

I think that is what most Americans think, that with reform we would say that if you do not work then you lose your benefits or that we would try to get at the welfare fraud or curb the cost of the bureaucracy administering the program. That is what is happening here.

What was supposed to be a historic effort to balance the budget has deteriorated into legislation that does relatively little to reduce the long-term deficit, but would substantially increase the depth of poverty and likely cause substantial numbers of poor children and elderly people to fail to secure adequate food and nutrition.

Now, the Castle-Tanner substitute, which I will be supporting tomorrow, basically ensures that States would be able to meet the work requirements in the bill by providing \$3 billion in additional mandatory funds that States can access in order to meet the cost of moving welfare recipients to work.

It costs money to get the States to train people to get them to work. That is why we need the Castle-Tanner substitute. We need a program that is going to get people to work and not hurt the children.

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

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. MANZULLO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. DORNAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM POSTPONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight during this hour of special orders to bring to the attention of this country, and particularly to my colleagues in this House, what is going on here in Washington, what is going on here in this Congress at this moment.

We heard earlier speakers talk about this was going to be the week that has been postponed, and it had been postponed that we were going to have Reform Week, where Congress was going to address all of those issues that the constituents of this country, the people, have said are broken and need fixing. This was the week to fix things.

Just hours ago we were told that the issue that we have all been waiting for, one of the biggest issues facing the United States in this election year, campaign reform, has now been taken off the table.

□ 2145

Postponed until next week, and who knows, if not taken up next week, maybe indefinitely. I am here tonight to talk with some of my colleagues about the importance of campaign reform. I am serving in my 21st year of elective office, having been in local government, State government. I do not think there has been a time in those 21 years when people did not ask me what we are going to do about campaign reform.

In California, a big State, we have done a lot. It certainly is not enough because there are two measures on the ballot this November that will radically change campaign law for election to State and local office. Perhaps the one that is most focused on is the Federal law that governs all of us who get elected to the United States Congress.

This is an issue that we have been working on for many years. My colleague, MARTY MEEHAN, from Massachusetts, has been a strong voice from the moment he arrived, talking about the need for Congress to address campaign reform. Indeed, he led a bipartisan effort to put together a bill that he spoke about earlier tonight that had about an even number of Democrats and Republicans cosponsor it.

The Republican leadership will not even allow that bill to come to the floor for a vote. Why? Perhaps Mr. MEEHAN might want to join me here in discussing why his bill cannot even get to the floor, and I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California not only for reserving an hour of time but also for his efforts on campaign finance reform.

The Committee on Rules is meeting right now and taking all kinds of testimony, so you never know, maybe they will come up with a rule that will allow a debate on this bill.

I think that one of the things that many on the Committee on Rules are afraid of is that the President will sign the bill. President Clinton has said when he spoke in the State of the Union address that we needed campaign finance reform and he specifically mentioned the bill that I have been working with LINDA SMITH from Washington and CHRIS SHAYS from Connecticut. It is a bicameral and bipartisan bill.

He challenged the Congress to pass that bill. I cannot help but think that part of the reason is, President Clinton has said, I am going to sign campaign finance reform if it limits how much money is spent in congressional elections and begins the process of trying to lessen the influence of special interests.

There are some times, with all respect, I think that the Republican leadership down at the Committee on Rules are afraid the President will actually sign the bill. Would that not be something?

Mr. FARR of California. Well, I think what your bill and my bill, which is very similar to it, very minor differences, frankly, our bills, we are relatively new to Congress, but our bills are based on what this House has been able to produce in the 103d Congress, the 102d Congress, the 101st Congress, going all the way back to 1988 to the 100th Congress.

The Democrats have led in putting our campaign reform bills that are very much similar to the bill that we are trying to get on the floor now and in fact had gotten through this House, and every time they have been blocked by the Republican leadership. In fact, in one case in 1992, President Bush just before the Presidential elections in 1992 vetoed the campaign reform passed by both the House and the Senate.

We are back at it again, and I think what is so shocking about where we are now, because some of the controversies in that bill were that you had vouchers, essentially the process where taxpayers would help pay for the cost of campaigns and that was always very controversial. Took those out. No longer in the bill.

And what do we see come along from the other side? Nothing about reform. There is no reform in the Republican leadership bill. There is no reform in the reform week of the Republican dialog. We are here tonight, three colleagues who are down in the trenches fighting for these issues and I think we are befuddled, we are just amazed that the bill they brought forth this week essentially allows you to auction off seats in the U.S. Congress.