

Murtha	Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak
Myers	Rose	Talent
Myrick	Roth	Tanner
Nadler	Roukema	Tate
Nethercutt	Roybal-Allard	Tauzin
Neumann	Royce	Taylor (MS)
Ney	Rush	Taylor (NC)
Norwood	Salmon	Tejeda
Nussle	Sanders	Thomas
Ortiz	Sanford	Thornberry
Orton	Sawyer	Thornton
Oxley	Saxton	Thurman
Packard	Scarborough	Tiahrt
Pallone	Schaefer	Torkildsen
Parker	Schiff	Trafficant
Paxon	Schumer	Upton
Payne (VA)	Scott	Velazquez
Pelosi	Seastrand	Vento
Peterson (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Visclosky
Peterson (MN)	Serrano	Vucanovich
Petri	Shadegg	Walker
Pickett	Shaw	Walsh
Pombo	Shays	Wamp
Porter	Shuster	Ward
Portman	Sisisky	Watts (OK)
Poshard	Skeen	Weldon (FL)
Pryce	Skelton	Weldon (PA)
Quillen	Smith (MI)	Weller
Quinn	Smith (NJ)	White
Radanovich	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Rahall	Smith (WA)	Wicker
Ramstad	Solomon	Wise
Rangel	Souder	Wolf
Reed	Spence	Woolsey
Regula	Spratt	Wynn
Riggs	Stark	Yates
Rivers	Stearns	Young (AK)
Roberts	Stenholm	Zeliff
Roemer	Stokes	Zimmer
Rogers	Studds	
Rohrabacher	Stump	

NOT VOTING—19

Bachus	Ford	McDade
Buyer	Gunderson	Richardson
Chapman	Hayes	Sabo
Coburn	Hunter	Williams
Collins (IL)	Hutchinson	Young (FL)
Farr	Klink	
Flake	LaTourette	

□ 1221

Mr. DAVIS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(B) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF A CERTAIN RESOLUTION

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 492 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 492

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to a resolution reported before August 1, 1996, providing for consideration or disposition of a conference report to accompany 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.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BONIOR moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 50, nays 350, answered "present" 1, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

YEAS—50

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Bonior	Hinchey	Oberstar
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Olver
Clay	Jefferson	Pastor
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Payne (NJ)
Collins (MI)	Johnston	Rush
Conyers	Kennedy (MA)	Schroeder
Coyne	LaFalce	Slaughter
Dellums	Lantos	Stockman
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Thompson
Dingell	McDermott	Towns
Engel	McNulty	Velazquez
Fazio	Millender	Volkmer
Filner	McDonald	Waters
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)
Frank (MA)	Mink	Waxman
Gephardt	Moakley	Wilson

NAYS—350

Ackerman	Chambliss	Fowler
Allard	Chenoweth	Franks (CT)
Andrews	Christensen	Franks (NJ)
Archer	Chrysler	Frelinghuysen
Armey	Clayton	Frisa
Bachus	Clement	Frost
Baesler	Clinger	Funderburk
Baker (CA)	Coble	Furse
Baker (LA)	Coburn	Gallegly
Baldacci	Coleman	Ganske
Ballenger	Collins (GA)	Gejdenson
Barcia	Combest	Geren
Barr	Condit	Gibbons
Barrett (NE)	Costello	Gilchrest
Barrett (WI)	Cramer	Gillmor
Bartlett	Crane	Gilman
Barton	Crapo	Gonzalez
Bass	Creameans	Goodlatte
Bateman	Cubin	Gordon
Becerra	Cummings	Goss
Beilenson	Cunningham	Graham
Bentsen	Danner	Green (TX)
Bereuter	Davis	Greene (UT)
Berman	de la Garza	Greenwood
Bevill	Deal	Gutierrez
Bilbray	DeLauro	Gutknecht
Bilirakis	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Bishop	Diaz-Balart	Hall (TX)
Bliley	Dixon	Hamilton
Blumenauer	Doggett	Hancock
Blute	Dooley	Hansen
Boehlert	Doolittle	Harman
Boehner	Dornan	Hastert
Bonilla	Doyle	Hastings (WA)
Bono	Dreier	Hayworth
Borski	Duncan	Hefley
Boucher	Dunn	Hefner
Brewster	Durbin	Heineman
Browder	Edwards	Hergert
Brown (FL)	Ehlers	Hilleary
Brownback	Ehrlich	Hilliard
Bryant (TN)	English	Hobson
Bryant (TX)	Ensign	Hoekstra
Bunn	Eshoo	Hoke
Bunning	Evans	Holden
Burr	Everett	Horn
Burton	Ewing	Hostettler
Callahan	Farr	Houghton
Calvert	Fattah	Hunter
Camp	Fawell	Hyde
Campbell	Fields (LA)	Inglis
Canady	Fields (TX)	Jackson (IL)
Cardin	Flanagan	Jackson-Lee
Castle	Foley	(TX)
Chabot	Forbes	Jacobs

Johnson (CT)	Molinari	Seastrand
Johnson (SD)	Mollohan	Sensenbrenner
Jones	Moorhead	Serrano
Kanjorski	Morella	Shadegg
Kaptur	Murtha	Shaw
Kasich	Myers	Shays
Kelly	Myrick	Shuster
Kennedy (RI)	Nadler	Sisisky
Kennelly	Nethercutt	Skaggs
Kildee	Ney	Skeen
Kim	Norwood	Skelton
King	Nussle	Smith (MI)
Kingston	Obey	Smith (NJ)
Klecza	Ortiz	Smith (TX)
Klink	Orton	Smith (WA)
Klug	Oxley	Solomon
Knollenberg	Packard	Spence
Kolbe	Pallone	Spratt
LaHood	Parker	Stark
Largent	Paxon	Stearns
Latham	Payne (VA)	Stenholm
Laughlin	Pelosi	Stokes
Lazio	Peterson (FL)	Studds
Leach	Peterson (MN)	Stump
Levin	Petri	Stupak
Lewis (CA)	Pickett	Talent
Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Tanner
Lightfoot	Pomeroy	Tate
Lincoln	Porter	Tauzin
Linder	Portman	Taylor (MS)
Lipinski	Poshard	Taylor (NC)
Livingston	Pryce	Tejeda
LoBiondo	Quillen	Thomas
Lofgren	Quinn	Thornberry
Longley	Radanovich	Thornton
Lowey	Rahall	Thurman
Lucas	Ramstad	Tiahrt
Luther	Rangel	Torres
Maloney	Reed	Trafficant
Manton	Regula	Upton
Manzullo	Riggs	Vento
Markey	Rivers	Visclosky
Martinez	Roberts	Vucanovich
Martini	Roemer	Walker
Mascara	Rohrabacher	Walsh
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen	Wamp
McCarthy	Rose	Ward
McCollum	Roth	Watts (OK)
McCrery	Roukema	Weldon (FL)
McHale	Roybal-Allard	Weldon (PA)
McHugh	Royce	Weller
McInnis	Sabo	White
McKinney	Salmon	Whitfield
Meehan	Sanders	Wicker
Meek	Sanford	Wise
Menendez	Sawyer	Wolf
Metcalfe	Saxton	Woolsey
Meyers	Scarborough	Wynn
Mica	Schaefer	Yates
Miller (FL)	Schiff	Young (AK)
Minge	Schumer	Zeliff
	Scott	Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

DeFazio

NOT VOTING—32

Brown (CA)	Gekas	Moran
Buyer	Goodling	Neumann
Chapman	Gunderson	Owens
Collins (IL)	Hayes	Richardson
Cooley	Hutchinson	Rogers
Cox	Istook	Souder
DeLay	Johnson, Sam	Torkildsen
Dickey	LaTourette	Torricelli
Flake	McDade	Williams
Ford	McIntosh	Young (FL)
Fox	Montgomery	

□ 1243

Mr. BUNN of Oregon changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 378, I was in the Banking Committee hearing and I did not hear the pager. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 492 is an extremely narrow resolution. The proposed rule merely waives the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House for a resolution reported from the committee before August 1, 1996, which provides for consideration or disposition of a conference report to accompany H.R. 3734, The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act.

This narrow, short-term, waiver will only apply to special rules providing for the consideration or disposition of a conference report to accompany the bill H.R. 3734, nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 492 was reported by the Committee on Rules by unanimous voice vote. The distinguished Member, Mr. MOAKLEY, stated in the Committee on Rules that he had no objections to this rule. The committee recognized the need for expedited procedures to bring the welfare reform conference report forward as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following extraneous material for the RECORD:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, June 3, 1996]

THE END OF WELFARE AS WE KNOW IT?

(By David Whitman)

Bertha Bridges is still waiting for the end of welfare as she knows it. Bridges and her three children have been on and off welfare since the early 1980s, and she has been unable to hold a job in recent years because school administrators often call several times a week to ask her to pick up her disruptive, severely depressed 13-year-old son for fighting and disobeying teachers.

Seventeen months after U.S. News first interviewed her for a cover story on welfare reform, matters have only worsened for the Detroit resident. Several weeks ago her son let three strangers into her house, and they promptly stole Bridges's money, jewelry, clothing, dishes and videocassette recorder. Her son is now back in a psychiatric hospital, his younger sister is starting to imitate him by refusing to complete school assignments and Bridges doesn't know where to turn for help. "I'm living a nightmare," she says.

Last week, President Clinton and Bob Dole jostled to claim the title of welfare abolitionist—and to deny the other guy credit for overhauling a welfare system that still does little to encourage self-reliance. But while the candidates feud, many of the 4.6 million families on Aid to Families with Dependent Children are living out nightmares like that of Bridges.

Clinton claims that waivers granted by his administration to 38 states to conduct demonstration programs have led to a quiet rev-

olution. "The state-based reform we have encouraged," he said in his May 18 radio address, "has brought work and responsibility back to the lives of 75 percent of the Americans on welfare." Yet according to federal statistics, only 13 percent of AFDC adults participated in any education, training or work program in a typical month in 1994, up a hair from 12 percent in 1992. At present, less than 1 in 100 AFDC parents toils each month in workfare programs in exchange for a relief check, a number that has remained constant since Clinton came to office.

Thanks largely to an improved economy, the number of Americans on AFDC—12.8 million—was 9 percent lower in January than three years earlier. Yet the rolls are still at historically high levels, and 1 in 5 American children still lives below the poverty line. In 1992, 13.5 percent of the nation's children received AFDC; in 1995, 13.4 percent of the country's children did so. One in seven kids in the United States is now on the dole.

According to the Department of Health and Human Services, 75 percent of AFDC recipients could be affected in an average month by at least one provision of the 61 waivers granted by the Clinton administration. That seems to be the basis for the president's claim that his waivers have re-introduced work and responsibility to the vast majority of AFDC recipients. But many of the waivers are for modest reforms. Such as allowing recipients to keep more earned income before their welfare checks are reduced.

The most far-reaching waivers permit states to impose time limits, usually two years. On how long a family can receive AFDC. According to a soon-to-be-released study by the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), HHS has authorized 11 states to run statewide programs with full-family cash-aid cutoffs and two more states' applications are pending.

Awaiting results. It is too early to tell whether the new time limits will fundamentally alter welfare. Since it takes years for recipients to use up their cash aid, time limits so far have affected few families. With the exception of Chicago, none of the nation's 10 largest cities is in a full-family time-limit state—and the new CLASP report indicates that 91 percent of AFDC recipients in Illinois are exempt from the time limits because they apply there only to families whose youngest child is 13 or older.

Other states provide narrower exemptions and extensions than Illinois but still have protective loopholes. One of the biggest: HHS has insisted that no state can remove a family from the AFDC rolls if the mother has complied with program rules and failed to find a job despite her best efforts.

CLASP's Mark Greenberg worries that the new time limits could throw many needy women and children off welfare. "If there are visible catastrophes," he says, "other states may be reluctant to move forward. But if the catastrophes are largely invisible, the nation's safeguards for protecting children will start to unravel." In Washington, meanwhile, the politicians are still fiddling.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I did make the statement that I had no objection to the rule. That was based on the promise that we were going to have the bill at 8 p.m. last night. But we do not have the bill, so I do object to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I have here a presentation.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXX, I object to the gentleman's use of the exhibit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman plan to use this exhibit?

Mr. WARD. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXX, the question is: Shall the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD] be permitted to use the exhibit?

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under paragraph 803 of Jefferson's Rules there is a provision, section 10, that states that no dilatory motion shall be entertained by the Speaker.

This particular section of the rules is very explicit. It goes through to proclaim that the clause was adopted in 1890 to make permanent a principle already enunciated in a ruling of the Speaker, who had declared that the "object of a parliamentary body is action, not stoppage of action."

Mr. Speaker, we have seen several motions to adjourn, one of which was offered by a colleague who then voted against that motion to adjourn.

We now have the second case, Mr. Speaker, of a chart being put up that is blank, that in fact has no substance.

The Speaker, has declined on a number of occasions in the history of this body or refused to allow procedures to continue that in effect stop the orderly process of business in this body.

I ask the Speaker, to rule on that section that, in fact, prohibits dilatory action. I ask the Speaker to rule on the parliamentary stature of an attempt to basically stop the action of the House through what in my opinion may be considered as a dilatory action under this particular rule of the operations of this body.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a vote is in order. This is not really even a legitimate parliamentary inquiry. I raise a point of order that with a vote already under way, this parliamentary inquiry is out of order and would ask that the Chair proceed with the vote previously ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to address the inquiry made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

The rule XXX question is not a motion. The rule XXX question is in the nature of a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 53, answered “present” 2, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

YEAS—351

Abercrombie	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Ackerman	Dooley	Jackson-Lee
Andrews	Doolittle	(TX)
Archer	Dornan	Jacobs
Army	Doyle	Jefferson
Bachus	Dreier	Johnson (SD)
Baesler	Duncan	Johnson, E.B.
Baker (CA)	Dunn	Johnston
Baker (LA)	Durbin	Jones
Barcia	Edwards	Kanjorski
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Kaptur
Barrett (WI)	Ehrlich	Kasich
Bartlett	Engel	Kelly
Bass	English	Kennedy (MA)
Bateman	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Becerra	Evans	Kennelly
Beilenson	Ewing	Killdee
Bereuter	Farr	Kim
Bevill	Fattah	King
Bilbray	Fawell	Kingston
Bishop	Fazio	Klecza
Bliley	Fields (LA)	Klink
Blumenauer	Fields (TX)	Klug
Blute	Filner	Knollenberg
Boehlert	Flanagan	Kolbe
Boehner	Foglietta	LaFalce
Bonilla	Foley	Lantos
Bonior	Forbes	Largent
Bono	Fowler	Latham
Borski	Fox	LaTourette
Boucher	Frank (MA)	Laughlin
Brewster	Franks (CT)	Leach
Browder	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Brown (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (GA)
Brown (OH)	Frisa	Lincoln
Brownback	Frost	Lipinski
Bryant (TX)	Funderburk	Livingston
Bunn	Furse	LoBiondo
Burton	Galleghy	Lofgren
Callahan	Ganske	Lowe
Calvert	Gejdenson	Lucas
Camp	Gekas	Luther
Campbell	Gephardt	Maloney
Canady	Gilchrest	Manton
Cardin	Gillmor	Manzullo
Castle	Gilman	Markey
Chabot	Gonzalez	Martini
Chambliss	Goodlatte	Mascara
Christensen	Goodling	Matsui
Chrysler	Gordon	McCarthy
Clay	Goss	McCollum
Clayton	Graham	McCrery
Clement	Green (TX)	McDermott
Clinger	Gutierrez	McHale
Clyburn	Gutknecht	McHugh
Coble	Hall (OH)	McIntosh
Coburn	Hall (TX)	McKinney
Coleman	Hamilton	McNulty
Collins (MI)	Hancock	Meehan
Condit	Hansen	Meek
Conyers	Harman	Menendez
Cooley	Hastings (FL)	Metcalfe
Costello	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Cox	Hayworth	Millender-
Coyne	Hefley	McDonald
Cramer	Hefner	Miller (CA)
Crane	Heineman	Miller (FL)
Crapo	Herger	Minge
Creameans	Hilliard	Mink
Cummings	Hinche	Moakley
Danner	Hobson	Molinari
Davis	Hoekstra	Mollohan
de la Garza	Holden	Montgomery
DeFazio	Horn	Moorhead
DeLay	Hostettler	Morella
Dellums	Houghton	Murtha
Deutsch	Hoyer	Myers
Diaz-Balart	Hutchinson	Myrick
Dicks	Hyde	Nadler
Dingell	Inglis	Neal
Dixon	Istook	Nethercutt

Neumann	Ros-Lehtinen
Ney	Rose
Norwood	Roybal-Allard
Nussle	Royce
Oberstar	Rush
Obey	Sabo
Oliver	Salmon
Ortiz	Sanford
Orton	Sawyer
Owens	Saxton
Oxley	Schiff
Pallone	Schroeder
Parker	Schumer
Pastor	Scott
Paxon	Seastrand
Payne (NJ)	Sensenbrenner
Payne (VA)	Serrano
Pelosi	Shaw
Peterson (FL)	Shays
Peterson (MN)	Shuster
Petri	Sisisky
Pickett	Skaggs
Pomeroy	Skeen
Porter	Skelton
Poshard	Slaughter
Pryce	Smith (MI)
Quillen	Smith (NJ)
Quinn	Smith (TX)
Rahall	Smith (WA)
Reed	Solomon
Regula	Spence
Riggs	Spratt
Rivers	Stark
Roberts	Stearns
Roemer	Stenholm
Rogers	Stokes
Rohrabacher	Studds

NAYS—53

Allard	Hilleary
Baldacci	Hoke
Ballenger	Johnson (CT)
Bentsen	Johnson, Sam
Bilirakis	Lazio
Bryant (TN)	Levin
Bunning	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Lightfoot
Collins (GA)	Linder
Combest	McInnis
Cubin	McKeon
Cunningham	Packard
Deal	Pombo
DeLauro	Radanovich
Ensign	Ramstad
Geren	Rangel
Greene (UT)	Sanders
Hastert	Scarborough

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Everett

LaHood

NOT VOTING—27

Barr	Flake	McDade
Barton	Ford	Meyers
Berman	Gibbons	Moran
Brown (CA)	Greenwood	Portman
Burr	Gunderson	Richardson
Chapman	Hayes	Roth
Chenoweth	Hunter	Roukema
Collins (IL)	Longley	Torricelli
Dickey	Martinez	Young (FL)

□ 1309

Ms. DELAURO changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. FURSE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. SPENCE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the gentleman was permitted to use the exhibit in question.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. LARGENT

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote

offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 172, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—239

Allard	Frisa	Norwood
Archer	Funderburk	Nussle
Army	Galleghy	Orton
Bachus	Ganske	Oxley
Baker (CA)	Gilchrest	Packard
Baker (LA)	Gillmor	Parker
Ballenger	Gilman	Paxon
Barr	Goodlatte	Peterson (MN)
Bartlett	Goodling	Petri
Barton	Gordon	Pombo
Bass	Goss	Porter
Bateman	Graham	Pryce
Bereuter	Greene (UT)	Quillen
Bilbray	Gutknecht	Quinn
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Radanovich
Bliley	Hamilton	Rahall
Blute	Hancock	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hansen	Regula
Boehner	Hastert	Riggs
Bonilla	Hastings (WA)	Roberts
Bono	Hayworth	Roemer
Brewster	Hefley	Rogers
Brownback	Heineman	Rohrabacher
Bryant (TN)	Herger	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunn	Hobson	Roth
Bunning	Hoekstra	Roukema
Burr	Horn	Royce
Burton	Hostettler	Salmon
Buyer	Houghton	Sanford
Callahan	Hutchinson	Saxton
Calvert	Hyde	Scarborough
Camp	Inglis	Schaefer
Campbell	Istook	Schiff
Canady	Jacobs	Scott
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Chabot	Jones	Shaw
Chambliss	Kasich	Shays
Christensen	Kelly	Shuster
Coble	Kim	Sisisky
Coburn	King	Skeen
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Combest	Klug	Smith (NJ)
Condit	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Cooley	Kolbe	Smith (WA)
Cox	LaHood	Solomon
Crane	Largent	Souder
Crapo	Latham	Spence
Creameans	LaTourette	Stearns
Cubin	Laughlin	Stenholm
Cunningham	Lazio	Stockman
Davis	Leach	Stump
de la Garza	Lewis (CA)	Talent
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Tate
DeLay	Lightfoot	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	Lincoln	Taylor (MS)
Dickey	Linder	Thomas
Doggett	Livingston	Thornberry
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Thornton
Dornan	Longley	Tiahrt
Dreier	Lucas	Torkildsen
Duncan	Manzullo	Trafficant
Dunn	Martini	Upton
Durbin	McCollum	Vucanovich
Ehlers	McCrery	Walker
Ehrlich	McHugh	Walsh
English	McInnis	Wamp
Ensign	McIntosh	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McKeon	Weldon (PA)
Ewing	Metcalfe	White
Fawell	Mica	Whitfield
Fields (TX)	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Flanagan	Molinari	Williams
Foley	Moorhead	Wilson
Forbes	Morella	Wise
Fowler	Myers	Wolf
Fox	Myrick	Young (AK)
Franks (CT)	Nethercutt	Zeliff
Franks (NJ)	Neumann	Zimmer
Frelinghuysen	Ney	

NOES—172

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Moran
Ackerman	Gephardt	Murtha
Andrews	Geren	Nadler
Baesler	Gibbons	Neal
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Oberstar
Barcia	Green (TX)	Obey
Barrett (NE)	Gutierrez	Olver
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Becerra	Harman	Owens
Beilenson	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Berman	Hefner	Pastor
Bevill	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Bishop	Hinchey	Payne (VA)
Blumenauer	Holden	Pelosi
Bonior	Hoyer	Peterson (FL)
Borski	Jackson (IL)	Pickett
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Browder	(TX)	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Rose
Cardin	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Chapman	Kaptur	Rush
Clay	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Clement	Kennelly	Sawyer
Clyburn	Kildee	Schroeder
Coleman	Klecza	Schumer
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Serrano
Conyers	Levin	Skaggs
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Coyne	Lipinski	Slaughter
Cramer	Lofgren	Spratt
Cummings	Lowey	Stark
Danner	Luther	Stokes
DeFazio	Maloney	Studds
DeLauro	Manton	Stupak
Dellums	Markey	Tanner
Deutsch	Martinez	Tejeda
Dicks	Mascara	Thompson
Dingell	Matsui	Thurman
Dixon	McCarthy	Torres
Dooley	McDermott	Torricelli
Doyle	McHale	Towns
Edwards	McKinney	Velazquez
Engel	McNulty	Vento
Eshoo	Meehan	Visclosky
Evans	Meek	Volkmer
Farr	Menendez	Ward
Fattah	Millender	Waters
Fazio	McDonald	Watt (NC)
Fields (LA)	Miller (CA)	Watts (OK)
Filner	Minge	Waxman
Foglietta	Mink	Weller
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Woolsey
Frost	Mollohan	Wynn
Furse	Montgomery	Yates

NOT VOTING—22

Bentsen	Gunderson	Meyers
Chenoweth	Hayes	Portman
Clinger	Hilleary	Richardson
Collins (IL)	Hoke	Seastrand
Flake	Hunter	Taylor (NC)
Ford	Klink	Young (FL)
Gekas	Lantos	
Greenwood	McDade	

□ 1330

Mr. POMBO changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a previous speaking commitment located off Capitol Hill earlier today, I missed votes on rollcall No. 379, to permit the use of an exhibit, and rollcall No. 380, to table the motion to reconsider. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 379 and "yes" on rollcall No. 380.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming time I yielded to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD], I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague and my friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr.

MCINNIS], for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are considering this rule waiving the two-thirds requirement for same day consideration because my Republican colleagues didn't finish the welfare bill until midnight last night.

And last evening, I agreed to this two-thirds rule because I was told this welfare bill would be available by 8 last night.

But, Mr. Speaker, we did not get the bill until quarter of one in the morning and that is completely unacceptable. Because, Mr. Speaker, this issue is very very important and 434 Members of Congress are going to be asked to vote on this enormous bill and the ink isn't even dry yet.

This bill is no small potatoes. It represents a major change in our welfare system which will affect millions and millions of Americans, most of those Americans, Mr. Speaker, are children.

For that reason I think no amount of time is too much. We have a very serious responsibility to the 9 million children who are supported by aid to families with dependent children and those children are depending on us to do it right.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this two-thirds rule. Congress hasn't had anywhere enough time to consider this bill and it will affect far too many children to be rushed through the Congress.

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

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

First of all, I am pleased to announce that we now understand that the President is going to have a press conference here in about 8½ minutes where he will announce that he is in support of this bill. I am also pleased to announce they have located Leon Panetta, so we can now proceed to the substance of this issue that we have sitting right here in front of us.

The substance is very simple. That is, we have to change welfare in this country. The welfare bill originally went out of here with bipartisan support. It is going to go to the President of the United States with bipartisan support, and it is going to be signed by the President.

The gentleman from Massachusetts brings up a valid point. The problem is it is somewhat exaggerated. The gentleman shows a huge bill over there, as that is the bill that has been given to him in the last several hours or early this morning to read. That is correct. That particular bill was given to him. But about 99.9 percent of that bill is what has been previously contained.

The only changes really were two-fold: First, on the family cap and, second, dealing with Medicaid. So that probably consumes maybe 20, 30 pages out of that entire bill. Yes, we have asked that Members here on the House floor take time this morning during their workday to read that 20 to 40

pages or whatever was necessary to be briefed by their staff.

We are trying to get this bill to the President. For the first time in a long time, we have general agreement on a major, major issue. We have got Democrat and Republican support on the House side. We have got Democrat and Republican support on the Senate side. We have got a Democratic President that is willing to sign it.

That means that we should expedite the movement of this bill. That means that this rule should pass. By the way, upstairs this bill was voted out of committee on a unanimous vote, no dissension upstairs. I think it is now an appropriate time for us to move on, pass this rule so that we can get to the meat of the conference committee report and send this bill to the President for signature.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is not any great pleasure that I come here today to be able to address the rule that is now before us. This is a rule that, when we as Democrats were in the majority, known as basically martial law, that we only used at the end of the session, usually the last 3 days, in order to facilitate the passage of conference reports in those last few days. Yet under this leadership and this majority, this year alone this martial law type of rule has been in effect longer than any time if you added up all of my previous 19 years here.

So in 1 year, this year, this session, we have used it more than I did in the previous 19 years. Now, that tells me a little bit about the running of the House and procedures in the House. This is not necessary. This rule is not necessary. If we follow the normal rules of the House, the rule to take up the welfare bill, it would be reported in a day, be taken up tomorrow in the normal course, be passed. The welfare bill will be taken up and passed. But for some reason or other, it has been dictated by on high, and that is what I did say, dictated by on high, the majority, the Speaker and the floor leader, the leadership of the Republicans have decided we are going to do it today.

They wanted to do it early this morning. They wanted to do this right away before any of us even had a chance to look at the bill.

The chairman, the ranking member of the committee has a copy of the bill there, and there is a copy right over here. I dare say on the gentleman's side and my side there is not 10 percent of the Members that have even read that bill. Now, they have a general idea of what is in it, but that is all.

A lot of them were willing to vote for it because I talked to Members on both sides. They are willing to vote for it, either for or against it this morning without knowing the details. Just the idea of what is in there.

That gives me a great deal of concern, that we have here representatives of the people in the U.S. House of Representatives that are willing to vote on a far-reaching piece of legislation that will impact on millions of people and yet doing it without knowing exactly what is in it. That gives me a great deal of concern about the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, not as great a deal as the policy that is being followed of, again, dictating to the Members of the House. That is basically what we are seeing here, is a dictatorial policy, autocratic. The leadership knows better than anybody else. We are going to do it their way or no way, and that is what we are up against today.

It is that policy that I think has led us to a lack of bipartisanship in this House. It is the Republican leadership, in my opinion, Speaker GINGRICH, Floor Leader DICK ARMEY, that are responsible for the highly partisanship feeling that pervades this House today. It is not only just on this side. It is on the majority side, too. I hear it constantly, about the partisanship. Yet everybody stands up and says, We ought to be bipartisan; we need to be bipartisan.

How can we be bipartisan when the hand is never reached out to the other side to say, hey, what can we do together on this. That hand is never reached out. Instead, it is just like this legislation, this rule, it is dictated from above. It is toned down. Take it or leave it. That is the way it is. There is no bipartisanship. There is no attempt to be bipartisan in this House.

I hope that somewhere between now and the end of this session the majority leadership under the Speaker would see fit to not be so autocratic, not to be so dictatorial, but to reach out that hand to Members on this side and say, let us work together the rest of the year on legislation and let us be bipartisan. There is not much bipartisanship here today.

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

First of all, to the gentleman from Missouri, I wanted to caution him a little on the utilization of the word "dictatorship." I do not think that adds to the comity on the floor. I think we should approach those kind of terms with some trepidation.

Let me address the other point. That is, I do not want the gentleman from Missouri, because I have great respect for the gentleman, to continue to use inaccurate facts. The gentleman stated to our body here that when they were in control we did not see these kind of rules until the end of the session. I do not know why this keeps coming up, but time after time after time, when we deal with a rule, Mr. Speaker, we

have to repudiate that. I have got the facts right here. I would be happy, if the gentleman would like to come over here, we will show him the statistics.

Let me cover very briefly 1993. It was not near the end of the session when his side utilized this rule. In fact, it was in February, in March, in March, in March, in March, in March, in March, and then, of course, we had some throughout the rest of the session, too. I just want to make sure that we are accurate on our facts.

The final thing I would caution the gentleman from Missouri, his statements about this is not bipartisan. In fact, I think this bill right here, No. 1, both Democrats and Republicans and unaffiliated and reform party people from across this country acknowledge that welfare needs to be changed. The system does not work. All of the incentive on this system is to stay on it, not to get off it. The system helps people that do not need help and does not help the people that really do need help.

Since I have been up here, I do not think I know such a major piece of legislation that has had more joint effort. Certainly the last 3 or 4 hours, I was somewhat amused when the gentleman said this morning, this morning escaped from us because, frankly, there was a lot of partisanship delay this morning. But we have gotten past that.

The bill itself, the substance of this bill is a bipartisan product, a Democrat and Republican product. Certainly. It has been brought up by the Republican leadership. It is a Republican part of our contract. It was one of our biggest efforts, but we have had lots of help and we have appreciated that.

□ 1345

It is bipartisan, and at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes, the President of this country is going to hold a press conference where we anticipate that he is going to agree to sign this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] for extending the time because today, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to pass a stark welfare reform that requires work and personal responsibility and lifts families from lives of despair and hopelessness. I think we should especially look to the fact that for able-bodied individuals this Congress and this Government will make sure that we have job training and job placement for the able-bodied, and for those that truly are in need, just seeking it, we will be there.

The fact is that on child nutrition programs we are talking about block-granting the States, which is a great benefit because right now on child nutrition programs we are spending 15 percent to administer those programs, and the States, only 5 percent for administration. With the extra 10 percent they will receive from the Federal Gov-

ernment, they must feed more children more meals by our great standards. The States will follow the Federal standards.

On child support enforcement, we are going to make sure that all of those individuals and families that do not now have, for many deadbeat dads and other parents, the funds they need to make sure that the children are protected. They will have to adopt in each State programs like they have in Maine where they had 21,000 people who had not paid their child support; and when they said they could lose their driver's license, they in fact, 95 percent within 30 days, paid their child support payment.

So we see a program that is going to become more modern, more sensitive, and make sure that we take care of those in need, and we make sure that the welfare reform that we have crafted here is bipartisan and worthy of the votes of both sides of the aisle in both Chambers and, hopefully, as well, with our President.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3734, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK OPPORTUNITY RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-729) on the resolution (H. Res. 495) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 495) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany 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 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 495

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3734) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The yeas and nays shall be considered as ordered on the question of adoption of the conference report and on any subsequent conference report or motion to