the Foster Grandparent Program, the Senior Companion Program, and the Retired Senior Volunteer Program that people like Mary Lloyd in Montgomery County and others across America who are volunteers in those programs are making a difference. Tonight, along with other colleagues, I salute the Foster Grandparent Program and all they have done for America.

A REVOLUTIONARY REFORM CONGRESS?

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, last January 1995, this House began its proceedings with great fanfare and with claims that this would be in fact a revolutionary reform Congress. In fact, things have changed quite a bit over the course of the last few months.

The taxpayers have seen this House squander $1.5 billion of taxpayer money with costly Government shutdowns. They have seen the extremism of this House in one failure after another, with almost no legislative accomplishments to point to. And now we get to 1996, and the reform Congress has, by the Republican leadership, been reduced to a reform week. This is reform week.

The only problem is that all the reforms that our Republican colleagues have come up with they now have taken their reform week, and I think they are reducing it to a reform hour. At the rate they are going, they may be down to a reform minute for this Congress.

The strange thing about the reform of this Republican Congress is that not many Members, Republican or Democrat, have much motion of what this reform hour will actually consider. Because, Mr. Speaker, in the reform hour that we will now have out of this reform Congress in this reform year, the Committee on Rules has yet to meet to even decide what amendments will be in order with reference to reforming the way this Congress operates.

Most people do not really realize that the Members themselves will not have an opportunity to vote on many of the reform ideas that people across America are talking about that they would like to see this Congress adopt. Indeed, we will consider two of the most important issues facing America: That of welfare reform and that of campaign finance reform and the way this Congress operates, without having adequate forewarning of what amendments will be considered in order, and what alternatives that people across America have advocated might be considered.

But, of course, all of this is consistent with the experience that America had last year leading up to the costly Government shutdowns. Because people across America will remember that we struggled against the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], to get a gift ban to end the ties that bind legislators and lobbyists. We finally were able to overcome his opposition and obtain that reform last year.

□ 2130

He held here at the desk, at his Speaker's rostrum, last year for a matter of months the first lobby reform bill in almost 50 years. We were able to build up enough public concern over lobby reform that we overcame the Speaker's opposition to that reform. Now we are finally to the most important issue, that of campaign finance reform for which there is some bipartisan support in this House. There are Members on both sides of the aisle that have come up and have spoken out in favor of genuine campaign finance reform. Indeed, it was the Speaker himself who a little over a year ago stood there in front of a crowd in New Hampshire with President Clinton, shook hands and said, ''We will have a bipartisan effort to address this issue of campaign finance reform.'' Yet once the smile was over and the cameras had gone away, nothing happened. Indeed, it took the Speaker from the summer until the end of October or the beginning of November to even announce his plans. Those plans were to appoint a commission to look at the issue. Of course, a commission has never been appointed in all the ensuing months. With all that valuable time going by, the chance that any reform, even from this reform hour that we have left, affecting the elections this year has simply gone down the drain.

I think that is extremely unfortunate. Because there was a proposal out there supported by Common Cause, supported by the Reform Party, supported by a number of independent organizations that neither the Republican Party nor frankly the Democratic Party, many elements of it, liked all that much. I think the only kind of reform that will really change this system once and for all is one that hurts each side a little bit, that there is dissatisfaction on from each side a little bit. I believe we have such a proposal in the bipartisan approach that Members of both sides have come together on and have advocated, but it now appears, not through any formal action of the leadership at this point but my word of mouth of what they may do, that they will refuse to even let this House consider that proposal in the very little time for reform, the hour or so for reform that we will have the day after tomorrow, to deal with the way that campaign dollars and campaign financing are polluting and affecting in a most negative way the way that this House operates. It is wrong that we have been narrowed to this little time. It is time for the American people to speak out and demand that this system be genuinely reformed.

FIXING A BROKEN WELFARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, before my colleague from Texas departs the floor, I just want to quickly hasten to point out that this Congress, the 104th Congress, has made reform a priority. In fact the reforms that we have enacted to date, a few of which the gentleman alluded to, have been enacted through this House of Representatives on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis: The Congressional Accountability Act, which applies the same laws to Congress as the rest of the country and basically makes Congress work under the same laws that it imposes on American families and businesses; the very strict gift ban that was enacted last year; and very comprehensive lobbying reforms.

So it is a shame, really, that the gentleman comes to the well and attempts to make congressional reform and campaign reform a partisan issue. But to the extent that it becomes a partisan issue, I should tell the gentleman that I very well remember from my service in the 102d Congress the House of Representatives under Democratic control, and I very well remember the House bank and post office scandals that sort of gave new meaning to the term ''the check is in the mail,'' at least back here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk, though, about our broken welfare system. I subscribe to the old adage that if it ain't broke, don't fix it, but our Nation's outdated and failed welfare system is definitely broken and it is in desperate need of major repair. We must fix it now. Time is simply running out.

In 1965, our country launched a war on poverty. The intentions were good, but this led, I think we know now, to the creation of the welfare state as we know it and this whole political constituency of dependency in our country. Thirty-one years and $5.4 trillion later, we have nothing really to show for the war on poverty but more poverty, despair, hopelessness, broken families, and a very damaged work ethic in American society. Doing nothing and allowing this destructive system to continue is one of the most uncompassionate things we can do.

Eighteen months ago, the new Republican majority in this Congress set out to truly reform welfare. We tried to help the Democratic President make good on his campaign promise to end welfare as we know it. But twice our efforts were stopped by Presidential vetoes. However, this week we are trying again.

Our welfare reform plan is built upon five principles; we call them pillars. We believe that welfare should not be a way of life; we feel that welfare should be replaced with work; we want to shift

power and flexibility back to the States so that they can run their own welfare programs for their own residents; we believe that noncitizens and felons should not receive welfare; and we think that personal responsibility should be encouraged in order to halt rising illegitimacy rates in America. Make no mistake about it, our present welfare system has contributed to soaring rates of illegitimacy and family disintegration in America to the point where today almost one out of three births are out of wedlock.

We believe that welfare should be a helping hand in times of trouble, not a handout that becomes a way of life. So our plan would impose a 5-year lifetime limit for collecting welfare benefits. Although a family will no longer receive cash benefits after that time, the safety net remains in place. They are still eligible after the 5-year limit on welfare benefits, cash benefits, for Medicaid and nutrition assistance. And recognizing the need for hardship cases, our plan would allow the States to exempt up to 20 percent of welfare parents or welfare families from the 5-year limit.

We really believe that this is a good program and in order to make sure that welfare is temporary assistance in time of need, we emphasize work over welfare. Our plan has welfare parents, many of whom struggle against heroic odds, working within 2 years or they lose their benefits; 15 percent of welfare parents must work in this fiscal year, with 50 percent required to work by 2002. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that our plan will require 1.3 million working parents to work in 2002 compared to 900,000, or 30 percent, under President Clinton's bill.

Make no mistake about the President's dilemma here. He is in a real predicament because he is going to have to choose when this legislation reaches his desk between doing the right thing, making good on that campaign promise to end welfare as we know it or alienating the left wing of his own political party, which is his political base. We hope that the President will come forward and do the right thing. We hope that he will join us so that no longer will States have to spend countless hours filling out required bureaucratic forms hoping to receive permission from Washington to implement their own welfare programs.

We hope that we can reduce and streamline the welfare bureaucracy so that we can crack down on waste and fraud in the system. We hope that our plan will help reverse illegitimacy by requiring welfare recipients to assist in the identity of the fathers, establishing paternity in all cases and requiring the parents to participate.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good solid plan we will take up this week that allows individuals to reach out and help their neighbors. If we fix this destructive welfare system now, future generations of children will thank us later.

WELFARE AND CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but come to the floor of the House in listening to the previous speaker argue so eloquently but yet with little substance on the question of welfare reform. In fact, I am not here to speak about welfare reform. I hope to be engaged in that debate as I have been engaged in the process of negotiating and trying to provide for the American people real welfare reform.

Might I remind my Republican colleagues that though they claim some sort of hold on the idea of work, they vigorously oppose the increase in minimum wage to make work valuable for those single mothers who have to support their children. They have also opposed in any welfare reform the reality of having child care and job care and, yes, a job. I am reminded of Mayor Norquist of Wisconsin, I believe, who shared with me as I was a member of the National League of Cities Board of Directors when some many years ago we as city representatives were discussing real welfare reform. If I can recall, I believe that Mayor Norquist talked eloquently about the Wisconsin plan. It was not a handout, it was a handup. But one thing he emphasized is that they were concerned and worked hard to provide jobs for those individuals that would move off welfare. They first allowed them to seek jobs in the private sector but if they could not find such jobs, the local government provided opportunity for them.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, when we engage in this debate toward the end of the week, we will be forthright with the American people, that we will not hide the ball, if you will, that we will not give them a shiny bright apple that is permeated with worms; and that is that we will tell them and work for real welfare reform that includes jobs, that includes health care, that includes opportunity for child care.

Let me now, Mr. Speaker, if I might, very briefly say that I come to the floor in support of the Farr bill on campaign reform, H.R. 3505, which I happen to be a cosponsor of. We too will be engaging in a fraudulent debate on reform at the end of the week, because we are not looking at the real issues. interestingly enough, the Farr bill has a candidate limitation where the candidates may spend no more than $50,000 of their own money.

They ask for a candidate to declare a statement that they will abide by the limits of this legislation. They require that anyone who is advertising on television will be sensitive to the physically challenged and require closed captioning. They will also limit the amount of money that can go to national parties by PAC's. That is real campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to comment on the opposition to H.R. 3760, the Republican bill, where, for example, they call it reform to allow individuals to get more than $1,000 up to $2,500 per election, when they call it reform to allow PAC's to give not $25,000 but $72,500 a year, when they call it reform when the maximum amount individuals can give to any one political party goes from $20,000 to $58,000 a year; and furthermore these amounts will not count toward the new $72,500 cumulative limit.

It is interesting that Members of their own party are opposed to this kind of campaign finance reform. I do believe that reform should be bipartisan.

I think the Farr bill offers a clear and pointed response that allows those who come to this elective process, not wealthy, but simply wanting to serve the American people, that they will have a fair shake in being represented. I think that we should have a bipartisan approach to campaign finance reform. We have that opportunity this week. I hope that we will not cast aside that opportunity and that we will show the American people we can stand up, one, for welfare reform, the right kind, but real reform and campaign finance reform; we will stand up for the physically challenged, we will not allow large sums to be given on an individual basis from $1,000 to $2,500; we will not pack the PAC's from $25,000 to $72,000; and, yes, we will not allow individuals to give to the political parties, the political party committee, moneys from $20,000 to $58,000 as we will recognize that it is important that candidates declare themselves committed to campaign finance reform, allowing themselves to sign on and to abide by these rules.

This is the challenge that we have in the U.S. Congress this week, to leave this week, proud of what we have done, voting for real welfare reform, giving people a hand up and not a handout; not casting aside those individuals who need help, those young mothers who have children who can in fact become independent if we provide for them the right kind of bridge; and yes, to show the American people that we are not afraid of real campaign finance reform and we are not going to hide behind a fraudulent bill as our Republican colleagues have offered, but yet other Republican colleagues likewise have disagreed with.

We hope that these colleagues can join with us and support the Farr bill, real campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the summary of the Farr bill, H.R. 3505, for the RECORD.

FARR BILL ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM—H.R. 3505

CAMPAIGN SPENDING LIMITS

Limits apply to a full 2-year cycle.

Voluntary limits of $600,000 (indexed for inflation, with 1996 as the base year).

Special election limits of $600,000.

Closely contested primaries: an additional $200,000 may be spent in the general election