these barrier islands are threatened.

While the President's budget recommends that the Army Corps of Engineers get out of the business of local flood and shore protection, I believe the Army Corps has a cost-effective and justifiable role in these projects. Savings can surely be made in the way the Corps carries out its mission. But the mission itself is vital to the Nation's coastal communities, and it is not one that can be transferred to State or local governments. From the commercial fishermen to the seaside merchants, the engine that drives our economy, small business, relies on the protection afforded by these Army Corps projects. The shoreline protection projects in which the Corps are involved are vitally important to the livelihood of the communities they protect and will save taxpayers money in the long run.

The first project funded by this bill would provide New York with accurate, real-time information on its coastal processes. Many coastal States already have monitoring systems in place, and such a system is essential for New York. A federally funded monitoring system was authorized for New York in the 1992 Water Resources Development Act, and appropriations have been made over the past 2 years to initiate its implementation.

As the authorization states, successful implementation will take \$1.4 million for up to 5 years, at which time the State of New York will take over funding and program implementation. The fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill also allocates this amount.

The second project in the bill, the reformulation study of the area from Montauk Point to the Fire Island Inlet, will provide valuable long-term information on the coastal processes of Long Island's south shore. It is expected to take approximately 10 years and \$14 million to complete. Over the past 3 fiscal years, over \$7 million has been appropriated by this committee for the reformulation study. This has provided important information and will lay the groundwork for possible interim projects needed to shore up Long Island's coastline. The fiscal year 1997 segment of the study will cost \$2.5 million, and this amount was included in H.R. 3816.

The third project in the bill will assist with navigation as well as coastal protection. The area involved, Fire Island Inlet, is the channel between Robert Moses and Jones Beach State Parks. This biannual dredging project, last completed in 1995, is essential to not only allowing marine traffic to flow smoothly between these barrier islands, but will also help nourish Gilgo Beach by depositing the dredged sand on this beach which will help prevent further erosion to this area. These two beaches provide the only line of protection for the State's Ocean Parkway, which runs along the south shore of Long Island and is an alternative route to the heavily traveled roads of the mainland. The fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill allocates \$5.3 million for this project.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I understand the fiscal constraints we face. I agree that every expenditure must pass stringent economic tests, and I am confident that, upon examination, expenditures for these projects will pass such tests. The importance

of the waterways and the barrier islands to homes and businesses on Long Island and New York cannot be overstated. As history has shown us, the establishment of protective measures now will save the Federal, State, and local government millions of dollars in the long term. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) having assumed the chair, Mr. OXLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 38916) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3734, WELFARE AND MEDICAL AID REFORM ACT OF 1996

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3734), to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the House of Representatives and the Senate on H.R. 3734 be instructed to do everything possible within the scope of the conference to—

(1) eliminate any provisions in the House and Senate bills which shift costs to states and local governments and result in an increase in the number of children in poverty;

(2) maximize the availability of Food Stamps and vouchers for goods and services for children to prevent any increase in the number of children thrown into poverty while their parents make the transition from welfare to work;

(3) ensure that the bill preserves Medicaid coverage so that the number of people without access to health care does not increase and more children and old people are not driven into poverty; and

(4) provide that any savings that redound to the Federal Government as a result of this legislation be used for deficit reduction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XXVIII, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will control 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that we must make needed changes to our welfare system to make it more efficient and fair for the American people. In doing so, we should emphasize personal responsibility, and we should honor work. But we should not shred the entire safety net in the process.

It would be unconscionable of this Congress to, in the name of reform, pass a welfare bill that drives millions of children into poverty. It would be equally irresponsible to simply push Federal welfare responsibilities off on State and local governments which may or may not have the resources to care for those truly in need. That is why I am offering this motion to instruct conferees today.

House conferees should use this opportunity to negotiate with the Senate and with the President to ensure that millions of children are not pushed into poverty because of the welfare changes enacted by this Congress. We should also ensure that we do not overwhelm the ability of States and localities to deliver needed welfare services. We must reform our welfare system, but we must not do it in a fashion that increases child poverty or increases the burden on State and local government.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it should be clear that any savings that result from this legislation should go for deficit reduction, not for other purposes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great interest the motions to instruct. I might say, as to each one of these items, in crafting the welfare bill, we had these objectives in mind. Therefore, I find it would be most difficult to oppose the motions to instruct because I think that is exactly what we intend to keep uppermost in our minds.

I think it is necessary to see this as to how we view welfare reform. We view this as giving a path and a way for people to get out of poverty. We know that the present system does not work. We know that people have been paid to stay in a way of life which is self-destructive and which has totally done away with a future for these people.

Unfortunately, the poor victims of this current system, which has been held in place for so many years, are the children. We know that the children of welfare parents are going to, in all probability, and statistics prove these to be correct, are more likely to be poor themselves. They are more likely to fail in school or drop out of school. They are more likely to have trouble and get in trouble with the law. It is a self-destructive behavior.

Mr. Speaker, I think the difference in defending the existing system, to defend the existing system is simply to make somebody comfortable while they are living in poverty. That is not the way. That is destructive of the human spirit. The new way, the way of

welfare reform is going to go to the root of poverty. The root of poverty is joblessness.

We have now found that in the inner cities of this country we have piled generation upon generation of people who otherwise would, as their ancestors were, be productive. It is important to remember that these people who are the descendants, who are on welfare, many of them are descendants of people who struggled their whole lives, who went to the cities for a better way of life, and now find that when the jobs went away, they were paid to stay there and do absolutely nothing.

The answer to welfare reform very clearly is to get people out of poverty, to get them jobs, to give them incentives, to give them child care, which we do, to give the States greater flexibility in order to craft these programs, the welfare programs, in order to help the people. We are at last going to be measured by the number of people we get out of poverty, not the number of people that we pay while they are in poverty. We are going to give the bureaucrats a vested interest in the solution to poverty, not the question of just how many people they keep in welfare.

This is a new day. I think yesterday we saw the action that was taken by the other body as a quantum leap forward in bipartisan cooperation. I can say that I am looking forward to a bipartisan solution in this body also.

We had 30 Democrat Members who crossed over and voted with the Republicans just last week on welfare reform. I am looking forward to increasing that number, and I would like to almost rival the Senate in getting as many of the minority party as I possibly can to vote with us on the final passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is not one Member of this Congress that is willing to get up and defend the status quo. Why? Because we all want a better life for the people of this country. I can say, again, that the four objectives that are set forth in the motion to instruct, unless somebody jumps up and says that there is something in here that I do not see, that there are some fishhooks that I do not anticipate, I would suggest that perhaps the Members vote yes on the motion to instruct that sets forth a general path toward getting people out of poverty. I believe it is a constructive motion to the conferees at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me the time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of motion to instruct the conferees in exactly the same spirit the gentleman from Florida has just spoken with. I believe when we carefully analyze this amendment, in the spirit in which was indicated support for, we will find that this motion ensures that welfare reform will not shift costs to State and local governments, which I

know the gentleman from Florida agrees to.

The National Governors Association, the National Council of State Legislatures, the National Association of Counties, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National League of Cities all have said the bill passed by the House places unfunded mandates on State and local governments and restricts the flexibility to administer welfare programs in their communities.

I am submitting for the RECORD a letter from each of the latter three organizations. Members will find that the Senate has made marginal improvements. The conferees can, if allowed to do our work, make it much better in the spirit of this motion to instruct.

I was particularly concerned to learn that the bills passed by the House and Senate would conflict with the reform initiatives being implemented by Texas, my State, and others States across the country. State legislators and Governors developed proposals after consulting with welfare field offices studying local job markets, evaluating the cost of implementing reforms, and deciding how best to protect children and other vulnerable populations.

The bill as passed by the House does exactly what the majority party generally rails against: That is, having Washington dictate to the States a one-size-fits-all solution. In the spirit of this instruction, we can work that out in conference and have a much better bill.

The bill would force many States either to apply for waivers from the mandates, make significant changes in the plans currently being implemented, or face penalties from the Federal Government.

The second key principle in this motion is protecting children. Again, I would encourage my colleagues to listen to what the States decided must be done to protect children. For example, the welfare reform proposal now being implemented in Texas continues benefits for children after their parents reach a time limit.

Several other States have followed Texas' lead in protecting children from the impact of time limits. Unfortunately, the bill passed by the House substitutes the views of Members of Congress in Washington for the judgments of State officials on how best to provide for children in their States by explicitly prohibiting States from using block grant funds to protect innocent children from being harmed because of the mistakes of their parents. If these provisions in the bill passed by the House become law, Texas and other States will be required to change their plan to apply time limits to children. If you believe that State and local officials know better than Washington how to provide for the needs of low-income children in their communities, you should support the motion to recommit.

Third, the motion to instruct provides that no one should lose health coverage as a result of welfare reform. I was pleased that both the House and Senate adopted amendments preserving current eligibility rules for Medicaid

coverage. However, I am concerned about reports that this provision may be dropped in conference. I hope that Chairman SHAW can assure me and other members concerned about this issue that current Medicaid eligibility rules will be preserved by the conference committee.

I am also concerned about the impact that denying Medicaid to noncitizens will have on the health care system. The bill passed by the House will effectively deny Medicaid to thousands of individuals, removing \$7 billion of Medicaid assistance from the health care system. However, health care providers will continue to be morally and legally obligated to provide care to these individuals, resulting in a cost shift to health care providers that will affect the cost, availability, and quality of care to everyone in Texas and other States with large immigrant populations.

In closing, I would say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that this motion reflects a continuation of the spirit of trying to break through partisanship to find a commonsense middle ground position on welfare reform. All members who voted for the Castle-Tanner substitute—and all Members who agreed with the principles of the Castle-Tanner substitute but who voted against it for whatever reason—should vote for the motion to instruct. I urge a “yea” vote on the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following letters:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,
Washington, DC, July 12, 1996.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: You may be voting soon on the Welfare and Medicaid reform bill (H.R. 3507/S. 1795). The National Association of Counties (NACo) is encouraged that there were improvements to the welfare section of the bill, including: increased funds for child care; maintaining current law for foster care adoption assistance maintenance and administration payments; and no funding cap for food stamps nor a block grant for child nutrition. However, there are not enough improvements to warrant our support. In some respect, particularly the work requirements, the bill has become even more burdensome. NACo particularly opposes the following welfare provisions:

1. The bill ends the entitlement of Aid to Families with Dependent Children, thereby dismantling the safety net for children and their families.

2. The eligibility restriction for legal immigrants goes too far. The most objectionable provisions include denying Supplemental Security Income and Food Stamps, particularly to older immigrants. In fact, by changing the implementation date for these provisions, the bill has become more onerous. NACo is also very concerned about the effect of the deeming requirements particularly with regard to Medicaid and children in need of protective services.

3. The participation requirements have become even more unrealistic. NACo particularly opposes the increased work participation rates and increased penalties, the changes in the hours of work required, and the new restrictions on the activities that may count toward the participation rates.

As the level of government closest to the people, local elected officials understand the importance of reforming the welfare system. While NACo is glad that the bill does contain language that requires some consultation with local officials we prefer the stronger language that is contained in the bipartisan welfare reform bill (H.R. 3266).

NACo also continues to oppose the Medicaid provisions. By capping the fiscal responsibility of the federal government and reduc-

ing the state match for the majority of the states, the bill could potentially shift billions of dollars to counties with responsibility for the uninsured. Allowing the states to determine the amount, duration and scope of services even for the remaining populations which would still be guaranteed coverage, will mean that counties will be ultimately responsible for services not covered adequately by the states. While we support the increased use of managed care and additional state and local flexibility in operating the Medicaid program, we do not support the repeal of Medicaid as envisioned in the current legislation.

As it is currently written, the Medicaid and Welfare Reform bill could potentially shift costs and liabilities, create new unfunded mandates upon local governments, and penalize low income families. Such a bill, in combination with federal cuts and increased demands for services, will leave local governments with two options: cut other essential services, such as law enforcement, or raise revenues. NACo therefore urges you to vote against H.R. 3507/S. 1795.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS R. BOVIN, President.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
Washington, DC, July 18, 1996.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the over 135,000 local elected officials the National League of Cities represents, we are writing to urge you to oppose the Welfare and Budget Reconciliation legislation (H.R. 3734) being considered on the floor this week. As it is currently written, the Welfare and Budget Reconciliation bill would cut federal investments in families and children, shift costs and liabilities, create new unfunded mandates upon local governments, and penalize low-income families.

While we find it encouraging that this welfare bill has some improvements such as increased funds for child care, a larger contingency fund and smaller reductions in SSI benefits for low-income disabled children, is still does not merit our support. In some instances, particularly the stringent work requirements, the bill has become even more harsh. NLC is especially opposed to the following provisions:

1. The bill ends the entitlement of Aid to Families with Dependent Children, thereby dismantling the safety net for children and their families.

2. The eligibility restrictions for legal immigrants goes too far. The most objectionable provisions include denying SSI benefits and food stamps to immigrants, especially older immigrants. These provisions will shift substantial costs onto local governments. Local governments cannot and should not be the safety net for federal policy decisions regarding immigration.

3. The participation requirements have become even more unrealistic. NLC is particularly opposed to the increased work participation rates, the increased penalties, the changes in hours of work required, and the new restrictions on the activities that may count toward the participation rates. Instead of providing more local flexibility, the bill moves in the direction of ever greater unfunded federal mandates.

As the level of government closest to the people, local elected officials understand the importance of reforming the welfare system. While NLC is happy to see that the bill does contain language that requires some consultation with local officials, we prefer the stronger language that is contained in the bipartisan welfare reform bill (H.R. 3266).

We believe that this budget legislation will sharply reduce resources in cities for families and children. It proposes a whole new chapter of unfunded federal mandates. Fi-

nally, the shift of liabilities to local governments will leave local governments with two options: cut other essential services, such as law enforcement, or raise revenues. NLC, therefore, urges you to vote against this bill.

Sincerely,

GREGORY S. LASHUTKA,
President.

THE UNITED STATES
CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
Washington, DC, July 17, 1996.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The U.S. Conference of Mayors has long advocated reform of the current welfare system which would change it from a system of dependency to one of work and self-sufficiency. We would like to see welfare reform enacted this year—reform that would be good for our nation, good for our cities and, most important, good for recipients.

We have, however, serious concerns with the welfare reform legislation now moving through Congress. Our primary concern is that the legislation will harm children, increasing the poverty rate among children and making many children who are currently poor even poorer.

The Conference of Mayors has a substantial body of adopted policy on welfare reform. Our basic principles for welfare reform are: the availability of jobs which pay an adequate wage, health care coverage and child care; provisions which encourage fathers to assume responsibility for providing both financial and emotional support to their children; welfare benefits sufficient to maintain a standard of living compatible with health and well-being, and which remain available for a period of time determined by the client's need rather than an arbitrary time limit; a system based on incentives rather than punitive measures.

While HR 3507 represents an improvement over HR 4, with increased funding for child care, maintenance of the entitlement nature of foster care and adoption assistance, and maintenance of the current mix of child nutrition programs, the bill does not meet the principles for welfare reform which we have set. Unless these concerns are addressed, The U.S. Conference of Mayors must urge you to vote against HR 3507.

Sincerely,

CARDELL COOPER,
Chair, Health and Human Services Committee.
RICHARD M. DALEY,
President.

H.R. 3734 RESTRICTS STATE FLEXIBILITY TO IMPLEMENT WELFARE REFORM INITIATIVES

While Congress has been debating welfare reform, states have begun to implement aggressive welfare reform initiatives through the waiver process. These innovative state plans requires greater personal responsibility, place work requirements on welfare recipients and set time limits on benefits. State legislatures and governors developed proposals after consulting with welfare field offices, studying local job markets, evaluating the costs of implementing reforms and deciding how to best protect children and other vulnerable populations. State officials were able to develop welfare reform initiatives that were tailored to the conditions in their states so that the programs would be practical and successful in moving welfare recipients in the state into work. These state plans reflected the views of citizens of their states.

The welfare reform bill passed by the House and Senate would conflict with many of the reform initiatives being implemented by states across the country. The bill overrules the judgement of state officials about what is practical and realistic in work programs by mandating work rules which are

much more severe than most states have established. The work requirements mandated by the bill are more severe than most states believed they could afford or successfully implement. In addition, the bill would prohibit several states from continuing provisions protecting children from the impact of time limits on benefits. Although the bill is intended to give states flexibility to implement welfare reform plans without the need for federal waivers, the bill would force many states to either apply for waivers from the mandates in the bill, make significant changes in the plans currently being implemented (absorbing additional costs to meet federal mandates while federal funding is being frozen), or face penalties from the federal government.

Among the states that are implementing welfare reform initiatives that would not comply with the mandates in H.R. 3734 as passed by the House:

Connecticut: Welfare recipients would be required to work a minimum of 15 hours a week after two years of assistance, 25 hours after three years and 35 hours after four years. The Connecticut program would fail to meet the work requirements mandated in H.R. 3734 because most individuals working under the state plan would not be counted under the rules established in H.R. 3734. Connecticut imposes a time limit for a portion of the caseload that applies only to employable adults. Under H.R. 3734, Connecticut would be required to apply the time limit to children as well.

Delaware: Private contractors are paid for placing welfare recipients in private sector jobs of at least 20 hours a week, recognizing the nature of opportunities in the labor market for unskilled applicants. H.R. 3734 would not count individuals placed in private sector jobs of 20 hours a week as meeting work requirements.

Georgia: Georgia applies a work requirement in ten counties that require recipients to work up to 20 hours per month at an assigned in local, state or Federal government or at a non-profit agency. The Georgia plan does not meet the mandates regarding either the hours of work required or the percentage of the caseload that must be working. The Georgia plan provides that benefits to children are not affected by the plan. H.R. 3734 would require Georgia to amend its plan to eliminate benefits for children after the five year time limit.

Hawaii: The state plan places job-ready recipients in part-time private sector jobs of up to 18 hours a week. These jobs would not comply with the mandates in H.R. 3734.

Indiana: The Indiana plan applies the time limit on benefits to adult benefits only. H.R. 3734 would require Indiana to amend its plan to apply the time limit to children as well as adults.

Iowa: Under the state plan, caseworkers are given latitude to set forth a work plan for recipients based on individual circumstances, including the individual's work history, education level, etc. and environmental barriers such as transportation, child care and the local job market. The work requirements in the individual agreements range from 20 to 45 hours a week. The work requirements mandated in H.R. 3734 would severely restrict the ability of caseworkers in Iowa to set work requirements based on individual circumstances.

Missouri: The Missouri plan applies the time limit on benefits to adults only. H.R. 3734 would require Missouri to amend its plan to apply the time limit to children as well as adults.

Montana: The Montana plan requires recipients to perform 20 hours of community service per week after receiving two years of benefits. This work requirement would not

meet the mandate in H.R. 3734. The Montana plan does not apply the time limit to children's benefits, as H.R. 3734 would require.

Oklahoma: Recipients in six counties who are not able to find a job after receiving benefits for three years are required to work at least 24 hours a week in a subsidized job. The Oklahoma plan does not meet the mandates regarding either the hours of work required or the percentage of the caseload that must be working.

Rhode Island: The bipartisan welfare reform proposal being considered in the Rhode Island General Assembly with the support of the Governor would exempt children's benefits from the time limit. H.R. 3734 would require Rhode Island to change its plan before it could be implemented.

Tennessee: The Tennessee welfare waiver request would require welfare recipients to work 25 hours a week, which would not meet the mandates in H.R. 3734.

Texas: The Texas plan requires individuals who are unable to obtain private sector employment of 30 hours week to participate in work activities under the JOBS program of 20 hours a week. The Texas plan is extremely unlikely to meet the mandates in H.R. 3734. The Texas plan continues benefits for children after the time limit, which H.R. 3734 would prohibit.

The list above is only a partial list of states that do not meet the mandates in H.R. 3734. Several states not listed above are in the process of developing programs that would not meet the mandates in the bill. Many other states have welfare reform initiatives that do not address the issues of work requirements and time limits mandated in the bill. Finally, virtually all states that are implementing work requirements have limited the work requirements to targeted segments of the caseload which fall far short of the participation rates mandated by the bill.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

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

I also have looked at the motion to instruct and do not find anything too objectionable in it, as well. When we look at the costs, I know it mentions the costs that have been put on State and local governments, that they are concerned that costs will be shifted there. What our bill tries to do is give States more flexibility to design and implement a welfare program that will free up resources because, clearly, the kind of welfare system we have had for the last 30 years has been overly restrictive. Just look at the number of waivers States have applied for, which has been a long, difficult, bureaucratic process. Some I think have recently been granted for Tennessee, or that announcement will be made very soon.

Even the Federal Government recognizes, the administration recognizes that the current system has not done the job. The whole purpose of our bill is to try to ease that. The purpose of doing that, of course, is to help lift children from poverty. I think if we look at the last 30 years, the war on poverty has not been won, and it is very, very important that we do better at that.

I think the bipartisan nature of this bill that came out of the Senate, half the Democrat Senators supported the

welfare bill. I think it is a very good, strong signal that the kind of bill we are going to design will be a very positive change, one that has been needed for a very, very long time.

□ 1730

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as we head toward the third conference on welfare reform, I hope that this time everybody gets it right and focuses on the children who need to be protected, rather than the political gains to be made. We have actually come very far over the past year, and the bill making its way to the conference is a little bit fairer and more reasonable than the first one.

But there are still loopholes. In other bills, loopholes mean a loss of revenue or a tax shelter. In this bill, a loophole means thousands of starving children.

Here are the holes in the conference that must close. First, in the House bill, children are penalized for their parents' mistakes. If a parent is irresponsible and does not get a job within the time limit, kids get cut off, too. Nobody wants starving children in dirty diapers. That is not welfare reform, but it is what will happen unless the loopholes are closed, with vouchers for kids.

Second, the House bill contained underfunded optional block grants for food stamps. The Senate was wise to recognize that these block grants will be attractive to States, but dangerous for children. When the money runs out, and it will for many States, there will be no money for hungry families. For example, what happens when companies downsize or a recession hits? Families that worked hard, but struggled from paycheck to paycheck, will look to us to help feed their children, and we will have to turn them away. The Senate recognized this problem and we should support their amendment to eliminate the optional block grants.

Like everyone else in this body, I want to see welfare reform, not status quo, signed into law this year. But in doing so, let us be guided by the words of Hubert Humphrey, who considered the moral test of government to be how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children. If we, the most plentiful Nation on Earth, bring harm to our children by passing the wrong welfare reform, we will have failed this test.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the State of Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Sabo amendment, because it does clarify a number of issues that are important for the conference to focus on. I personally worked very, very hard on the Medicaid provisions, and we need to assure

that they are strong and will provide the kind of health care that children need.

I personally feel that one of the important things for the conference, though, is not to be bound by the old thinking. When I hear the preceding speaker talk about children after the 5 years, I do not feel that she really sees what the impact of this plan is going to be. There are just so many opportunities from day 1 to provide day care, to get into job training, to use those day care dollars so effectively that women work in day care centers half the day and then they are in job training half the day, and from the very beginning, day 1, the whole family comes together to the family center and everybody begins growing, changing their future. So, I think there is enormous opportunity here.

Michigan has done a great job with kinship groups. If you see you are going to have trouble, you can bring kinship groups into it, and the whole family, the larger family, needs to have the role here, have a role in planning the solution for this family. So, we need to be sure to be creative and not to cut off the kinds of initiatives that are going to develop.

We do have that 20 percent protection. I agree, we do not want any children disadvantaged by this reform. This should offer opportunity and hope to both women and children. But we do not want our thinking about the welfare of the next 20 years to be too narrowly fenced in by the experience of the last 10 years and 20 years when the States were very limited in what they could do.

In Connecticut, we have a 21-month limit, and one of the biggest newspaper critics of it wrote a column just the other day saying, you have to own up when you are wrong, and he was wrong. It is working great.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] and the others who worked with us. I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] and others who have worked on our side. I think we are very close.

This motion to instruct has really four general, but necessary, principles I think we all share in this body, Democrat or Republican, to make sure, as one of the previous speakers said, we get it right. It talks about the cost shifting to local governments, and we need to really take a look at that. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] said, there is no reason to again demand that States do it our way or face penalties, and then we all know what happens there.

There is still a part of the House bill that treats a 4-year-old child like a 34-year-old irresponsible adult. We really can fix that, and we need to.

We talk also about Medicaid coverage. The Senate took a great step yesterday in a vote of, I think it was, 95 to 2 to fix that portion of it, and surely the conference committee can take a look at that. Finally, we talk about the savings that are achieved here going to deficit reduction, which directly will affect these children that we are talking about in the previous parts of the bill.

So we are close. The Senate did some good work yesterday. If we can just in the conference utilize our imagination, as one of the previous speakers over there said, to try to get to some closure on these principles, not harming children, actually making sure that the funding is there to make the system work. I think we are very close to a breakthrough and a conference committee report that we can all support and the President can sign.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Washington [Ms. DUNN], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am very pleased today to see us moving toward bipartisanship on welfare. We are all very concerned about solving this major problem. Many of us here on the House floor who have worked on this issue month after month, and some people year after year, are worried about what the current system of welfare has done to children.

I do want to reassure the gentleman from Florida that we have indeed built flexibility into this system, this new bipartisan proposal that will take care of children, that they will not suffer at the end of 5 years, that there is a 25-percent exemption number there, that money can be shifted from child care from title XX to take care of those children, and they can be transferred within the block grants, and that there are other State sources that may be used to support the children after 5 years as well.

But I continue to be very pleased to see how much emphasis both sides of the aisle are putting on the issues that are most important to me in this bill, the issues of child care and child support. In the original welfare bill, we were very thoughtful in how we addressed child care. We took a great deal of time to work with the governors of the States, the Members on both sides of the aisle, the administration, to develop a plan that would fund child care at a level that would be far better than what exists in the current system today.

So at this point we are something around \$4.5 billion more than the current welfare program provides to the States for child care, including their

funding, and \$2 billion more than the President originally asked for, and I think this is an appropriate level and shows the concern that we have for those mothers on AFDC who are wishing to get off welfare and into the work force. We have talked to these women and we have figured out that this is the most important piece of this whole legislation that allows them the peace of mind they need to make this transfer.

Child support is critically important. We spent a lot of time, there has been a lot of work that has gone into the child support issue, the issue of deadbeat parents, 30 percent of whom leave the States, Mr. Speaker, to avoid paying child support. We have provided a nationwide information service here that will allow States to find those deadbeat parents, and I must say that today in our Nation, \$34 billion is owed in court-ordered child support to custodial parents. When it is not paid, those kids go on welfare and the taxpayers become the parent.

So I am here today to commend both sides of the aisle to support the Sabo motion to instruct and to urge my colleagues to continue the bipartisan approach to welfare that I hope will continue right through to the signing by the President in the White House.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct the conferees. First, let me make one attempt, one final attempt, to interject some sanity into this debate about the future of mothers and their children. We can accomplish welfare reform without abandoning poor children. If this government cannot agree to that, it will agree to nothing.

Both the House and Senate versions of this bill would decimate the food stamps program; both would unduly restrict benefits for legal immigrants. The proponents of this legislation are clearly driven by two impulses, neither of which is reforming welfare. First, they are eager to balance the budget on the backs of poor children rather than tackle corporate welfare. And second, they are attempting to create a wage issue, which they know divides Americans, and inject their divisive spirit into this political season.

This is not how we make sound public policy, Mr. Speaker. The last bill that was sent to the President's desk would have thrown at least 1.2 million children into poverty. While we do not have a comparable study on the impact of this bill, I would ask my colleagues, how many children will this Congress feel comfortable making poor? One million, 2 million, a half million? Where is the job creation? Where are the incentives to business to stop exporting our jobs to Third World countries for cheap labor so that we can provide jobs for jobless Americans here at home?

Mr. Speaker, many welfare recipients want desperately to change their lives.

They want to correct the mistakes in their lives. They want help, not more pain. They want jobs. Let us train them, not starve them.

Mr. Speaker, we should support this motion to instruct the conferees to keep children out of poverty, preserve Medicaid, maximize food stamps, provide job training and work opportunities. This is not fun and games. This issue is about human lives.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is pretty amazing for the American people to make note of the fact that in the other body, 74 Members of the other body voted for a significant, the most significant change in welfare that we have seen in this country since welfare was created, and that of course enjoins the action of this body to do a number of things.

First, to say that we will take care of people who cannot, simply cannot take care of themselves. But at the same time, it says for those people who are able-bodied and find themselves on this welfare system, that we will provide adequate day care so that the children of people on welfare will be protected.

Second, that the people who are on welfare are going to be asked to get trained. We are going to give them a skill. We are going to educate them. We are going to help them. And at the end of the day, it is also expected that those folks will be able to leave welfare and find employment to work.

I think that is what Americans have been calling for in this country my entire political career, and frankly all of my lifetime. Because in a Judeo-Christian society, it is wrong not to help people who need help; but in a Judeo-Christian society, it is also wrong to help people who need to learn how to help themselves. I do not think there is much disagreement with this.

Now, there are some starts and some stops in any legislation. There is always concerns about what happens. But it has been those concerns that have blocked this Congress, not this Congress, but previous Congresses from being able to deliver the kind of welfare reform that taxpayers want, and the kind of welfare reform that taxpayers will support.

□ 1745

I would say to the Members of the House today that the gentleman from Minnesota makes an amendment that I think has a lot of merit. It speaks to the fact that we do not want unfunded mandates. That is why, in fact, Governors sit in our deliberations and give us their opinions in terms of the impact of this legislation on their States. They basically have one plea, however: "Trust us, we can do the job. After all, it is our citizens' money, and we think we can design a program that fits local solutions to local problems at less cost and will be more productive and rescue people from poverty."

At the same time I think it is very important to realize that as we go

through this, we are going to be in a position where taxpayers finally are going to be able to say, "I can support this program. It is fair to those who cannot help themselves, it is fair to those because we provide the adequate programs to protect their children as they get skills and get work, and it is fair to me as a taxpayer."

I am always proud of saying that I think the real American heroes in this country are not the Shaquille O'Neals who make \$125 million or the Juwan Howards who make \$100 million. God bless them for having the skills to drive the market to make that kind of money but they are not my heroes.

My hero is that lady who goes to the airport to pour the coffee, puts her children in day care, and works like the dickens with her husband to make ends meet, and they do not get anything from the government. They are not unwilling to help those that cannot help themselves, but at the end of the day they want to believe it is a system that encourages people to leave.

We cannot let the concerns that we have had over the years deny the kind of welfare reform we ought to have. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] speaks to the issue of the local mandates, the need to be concerned about children, which all of us are. We believe at the end of the day this is a compassionate bill that will help the folks that need the help and help the taxpayers who want to have a legitimate welfare system.

So we can support the Sabo amendment, move to conference, and, ladies and gentlemen, I think we are on the verge of truly historic reform of the system that has needed reform all of my lifetime and I think it is a day for us to be excited.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we will agree that the welfare system does not work for taxpayers and it certainly does not work for families on welfare. That is the easy part.

The challenge and responsibility we face as legislators, however, is to fix the system so that it helps parents move from welfare to work while at the same time ensuring that children are safe, healthy and protected. We have to do that because parents cannot succeed in school, training or work if their children are not taken care of. They cannot do their best when their children are home alone or in a car or if they are sick or hungry.

Take it from me. I was on welfare. Even though I was working, I needed Aid For Dependent Children for one reason and one reason only, to give my children the food, the medical care, and the child care they needed. Without those crucial support services, Mr. Speaker, without that safety net, I do not know what would have happened to my family.

So, conferees, Members of this body, remember, the lives of millions of children are in your hands. Take this responsibility very seriously. If you err, err on the side of our children. Make sure that no child is left without proper health care, nutrition, or child care. Make sure that no child is left behind. Remember how the safety net saved my family. Remember the children. I urge my colleagues, protect our children.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], the former Governor.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to share some thoughts I have on welfare reform. I support all the concepts of the motion to instruct conferees. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has done a good job here, but I would just like to point out where we have gone in the welfare reform package.

We had it coming out of committee, we took it to the floor of the House, we made some amendments to it which I think made it a better bill. It went over to the Senate, they acted on it. I think they have added some aspects to it or reaffirmed what we have done in the House, which makes it a better bill. Hopefully the conferees can sit down and meet and also make some of the improvements along some of the lines that have been discussed here to make it an even better bill.

I think we are going to have welfare reform in the United States. I think we need to be very serious about what is going to be in it. Quite frankly, I think we have worked hard to actually make this a very good piece of legislation.

I could not agree more, we should not have unfunded mandates. We have now preserved Medicaid coverage almost completely in this bill. We need to protect that. That is a very important point which is made here. I also believe we need to deal with the vouchers for goods and services, and I think maybe we are a little further along that line than even I thought after some further research. Hopefully we can develop that a little bit more too, as well, as we look at this.

Obviously I believe we should have whatever savings we can possibly have, but the bottom line is right. So many people have spoken here today and before on welfare reform. We need to put into place a system which will change it. There are job opportunities being created in America. The President of the United States says that constantly. Our economy shows that. We think these individuals ought to have the opportunity to go out and work where they can. We believe some should be protected, the 20 percent who cannot work.

I think this is all coming together. I congratulate all the Members of the House. Sometimes we do not listen to one another. I think in this instance

we have been listening to one another. Hopefully we will listen to this motion to instruct conferees, go to conference and have a good welfare reform package.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to follow the preceding speaker who has worked so hard to make certain that a bipartisan welfare reform package is possible. The issue before us is not whether we should reform welfare. It is how we reform welfare in the correct way. I think the Senate took a major step forward in showing that true bipartisan reform is possible. Substantial changes were made in the Medicaid and in the food stamp areas, resulting in a much more bipartisan vote than was achieved in the House.

What other changes can be made in conference to get a stronger bipartisan House vote? The motion before us lays them out. Do not shift costs to localities, do not harm children, particularly as parents make that critical transition into the work force, preserve Medicaid coverage so that people without health care access does not increase, and, finally, if there are savings, let us apply them on the deficit.

We can do better than the bill that came out of the House in reaching bipartisan agreement. If the conferees adhere to these points, we will have a bipartisan welfare reform proposal.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA], and I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] and that he have authority to yield to others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, if there is one clarion call that we should hear in this Congress when it comes to reforming welfare, it should be: Hold our children harmless. We can disagree on a lot of things, but I think one thing is clear: None of us intends to put children in worse condition by reforming welfare. Yet we still have an issue. The Republican welfare bill that passed in this House would send 1.5 million children into poverty. It would increase the level of poverty for those children already existing without enough. Why would we want, as this bill does, to deny a child who lives in a home where there is domestic violence the opportunity to escape that home? Why would we want to deny more than 300,000 children who exist with a dis-

ability the opportunity to try to have the same opportunity as any other child? Why would we want to deny a child who is hungry the opportunity through food stamps to be nourished? I do not think we want to do that, and I believe on a bipartisan basis we can get there. We are getting closer. There are still some disagreements. But certainly we can get there. Let us not fool ourselves. If we do not give through the Federal Government some assistance through food stamps or other services to that child, no one in the community in Los Angeles where I live or any community where you live will say, "We're going to leave that child on the street." We are going to care for that child one way or the other because we are very humane in this country. But let us not shift costs to the local governments and claim that we have saved welfare. Let us do it the right way and let us remember, in the end, the clarion call should be: We will hold our children harmless.

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, my dear friend CLAY SHAW who has worked so hard to protect the children of our great Republic and who made so many attempts to make this a bipartisan effort closed his remarks by saying, "And who would want to be in a position of defending the status quo?"

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has no idea what a powerful political statement he made. Because the answer should be, "Nobody."

There is widespread feeling in this Congress and in the United States that anybody that can work should be working, and anybody who freeloards is inconsistent with the ideas and the ideals that made our country the great country it is. Nothing gets to a taxpayer more than seeing a freeloader living at their expense and not making any attempt to pay their own way with the dignity that a job brings to them.

Having said that, if I understand this bill, this is not just reform because you call it reform. President Clinton said you can put wings on a pig but it does not make it an eagle. Why should I accept the fact that just because it is different, it is reform?

"Trust the States." I trust the States. Give them the Federal money, they are closer to the problem. Put in a safety net. Make certain the children are protected. We are not talking about aid to dependent mothers. We are talking about children. Whether you are Democrat, conservative, liberal, or Republican, OMB says 1 million kids are going to be pushed into poverty. Why? Because people have arbitrarily said, "Trust the Governors." After 2 years they decide if the mother is not working, kick the kid off.

Well, I do not know what would have happened in the manger at Christmas-time if that attitude had prevailed, but

I think that Mary and Joseph would have had a harder time under today's bill than they had 2,000 years ago.

The fact remains is, if you say go to work, is there not a responsibility to have a job? If someone plays by the rules, makes a mistake, the boyfriend got killed, they were on their way to the church, they looked for the job, they took the training, but there were no jobs.

□ 1800

Oh, the Governors will work out something. If we are providing Federal funds and for the first time in 60 years are saying we wash our hands of this problem, it is now a State problem and you, RANGEL, trust the Governors, you have been there for 40 years, that is a heck of a thing to tell to a child that is being denied food stamps, that is being denied health care because we have a problem with the mother. But if you do not have a problem with the mother and she has worked hard and there is no job for her to find, you say if it is 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, 5 years, it is OK with you that she has not got a job.

I say if we want to turn it over to the States, I think it is wrong, but I would support it. But we have an obligation as a Congress, as a Nation to put a safety net there for those kids. They have not hurt anybody. But it is not there in any of these bills.

What has really happened is that the question before us as we adopt the resolution that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has is not whether or not this is a good or bad bill. It is the question that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], my friend, raised: Who is prepared before this election to protect the status quo? It is not me, but that does not mean that this flying pig is an eagle. It means that we have to do something before the election.

Democrats have to have a vote on something and so do the Republicans, unless, of course, which I know never entered the minds of my friends in the majority, unless we can make the President look worse by having to veto it. So now good-thinking people are wondering in the Congress do they really want a bill or do they really want to embarrass the President. And that is what we are talking about today. The urgency to get this bill out is based really to get it out before we go to the election.

All I am saying is, if the bill is so good, why does Catholic Charities say it is so bad? Are they dealing with such a higher authority that they cannot reach the Christians outside of the Christian Coalition? If the bill is so good, why is it my Jewish friends who take care of kids every day in the Jewish Council Against Poverty, which every year, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], my good friend, and I are there saying that poverty is not black or white or Catholic or Protestant or Jew or gentile, hey, they are against the bill. And the Muslims

are against the bill. The Protestant Council said it may be a good concept but it is bad for children.

I tell my colleagues one thing, this is the best medicine we can find to have food for an election. So I retain my time to yield to other Members, but I really wish that we could hurt the people that should be hurt and provide the jobs and the opportunity for those people who played by the rules; but there is no provision there to protect them.

One day when we are talking about welfare reform, we will concentrate on education and dreams and training and have people that have more time to be prepared to get married and to get the picket fence and to have the same dreams as other people. But I realize that that issue is a local issue. We will leave that to the local school boards, and we will tackle the big ones like welfare reform and let the Governors tell us how well they are doing.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond very briefly to my good friend from New York. On this floor we often use the word good friend in referring to somebody right before we slap them upside the head, but CHARLIE and I are good friends; we really are, both on the floor and off of the floor. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York, next year I think we all anticipate he would be the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means.

My colleague may try to make the argument that he is going to be chairman, but it is not going to happen next year. But in any event he is going to be the top Democrat on the Committee on Ways and Means. In that position, as I have said to him in the past that I would hold out to him my hand to work in cooperation with him once welfare reform gets in place to be sure it is going to work, there are going to be problems with welfare reform.

Anyone in this body that feels that we have washed our hands of the problem is kidding themselves. The Federal Government, by defense of a welfare system that has not worked and has built up layer after layer of generations on poverty, we have a responsibility as a Federal Government to go in and clean up this mess and to get people where the jobs are or get the jobs where the people are. I know, I say to my friend and colleague, that this is something that he is interested in, and I will tell my colleague tonight that I would be happy to go to his district and to work with him because I know of his concern for the people he represents. I also have concern for them.

Now, one quick response to the question as to whether we are trying to rush something in before the election, we are trying to give this President the opportunity to deliver on a promise he made 4 years ago during the campaign on which he mentioned right below where the speaker is standing here tonight in telling us during the State of

the Union Address that he wants a welfare bill that he can sign. We intend to deliver him a welfare bill that hopefully he will sign.

It got great support in the Senate. I hope we take the momentum that they came out of the Senate onto the House Floor and that we send him a bipartisan bill and he will sign it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the President will make note of this contribution that we are making to his campaign and the great opportunity that we have given to him. I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans have agreed from the very beginning of this session on welfare reform, the need for welfare reform. We agreed that one title of the welfare reform bill should be there, child support enforcement. It was placed in, we worked together and it stayed that way.

Other than that, there were many disagreements. There were many debates. There were many arguments. We come to this point where we have the motion before us that will put people to work and protect children.

We look at this motion. It says yes to welfare to work programs and no to unfunded mandates. We look at this motion that says yes to strict time limits on adults and no to driving additional children into poverty. The motion says yes to reforming welfare but no to increasing the number of people without health coverage.

So the motion is a good motion. This bill can become a better bill. I remember the other day last week when we were voting on final passage in the House, on the welfare bill. One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle came down and said: BARBARA, I thought you said, if we made this bill better, you would vote for it. I said yes, I said that, but I think it can be better.

Yesterday it was made better. Yesterday Medicaid language was much better in the Senate. Yesterday no block grant for food stamps. Let us use the surplus agriculture supplies we have for nutrition for the children. Yet there were other ways that the Senate bill very definitely made this a better bill.

We have this motion, a commonsense blueprint for welfare reform that will work and that President Clinton can look at so he can decide if he is going to sign it.

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle this is a much better bill that we continue to talk about. Tomorrow there will be a conference, where we will meet. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] has been a leader on this and has been patient, unbelievably patient.

I say let us still consider that safety net for children. Let us still make it a better bill so that we can all vote for it and the President can sign it and we can all say we did welfare reform.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, certainly it is the tradition of the Congress that going to conference is a time when House Members and Members of the other body think together anew about legislation, and the best ideas from both sides are merged. So, there is no doubt in my mind that what comes out of conference will be a bill we will all be proud of.

I do want to go back to something that my friend from New York said, and that is jobs; what are we going to do if there are no jobs? And why do all these religious groups oppose the bill? Well, I would say to my colleagues that welfare reform is not just about welfare. Welfare reform is about system change in America. Those groups do not understand that. They do not see the possibilities.

I think we are missing the understanding of the new opportunities this bill creates. For example, it has always been unfair for local taxpayers, and we know how terribly, terribly stressed people are at the level of local property taxes. Those people are paying their local government people, and they are participating in paying welfare benefits.

Through attrition, without anybody who is employed losing their job, there is not any level of government that cannot open up entry-level jobs for welfare recipients so right off the bat they get real wages for real work. They make contacts and then the local governments can use that money to up the salaries of some of their people to do supervision and to do coordination.

So I believe in the long run we are going to use our public dollars better as a result of welfare reform because we are going to open up jobs. We are going to build job training into our Federal, State and local bureaucracy, and people will have opportunities right off the bat they never dreamed of. So I think using the resources of the employment base that government provides with taxpayer dollars, our community colleges and our adult education resources, we are going to create opportunity with this bill that we are going to be proud of.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the basic foundations of welfare reform have been clear for some time: moving people on welfare into productive work with time limits and State flexibility, protecting the child who will be a main beneficiary of breaking the cycle of dependency.

While I have believed that there was a mainstream cutting across the parties to build a new structure on these foundations, and I have been actively engaged along these very lines, early

Republican bills veered sharply in an opposite direction and as a result the President vetoed them.

In direct response, the majority moved and there have been some significant improvements in the proposed legislation, moving from no specific provision for health care and woefully inadequate day care to assurance of health and day care as parents move off of welfare to work, better ensuring that States who meet their responsibilities and maintain their effort, not simply substituting Federal dollars for their own, canceling the punitive program cuts for severely handicapped children, restoring the safety net for foster care and child nutrition and creating a structure, though still very inadequate, to protect people who want to work from the ravages of a major recession.

The bipartisan Tanner-Castle bill, which I actively supported, and several amendments in the Senate point to several key areas where there is a serious need for further change, especially those relating to the protection of health and welfare of children who are legally in this country, and to really achieving what is most needed for the parent on welfare, for their benefit, for the child and for the taxpayer; that is, work.

This motion instructs the conferees to do everything possible to achieve the stated objectives on a bipartisan basis. The conference can be an important step forward on a bipartisan basis toward welfare reform or a backward step on a partisan one leading to further gridlock. This Nation badly needs and wants the former. We must strive to achieve it.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to say to my friend from New York I was amazed the other day in talking to some of my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle. They were wondering about our economic program. I think what my colleagues have to understand, they may not like our program, but our program balances the budget and lowers interest rates.

One of the major ways we do it is to shift power and money from this city back home so that people can solve local problems with local solutions, I would say to the gentleman. I want my local housing authority administrators to set the rules for the people that live in the housing in my community. I do not want to come to Washington for the rules. I want to do it in the neighborhood.

Our program is to provide tax incentives, we believe, and lower taxes on risk-taking. We think that will create jobs, and my good friend Bob Garcia joined with Jack Kemp to create enterprise zones to give tax relief so we can create jobs. The day is going to come, in my judgment, where the poorest Americans are going to support lowering capital gains taxes so that people will risk money to create jobs.

I would also say to the gentleman that our view of deregulation, of

unshackling businesses that cannot get started in communities because they got to hire lawyers and accountants and Lord knows how much. Instead of treating those people with great respect, we make it difficult for them to create a job and hire people. That is why we support deregulation.

□ 1815

That is why we support less Federal involvement, because we believe we need to reclaim our communities and our neighborhoods and our families.

So this plan cannot be divorced from our economic plan. The gentleman may not agree with our economic plan, but we are sincere in our efforts to try to bring greater prosperity to this country, and we think we are on the right track. The gentleman believes we are not. But we cannot divorce welfare from the need to provide economic growth. We believe we have the better way to do it, and I want the gentleman to understand that is our approach.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct and reject the idea of putting more children into poverty.

Mr. Speaker, we can all agree that the welfare status quo is unacceptable. But the Republican welfare reform proposal will make the problems of poverty and dependence much worse because it refuses to make work the cornerstone of welfare reform.

Real welfare reform is about work. Opportunities for work, jobs that pay a living wage, job training opportunities to provide skills necessary to earn a living wage are long term solutions for a permanent and productive reform in our welfare system.

Real welfare reform must emphasize the importance of work. Real welfare reform must also aid rather than punish children. In the United States, 14 million children live in poverty. Passage of this legislation would add millions more to that statistic. This welfare bill is punitive and unrealistic.

Abolishing the safety net for children, imposing family caps, denying legal immigrants benefits, imposing arbitrary time limits and failing to provide adequate child care, health care, education, job training, and work opportunities for people in need will thrust millions more into poverty.

This bill cuts almost \$60 billion from the poor in this country. These cuts will affect children whose parents are on welfare. These cuts will trap countless women in abusive relationships, with nowhere to turn—without a realistic way to gain independence, gain work, and provide for their children.

Welfare reform must be about education, job training, and work. We must keep families together, rather than ripping them apart. We cannot simply reduce the deficit at the cost of our poorest Americans. This proposal has little wisdom, conscience, or heart.

Some of my colleagues will vote for this bill and then wash their hands of welfare reform,

saying they have done their job. But the job of welfare reform is more complex and dire. People living in poverty are not cardboard cutouts: they do not have the same stories, they do not need the same services. This bill treats everyone alike, with unrealistic time limits and no real lasting and effective plan to move welfare recipients to work at a living wage.

The denial of benefits to legal immigrants in this legislation will do great harm to children and have a devastating impact on the health care system in our country. Only 3.9 percent of immigrants, who come to the United States to join their families or to work, rely on public assistance compared to 4.2 percent of native-born citizens. According to the Urban Institute, immigrants pay \$25 billion more annually than they receive in benefits. Yet the myth persists that welfare benefits are the primary purpose for immigration to the United States. Instead of appreciating legal immigrants for their significant contributions to this, their adopted country, this bill blatantly punishes them, especially young children and the elderly. It bans SSI and food stamps for virtually all legal immigrants. It tosses aside people who pay taxes, serve our country, and play by the rules. This lacks compassion and common sense.

If we want to achieve real welfare reform, we need to offer some long-term solutions to help people move up and out from the cycle of poverty. The current welfare system is not adequate, but this bill makes it far worse.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican bill and work together for meaningful reform that puts people to work and pulls them out of poverty for good.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] for yielding me this time.

Let me offer a statistic this evening that I think is the most compelling number that has surrounded this debate for the better part of 18 months. There are 12.8 million people in America who receive AFDC. Of that number, between 8 and 9 million of those recipients are children.

That is the issue that we can never lose focus on. That is the issue that ought to motivate, and that is the issue that ought to drive these deliberations. And yet after 18 months there has only been one bipartisan initiative that deals with welfare. The authors having been the former Governor of Delaware, MIKE CASTLE, and the Congressman from Tennessee, JOHN TANNER. Only one bill had the support of Democrats and Republicans alike in this institution, and it was the piece of legislation that Bill Clinton said "I will sign if you put that on my desk."

But the posturing that has taken place over this issue has delayed getting to a bill that withstands the scrutiny that we all know welfare reform deserves. Let me just read one sentence from a letter that was sent by the Speaker of the House to the members

of the Republican Conference. He said, in suggesting they oppose the bipartisan bill, the following: "It is critical that Republicans maintain the upper hand on this issue by rejecting the Gephardt substitute."

That they maintain the upper hand, because that is what this debate has been about. This debate has been about November. This debate has been about trying to get a bill down to the White House that they know the President of the United States cannot sign. That is how policy has been made, and that is how it has evolved in this institution. And remember those words, it is important that the Republicans maintain the upper hand on this issue.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY].

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

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of points. My good friend on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL], is a good member of that committee and certainly I listen when he speaks. He talks about a bipartisan bill that was offered here on this floor, and he said that was the only bipartisan bill offered. Well, maybe it was the only bill with a bipartisan list of authors, but the fact is that that bill only got 9 Republicans to vote for it on the floor. The Republican bill got 30 Democrats to vote for it on the floor. So the more bipartisan of those two bills, my colleagues, was not the so-called bipartisan bill, it was the Republican bill that in fact passed this House.

Another point. The gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. NEAL] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] talked about how far Republicans have come, and I appreciate their giving us that. We have come a long way from where we started. But so has the President. To give him some credit, he has come a long way.

The first bill the President sent to this House increased spending for welfare programs in this country. The bill that we hope he will sign now will save somewhere on the order of \$60 billion. So that is coming a long way on the part of the President and the Democrats in this House. And I appreciate that, too.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a classic example of negotiators starting at the far ends, coming to the middle, producing a product that is a compromise but that will move this country forward, that will bring families and children out of poverty finally in this country, give them some hope instead of lives of despair and hopelessness.

So I want to congratulate both sides of the aisle, the Republicans and the Democrats, for compromising, coming to the middle, producing a bill that I hope will become law.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the Sabo amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct. Welfare conferees should do all in their power to ensure that the welfare conference agreement reinforces our basic values of responsibility and work and protects our Nation's children.

The welfare bill that passed the House last week woefully fell short on these goals. Instead, the bill is tough on children and soft on requiring work.

The Republican bill fails to meet the goal of moving people from welfare to work by underfunding the work program by \$10 billion. My Republican colleague from Connecticut talked about local government being the source of jobs. I quite frankly do not understand how New Haven and Hartford and Bridgeport and Stanford, how they provide jobs without raising the property tax in Connecticut. And those in Connecticut know that they are being choked by taxes.

Let me just say that I urge the conferees to protect our children. Without these protections attempts to reform welfare will increase the number of children living in poverty and fail to move people off the welfare rolls and into the work force. Protect innocent children, vote for the motion to instruct.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

I am astounded to hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] talk about a bill that will cut out the safety net under the poor and then say in years to come the poor will ask us to cut capital gains and maybe something will trickle down.

We need this motion to instruct. Both the House and the Senate have protections for eligibility standards for Medicaid. Let us make sure they do not drop it. That is what they did in the last conference, and unless we get any assurances to the contrary, let us instruct our conferees to hold to the provisions that protect the rights of children at least to get health care, which is both in the House and the Senate bill.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as we conclude the debate in support of the motion to instruct by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], I would like to say that I do not think that any Member in this House could challenge the fact that if we want true welfare reform we have to talk about education, training, access to jobs and people working with dignity and with pride so that they do not have time to do the things that require dependency on the Government.

Maybe one day we will get to those issues instead of talking about punishment, cutting grants, mandatory sen-

tences, and make this country as great as she can be with education, jobs, and productivity. One day when we reach that, that truly will be welfare reform and an opportunity for this great republic to reach the heights that she can reach.

(Mr. MYERS of Indiana asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3816, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of H.R. 3816, in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 483, the bill be considered as read, and no amendment shall be in order except for the following amendments, which shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. SOLOMON for 10 minutes; amendment No. 2 by Mr. FOGLIETTA for 10 minutes; amendment Nos. 3 or 4 by Mr. OBEY for 40 minutes; amendment No. 5 by Mr. GUTKNECHT for 20 minutes; amendment No. 6 by Mr. KLUG for 20 minutes; amendment No. 7 by Mr. KLUG for 20 minutes; amendment No. 8 by Mr. ROEMER for 10 minutes; amendment No. 9 by Mr. ROEMER for 10 minutes; amendment No. 10 by Mr. ROHRBACHER for 10 minutes; amendment No. 11 by Mr. TRAFICANT for 5 minutes; amendment No. 12 by Mr. BARTON of Texas for 10 minutes; amendment No. 13 by Mr. BREUTER for 10 minutes; amendment No. 14 by Mr. HILLEARY for 10 minutes; amendment Nos. 15 & 16 en bloc by Mr. MARKEY for 20 minutes; amendment No. 17 by Mr. PETRI for 20 minutes; amendment No. 20 by Mr. ZIMMER for 10 minutes; an amendment by Mr. ROGERS—regarding the new Madrid floodway—for 5 minutes; an amendment by Mr. FILNER—regarding the Tijuana River Basin—for 10 minutes; an amendment by either Mr. KLUG or Mr. SCHAEFER or Mr. FAZIO—regarding solar energy—for 30 minutes; an amendment by Mr. KOLBE—regarding the central Arizona project—for 10 minutes; and an amendment by Mr. PICKETT—regarding the Sandbridge beach project—for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished chairman if this would preclude me from making the pro forma amendment that I had discussed with him earlier?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, the gentleman can address the Committee for 5 minutes during which we will have a colloquy for that period of time and we will not object.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the colloquy that was just had answered my question as well, because I was anticipating a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield under this reservation?

Mr. BROWN of California. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that I think we have taken care of all those. We have an understanding that there are some of these in controversy or in misunderstanding which require further consideration and we will have a dialog and a colloquy and we will yield for that purpose and there will no objection.

We would like to hold that to a minimum, however, I must say to each of the gentlemen. I hope we hold it to just 5 minutes, because we want to expedite this and get finished tonight. Here in Washington it is 6:30 and we hope we can finish by no later than 11, give or take an hour.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I understand the problem and I will do my best to accede.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I was expecting to be long-winded, but given what he has said, I will try to be succinct.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

AYES—418

Abercrombie	Barcia	Berman
Ackerman	Barr	Bevill
Allard	Barrett (NE)	Bilbray
Andrews	Barrett (WI)	Bilirakis
Archer	Bartlett	Bishop
Armey	Barton	Bliley
Bachus	Bass	Blumenauer
Baesler	Bateman	Blute
Baker (CA)	Becerra	Boehlert
Baker (LA)	Beilenson	Boehner
Baldacci	Bentsen	Bonilla
Ballenger	Bereuter	Bonior

Bono	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Borski	Frisk	Lofgren
Boucher	Frost	Longley
Brewster	Funderburk	Lowey
Browder	Furse	Lucas
Brown (CA)	Gallegly	Luther
Brown (FL)	Ganske	Maloney
Brown (OH)	Gejdenson	Manton
Brownback	Gekas	Manzullo
Bryant (TN)	Gephardt	Markey
Bryant (TX)	Geren	Martinez
Bunn	Gilchrest	Martini
Bunning	Gillmor	Mascara
Burr	Gilman	Matsui
Burton	Gonzalez	McCarthy
Callahan	Goodlatte	McCollum
Calvert	Goodling	McCrery
Camp	Gordon	McDermott
Campbell	Goss	McHale
Canady	Graham	McHugh
Cardin	Green (TX)	McInnis
Castle	Greene (UT)	McIntosh
Chabot	Greenwood	McKeon
Chambliss	Gunderson	McKinney
Chapman	Gutierrez	McNulty
Chenoweth	Gutknecht	Meehan
Christensen	Hall (OH)	Meek
Chrysler	Hall (TX)	Menendez
Clay	Hamilton	Metcalfe
Clayton	Hancock	Meyers
Clement	Hansen	Mica
Clinger	Harman	Millender-
Clyburn	Hastert	McDonald
Coble	Hastings (FL)	Miller (CA)
Coburn	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Collins (GA)	Hayworth	Minge
Collins (MI)	Hefley	Mink
Combest	Hefner	Moakley
Condit	Heineman	Molinari
Cooley	Herger	Mollohan
Costello	Hilleary	Montgomery
Cox	Hilliard	Moorhead
Coyne	Hinchey	Moran
Cramer	Hobson	Morella
Crane	Hoekstra	Murtha
Crapo	Hoke	Myers
Cremeans	Holden	Myrick
Cubin	Horn	Nadler
Cummings	Hostettler	Neal
Cunningham	Houghton	Nethercutt
Danner	Hoyer	Neumann
de la Garza	Hunter	Ney
Deal	Hutchinson	Norwood
DeFazio	Hyde	Nussle
DeLauro	Inglis	Oberstar
DeLay	Istook	Obey
Dellums	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Deutsch	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
Diaz-Balart	(TX)	Orton
Dickey	Jacobs	Owens
Dicks	Jefferson	Oxley
Dingell	Johnson (CT)	Packard
Dixon	Johnson (SD)	Pallone
Doggett	Johnson, E. B.	Parker
Dooley	Johnson, Sam	Pastor
Doolittle	Johnston	Paxon
Dornan	Jones	Payne (NJ)
Doyle	Kanjorski	Payne (VA)
Dreier	Kaptur	Pelosi
Duncan	Kasich	Peterson (MN)
Dunn	Kelly	Petri
Durbin	Kennedy (MA)	Pickett
Edwards	Kennedy (RI)	Pombo
Ehlers	Kennelly	Pomeroy
Ehrlich	Kildee	Porter
Engel	Kim	Portman
English	King	Poshard
Ensign	Kingston	Pryce
Eshoo	Kleckza	Quillen
Evans	Klink	Quinn
Everett	Klug	Radanovich
Ewing	Knollenberg	Rahall
Farr	Kolbe	Ramstad
Fattah	LaFalce	Rangel
Fawell	LaHood	Reed
Fazio	Largent	Regula
Fields (LA)	Latham	Richardson
Fields (TX)	LaTourette	Riggs
Filner	Laughlin	Rivers
Flake	Lazio	Roberts
Flanagan	Leach	Roemer
Foglietta	Levin	Rogers
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher
Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Roth
Fox	Lightfoot	Roukema
Frank (MA)	Linder	Roybal-Allard
Franks (CT)	Lipinski	Royce
Franks (NJ)	Livingston	Rush

Sabo	Souder	Velazquez
Salmon	Spence	Vento
Sanders	Spratt	Visclosky
Sanford	Stark	Volkmer
Sawyer	Stearns	Vucanovich
Saxton	Stenholm	Walker
Scarborough	Stockman	Walsh
Schaefer	Stokes	Wamp
Schiff	Studds	Ward
Schroeder	Stump	Waters
Schumer	Stupak	Watt (NC)
Scott	Talent	Watts (OK)
Seastrand	Tanner	Waxman
Sensenbrenner	Tate	Weldon (FL)
Serrano	Tauzin	Weldon (PA)
Shadegg	Taylor (MS)	Weller
Shaw	Tejeda	White
Shays	Thomas	Whitfield
Shuster	Thompson	Wicker
Sisisky	Thornberry	Williams
Skaggs	Thornton	Wilson
Skeen	Thurman	Wise
Skelton	Tiahrt	Wolf
Slaughter	Torkildsen	Woolsey
Smith (MI)	Torres	Wynn
Smith (NJ)	Torricelli	Yates
Smith (TX)	Towns	Young (AK)
Smith (WA)	Trafigant	Zeliff
Solomon	Upton	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—15

Buyer	Ford	McDade
Coleman	Gibbons	Peterson (FL)
Collins (IL)	Hayes	Rose
Conyers	Lantos	Taylor (NC)
Davis	Lincoln	Young (FL)

□ 1846

Messrs. SKEEN, FLAKE, and BLILEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KASICH, ARCHER, GOODLING, ROBERTS, BLILEY, SHAW, TALENT, NUSSLE, HUTCHINSON, MCCRERY, BILIRAKIS, SMITH of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Messrs. CAMP, FRANKS of Connecticut, CUNNINGHAM, CASTLE, GOODLATTE, SABO, GIBBONS, CONYERS, DE LA GARZA, CLAY, FORD, MILLER of California, WAXMAN, STENHOLM, Mrs. KENNELLY, Messrs. LEVIN, TANNER, BECERRA, Mrs. THURMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3734.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2391, WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 1996

Ms. GREENE of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-704) on the