if you started showing a little common decency and respect.

□ 1030

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: the Committee on Agriculture; the Committee on Banking and Financial Services; the Committee on Commerce; the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; the Committee on International Relations; the Committee on the Judiciary; the Committee on National Security; the Committee on Resources; the Committee on Science; the Committee on Small Business; the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3562, WISCONSIN WORKS WAIVER APPROVAL ACT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 446 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 446

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3562) to authorize the State of Wisconsin to implement the demonstration project known as ''Wisconsin Works''. The amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees; (2) one motion to amend by Representative Kleczka of Wisconsin or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment to the bill considered as adopted pursuant to the first section of this resolution is as follows:

In section 1(d) of the bill, strike ''subsection (b)(2) exceeds the amount described in subsection (b)(1)'' and insert in lieu thereof ''subsection (b)(1) exceeds the amount described in subsection (b)(2)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Boston, MA [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 446 is a modified closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3562, the Wisconsin Works Waiver Approval Act. The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees. The rule allows one amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] and provides 1 hour of debate on the amendment, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule provides that an amendment contained in section 2 of the resolution shall be considered as adopted. This change to the bill is necessary to correct a technical drafting error which has been cleared with the minority.

Finally, this rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. The rule before the House is abundantly fair. It makes in order a minority substitute and provides adequate debate time. It was reported by the Committee on Rules yesterday by a voice vote, noncontroversial.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House this morning is proceeding on an admittedly hurried timetable, out of sincere desire to accommodate the President of the United States. On May 19, 1996, President Clinton announced his support for Wisconsin's landmark welfare reform plan and suggested it be implemented immediately. He said, ''The plan has the makings of a solid, bold welfare reform plan.'' He intoned that to his radio listeners. He said further, ''We should get it done now.''

Mr. Speaker, if someone who had not followed this issue had heard the President's radio address, they might easily come away with the impression that this is a man who supports real welfare reform. As with all things, he sounded perfectly convincing. The record, Mr. Speaker, is quite another story. The President has vetoed genuine and compassionate welfare reform on two separate occasions, once in the context of a bill to balance the budget in 7 years, a terribly important bill; another, the stand-alone welfare bill, he vetoed in the middle of the night, during a huge snowstorm here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Works plan ironically contains many of the features of the two welfare reform bills that President Clinton has already vetoed. It requires, and this is so, so important, it requires work, contains a time limit on benefits, and it ends the auto pilot spending that has busted Federal and State budgets for the past two decades, and even more.

Mr. Speaker, over the next few hours, we will hear Members on the other side of the aisle suggest that we should let the waiver process work and allow for adequate time for Federal officials to study this. They are going to say that in just a few minutes. This is essentially, Mr. Speaker, a defense of the status quo, and that is not good enough. It is essentially a defense of the convoluted and failed national welfare system. We all know what that has done.

Mr. Speaker, the present waiver process, in which innovative Governors trudge to Washington to receive a blessing to implement new welfare reforms, is an absolute sham. Mr. Speaker, if the States received block grants of the sort envisioned in our welfare reform bills, rejected by the President, Governors would not need to make this embarrassing pilgrimage here to Washington.

Under the present system, after a State legislature and a Governor have approved a measure which requires Federal waivers, Federal bureaucrats then are free to change those requests, to stall them, to deny them completely, and they often do. These bureaucrats view the requests for waivers from Federal rules as a negotiation in which details could be changed.

Mr. Speaker, this is how the White House Deputy Chief of Staff, Harold Ickes, described the process just 3 days after the President endorsed the Wisconsin Works plan. Evidently, they were not working together or seeing eye to eye or something.

Members of the House yesterday in the Committee on Rules, we heard testimony that several States, including California, including the State of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], have waivers pending for welfare reform before this President.

If Congress takes no action this year in the direction of welfare reform, my State of New York will be forced to present a lengthy list of waivers necessary in order to implement proposed welfare changes from Governor Pataki's budget, which is already busted and has to be fixed.

Mr. Speaker, the way to ensure that this is not necessary is to pass yet another comprehensive welfare reform bill, which we will do in just a few weeks, and for President Clinton to courageously sign it, not to veto it and talk different each time.

This waiver process for Wisconsin and the debate it has engendered is in itself an argument for our larger welfare reform bill. We have to get it out here and get it passed as soon as possible. If the President sees fit to approve these necessary and very compassionate policy decisions for one State in the country, why not sign a comprehensive national program of welfare reform?

The debate today will range to classic issues of federalism: How much control should the Federal Government have over local and State policies to assist the underprivileged in America? That is what this debate is going to be all about here today. The Congress has committed on two occasions to a policy of block grants for the States, to allow them to utilize their resources as they see fit to grapple with the problem of poverty, but the argument that we should reject this fast track approval of Wisconsin's welfare plan because we need more time for Federal officials to study this program which has been going on for 40 years reflects a lack of compassion toward the families who are trapped in the current welfare system and its cycles of dependency. We have to stop that.

The way to do it is to test this pilot program in Wisconsin, which has already reduced under the first plan by Governor Tommy Thompson, has already reduced the caseload by 39 percent. If we can do that in New York State, my goodness, what that would mean to the taxpayers that have to support county and local taxes by their property taxes? Let us get on with it. Let us pass this rule and pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a document entitled ''The Amendment Process Under Special Rules Reported by the Rules Committee, 103rd Congress versus 104th Congress.''

The information referred to is as follows:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 5, 1996]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open [2]	46	44	71	59
Structured/Modified Closed [3]	49	47	32	27
Closed [4]	9	9	17	14
Total	104	100	120	100

[1] This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

[2] An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

[3] A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

[4] A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 5, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350–71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255–172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229–100; A: 227–127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282–144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252–175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253–165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271–151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257–155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	A: 242–190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228–204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253–172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414–4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233–176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225–191 A: 233–183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–196 A: 236–191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221–178 A: 217–175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258–170 A: 271–152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PQ: 236–194 A: 234–192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235–193 D: 192–238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230–194 A: 229–195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242–185 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–192 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217–202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230–189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409–1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255–156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323–104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414–0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388–2 (9/19/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of June 5, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241–173 A: 375–39–1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304–118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344–66–1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231–194 A: 227–192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235–184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228–191 A: 235–185 (10/26/95).
		H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237–190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241–181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216–210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220–200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223–182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220–185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229–176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239–181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223–183 A: 228–184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands.	
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H.Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	PQ: 230–188 A: 229–189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: 228–182 A: 244–168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: voice vote A: 235–175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	MC	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 251–157 (3/13/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 233–152 A: voice vote (3/21/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 234–187 A: 237–183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/20/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	A: 244–166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	PQ: 232–180 A: 232–177, (3/28/96).
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	PQ: 229–186 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	MC	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	PQ: 232–168 A: 234–162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	O	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	O	H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 418 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2641	U.S. Marshals Service	PQ: 219–203 A: voice vote (5/1/96).
H. Res. 419 (4/30/96)	O	H.R. 2149	Ocean Shipping Reform	A: 422–0 (5/1/96).
H. Res. 421 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 2974	Crimes Against Children & Elderly	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 422 (5/2/96)	O	H.R. 3120	Witness & Jury Tampering	A: voice vote (5/7/96).
H. Res. 426 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 2406	U.S. Housing Act of 1996	PQ: 218–208 A: voice vote (5/8/96).
H. Res. 427 (5/7/96)	O	H.R. 3322	Omnibus Civilian Science Auth	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 428 (5/7/96)	MC	H.R. 3286	Adoption Promotion & Stability	A: voice vote (5/9/96).
H. Res. 430 (5/9/96)	S H.R. 3230	DoD Auth. FY 1997	A: 235–149 (5/10/96)..	
H. Res. 435 (5/15/96)	MC	H. Con. Res. 178	Con. Res. on the Budget, 1997	PQ: 227–196 A: voice vote (5/16/96).
H. Res. 436 (5/16/96)	C	H.R. 3415	Repeal $43 cent fuel tax	PQ: 221–181 A: voice vote (5/21/96).
H. Res. 437 (5/16/96)	MO	H.R. 3259	Intell. Auth. FY 1997	A: voice vote (5/21/96).
H. Res. 438 (5/16/96)	MC	H.R. 3144	Defend America Act	
H. Res. 440 (5/21/96)	MC	H.R. 3448	Small Bus. Job Protection	A: 219–211 (5/22/96).
		H.R. 1227	Employee Commuting Flexibility.	
H. Res. 442 (5/29/96)	O	H.R. 3517	Mil. Const. Approps. FY 1997	A: voice vote (5/30/96).
H. Res. 445 (5/30/96)	O	H.R. 3540	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1997	A: voice vote (6/5/96).
H. Res. 446 (6/5/96)	MC	H.R. 3562	WI Works Waiver Approval	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as four members of the Wisconsin delegation said yesterday in the Committee on Rules, these waivers have absolutely no business in the House of Representatives. Although I will not oppose this rule, I urge my colleagues to support the Obey substitute, which will allow the people of Wisconsin 30 days to comment on the waivers.

The substitute of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] says quite simply that if the Wisconsin welfare bill does what Governor Thompson says it will, then grant the waivers and let them get on with the business of helping people get off welfare and into jobs. If the bill does not do what the Governor says it will, then change it until it does.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, it is really not that simple. Unfortunately for the entire country, this issue, the issue of how the State of Wisconsin reforms its welfare system, has reached the level of Presidential politics, and heaven help Wisconsin. Now that the Presidential race has been swept up in the issue of Wisconsin welfare, we will not hear the end of it for a while.

It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, that this welfare bill overwhelmingly passed the Wisconsin State legislature. It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats and Republicans have supported it. It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, that President Clinton supported the goals of the plan in his radio address, despite its being offered by a Republican Governor. Now my Republican colleagues are smarting politically and they want revenge.

Mr. Speaker, the entire House of Representatives, all 434 or 435 Members who represent 50 States, have to vote on a 600-page waiver request for a bill which will affect only one State, and not, and I want to make this very clear, and not until October 1997. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, since 60 percent of this money to fund this program will come from the Federal taxpayers, it should have to go through the same approval system that all other waivers do; incidentally, the same approval system that has never denied a waiver from the State of Wisconsin, the same approval system that has already approved waivers from 40 States.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is politics. It should be reviewed and approved by the staff people at the Department of Health and Human Services, whose only job is to make sure that the Federal tax dollars are not spent in violation of Federal law. This department has already approved, as I said, waivers for 40 States. I expect there will be no problem with the Wisconsin waivers, especially since President Clinton says he supports the goals of the plan.

The Wisconsin plan, and I would like people to listen to this, this Wisconsin plan that we have before us today was submitted to the White House on May 29, 1996, 2 weeks ago. The Governor of Wisconsin at that time asked that the waivers be granted by August 1, 1996, which gives us plenty of time. We do not need legislation. The waivers will not go into effect again until October 1997.

I have no idea what this plan is doing here, Mr. Speaker, unless it is pure partisan politics. It should not be before the Congress when the White House as yet does not even have it for 3 weeks.

But my Republican colleagues, in order to help the Dole Presidential campaign, are going to shove these waivers down the throat of Congress, even when the Governor of Wisconsin himself has said he does not need them until October 1, 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, I am not going to oppose the rule, but I urge my colleagues to support the Obey substitute. Let us make sure that this plan does what it is supposed to do. Let us make sure that the American people are given their promised 30-day comment period. Let us not blindly waive 88 Federal laws just to help the Dole Presidential campaign.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me assure the members, we are not doing this to help the Dole campaign. I wish it were New York State applying for these waivers. We need it desperately in our State. Let us do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. PORTER GOSS, a very valuable member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend my good friend, the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, for his very diligent work in seeking cooperation and receiving it from the minority in crafting this rule. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely fair rule, providing the minority with a substitute, as was requested, along with a traditional motion to recommit, in effect giving those opposed to this measure two opportunities to propose changes. I think anybody would agree that is exceedingly fair.

Mr. Speaker, welfare reform is one of the most challenging and overdue matters pending before this Congress and this country. The welfare state, for all the social engineering and the trillions, in excess of $5 trillion of taxpayers' dollars over the past 40 years, has failed to bring people out of poverty or to break the cycle of dependency that we all see and are upset about.

On the contrary, the policies of Big Brother government have indisputably contributed to the very problems they were originally built to solve. Even our President recognizes the need to fix this failure of big government. He made it a celebrated campaign issue 4 years ago.

□ 1045

But unfortunately, his campaign rhetoric has yet to translate into concrete action at the White House, even though Congress has twice passed real welfare reform.

I say again, President Clinton, the man who, while in search of the White House 4 years ago, promised to end welfare as we know it, has rebuffed workable welfare reform that we have passed. Now States such as my home State of Florida are anxiously left hanging, awaiting reform at the national level. The wages program in Florida that passed through both the Florida House and Senate without a single ''no'' vote is predicated on action by President Clinton, action that was promised and action that has never happened.

Florida's approach was designed to fit the unanimously passed National Governors' Association plan, which closely resembles our H.R. 4, which is the true reform plan that President Clinton vetoed.

The bill before us today focuses on the State of Wisconsin's Wisconsin Works Program, which has taken tremendous steps toward restoring the work ethic and emphasizing the American values of responsibility and opportunity.

What the people of Wisconsin have done by an overwhelming vote, and I congratulate them, is create a system that reinforces the importance of a job. A remarkable thing about the Wisconsin plan is that it will eliminate the cycle of dependency that our current system regrettably fosters.

By requiring recipients to work, whether in a transitional job, a community service job, or a minimum- or low-wage job, the system will help individuals become productive members of our society. This is a bipartisan program that has the endorsement of the President of the United States by his own publicly spoken words. Yet, despite this extraordinary accomplishment, Wisconsin finds itself stymied by the old entrenched Federal regulation and redtape that have bound so much in Washington, and that is why we are here today. This bill will cut away the Federal shackles and let Wisconsin Works work.

Wisconsin's experience and Florida's experience and those of many other States raise the question of why this process is necessary in the first place.

My Republican colleagues and I favor ending the centralized, Washington-knows-best system that requires States to get Federal blessing when they attempt to solve the real problems in their State or to end the status quo that is killing them. That is what our comprehensive welfare reform proposals are all about, sending decisionmaking power back home to the States, closer to home, closer to the people.

In the next few weeks, we will be sending President Clinton another welfare reform bill. This time America will be watching ever more closely to see if he honors his campaign promises and actually signs the bill. In the meantime, I urge support for this rule and this bill because at least it allows one of our great 50 States to get on with the job of reform.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman alluded to the bureaucratic redtape. Will the gentleman yield that this proposal has only been before the White House less than 2 weeks?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I take the gentleman at his word. We are trying to expedite a good idea, and I have seen 2 weeks stretch into many years at the White House. Let us hope that we can preclude that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, would the gentleman also agree that every waiver that Wisconsin asked for has been granted in the past?

Mr. GOSS. I have no idea about that. I am sure we will hear it in the debate.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT], who testified very well before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, welcome to Presidential politics, 1996, Wisconsin style. We are fortunate today to have the Presidential campaign brought to my home State and most particularly the district that I represent, because I represent the most people in this country that are going to be affected by this legislation. But I think it will be interesting just to give you a little history about how this came about, why this issue is here before us.

Wisconsin has been working on welfare reform for some time. They held many hearings, they passed a bill, and they asked the presumptive nominee, Senator DOLE, if he would attend the signing of this bill. They thought it would be a good opportunity to get his name in front of the American people on welfare reform.

Well, he did not show up, and they were frustrated, because he did not come to our State, the Governor asked him to come, and he was not there when they signed this bill into law.

A couple of weeks later, President Clinton announced that he was going to be attending a summit with Chancellor Kohl in the city of Milwaukee. It was going to happen on a Thursday. No doubt, the Dole campaign heard about this and thought, How can we upstage the President in Wisconsin? They said, I know what we will do, we will go to Wisconsin 2 days before the President is going to be there and we will blast him on welfare reform.

So they set up the entourage, and they were all set to blast the President on welfare reform. Well, the President, of course, got wind of this and thought, Why should I let him get in front of me on this issue when I support the welfare program and the welfare changes in Wisconsin as well? So in his Saturday evening address, he told the American people that he supports the aims and the goals of the Wisconsin welfare program.

Once again, the Dole campaign was just sputtering, they were so frustrated that the President of the United States supports an issue that they support,

that he is actually attempting to take an issue that they consider to be a Republican issue and take it as his issue. They just, their frustration, you could almost see it in their eyes, because now here is the President of the United States, the leader of the entire country, saying that he favors welfare reform.

Well, now, this is not an issue that came out of the blue, especially as it relates to President Clinton, and especially as it relates to the State of Wisconsin, because nine times the State of Wisconsin has come to President Clinton and asked him for a waiver. Has he turned them down? Not a single time. Every single time the State of Wisconsin has come to President Clinton and asked him for a waiver, he has granted it.

Never before have we had to have this expedited process on the floor of the House of Representatives to grant the waiver by Congress. Why have we not? Because we were not in the middle of a Presidential campaign then. Now, we are in the middle of a Presidential campaign. Now, the Republicans have to take this issue, which is essentially a bipartisan issue, and they go back to their room and they sit down and they say, all right, darn it, he has got us on this one. He is in favor of this plan in Wisconsin. How can we take this bipartisan issue and make it a partisan issue? How can we try to drive a wedge in this process? So the solution is, let us not let the American public comment on this waiver request at all. Let us shut them out entirely.

Now, you will hear from my colleagues on the other side that there were 18 months of hearings that the legislature acted on this, they acted on it on a bipartisan basis, and every one of those statements is true, that is exactly what happened.

But what happened next? Next, Governor Thompson took out his partial-veto pen. He has the largest partial-veto power of any Governor in this Nation, and 97 times he went through this document and used his partial-veto pen; 97 times he crossed out words or phrases or sections that affected 27 different topics. Since that date, since Governor Thompson exercised his item veto power 97 times, we have not had a single opportunity for public input on this measure.

So the measure that is before us is not exactly the measure that was before the Wisconsin Legislature where you had all of those hearings, no. What we have before us is a product that was molded by one person in this country, one person, the Governor of the State of Wisconsin.

So what do the Republicans decide to do? They say well, let us go and let us try to embarrass the President. Let us take the olive branch that he has extended to us, let us break it in half and shove it in his eye. Let us try to make this bipartisan issue a partisan issue.

How do they do it? For the first time in our Nation's history, this House of Representatives is considering a stand-alone bill that will grant a waiver.

Now, you would think if this is the first time in our Nation's history that we are going to do this, that at least you would have some public hearings, at least it would be referred to a committee, but no, not on your life. This is the plan that Governor Thompson says is going to be a model for the Nation. You would think that they would want to have a lot of sunshine placed on this plan, that a lot of people would want to see what is in this great waiver request. Exactly the opposite of what is happening here.

Instead, Governor Thompson delivers it to the White House last Thursday, 1 week ago today. My office received its copy from the State of Wisconsin 2 days ago, 48 hours ago. I would bet there is not a single Member of this body who has read this waiver request, yet the House of Representatives today is going to be asked to approve this, 600 pages of waivers, without a single bit of public input.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the way we should be doing business in this Congress, that is not the way we should do doing business for the American people. The American people have a right to be heard.

At his press conference, Governor Thompson said, yes, there are going to be speed bumps along the way in this program. Well, Mr. Speaker, those speed bumps just happen to be real people in some instances, real people. Women with infants 4 months old. I do not refer to women with infants 4 months old as speed bumps, and I think that we have an obligation here to try to listen to the concerns that we hear from the American people and the people of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, is it true that Governor Thompson just asked that this be acted on by August 1, 1996, to take effect in October 1997?

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. In his waiver request, Governor Thompson asks that the administration act on this by August 1.

Mr. MOAKLEY. All right. To take effect in October of 1997.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. To take effect in October of 1997, that is correct.

Mr. MOAKLEY. So there is no reason for expedited procedures at this time?

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Oh, no. There is a reason. Presidential politics, that is the only reason.

Mr. MOAKLEY. That is what it is. I am sorry. I overlooked that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], who will be carrying this legislation.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I certainly would like to commend the chairman on developing a rule here that recognizes the right of minority and respects the rights of the minority so all may be heard on this issue.

I am a new Member of this Congress, this is my first term, and one thing I have learned since coming to Washington is that once I get out in the city, things that seem so logical back home in Wisconsin get tipped right upside down. I thought partisan politics is when one side of the aisle develops something and, because they were in the majority, forced it on the other side.

Here we have a situation where a Democrat President came into the State of Wisconsin and said, I support this plan, let us get it done. You have a freshman Republican here on the floor of the House of Representatives presenting a bill that literally gives the President, that Democrat President, exactly what he asked for. This is not partisan politics; this is bipartisan politics.

In Wisconsin, when the Democrats and the Republicans work together to craft legislation and to get a job done, such as they have done in the Wisconsin Works Program under Gov. Tommy Thompson, when the Democrats and the Republicans get together for the same purpose to get a job done, we call that bipartisan, not partisan, and that is in fact what is going on here.

But this bill is not about Presidential politics. This bill is about giving the people in the State of Wisconsin the right to implement the program that they have debated for 18 months. Somebody out here just said that there was no debate on this. It has been debated for 18 months, by public input by the very people who are going to be affected by this program; 18 months of debate in the State of Wisconsin.

What came out of that 18 months of debate in the State of Wisconsin? Well, they passed it. They did not pass it with Republicans all voting one way and the Democrats all voting another way. They passed it with a two-thirds vote in their assembly and a three-quarter vote in their Senate. As a matter of fact, even the majority of the Democrats voted for this bill in the State of Wisconsin.

I do not see what we are all out here debating. We have a bill that has been debated for 18 months in the State of Wisconsin, received a two-thirds vote, more than a two-thirds vote in both Houses of the State. The President of the United States, who supports the bill, I do not see why in the world we would not just say to Wisconsin, go ahead and do it. That is what this is all about, it is about common sense.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEUMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, let me make a fundamental point in all of this, and that is the fact that even though Washington occasionally promises us that they are going to get waivers, they

wait. This is an indication that right now there are 28 welfare waivers involving 19 States, 5 of them involving Democratic Governors, where we are waiting for Washington to act.

That is why it is necessary to come to the floor today. And the sense that somehow this is a ginned-up Republican operation, the fact is that the President said he was in favor of the Wisconsin plan, and we are trying to expedite the process. In fact, we have some applications pending back to September 20, 1993, and that is the Democratic Governors of Maryland and Florida and Hawaii, who are simply waiting for Washington to act.

My colleague from Wisconsin is absolutely right, that we want to get these waivers done and we want to get them done as quickly as possible. If the promise is just turn them over to Labor-HHS and we will get them done, well, fine, we will be back here in 1998 asking where they are.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just like to point out that this is about more than that too. It is about the people in Wisconsin being asked to pass this legislation and then coming hat in hand and asking the bureaucrats in Washington, DC, 900 miles from the State of Wisconsin. I have to tell my colleagues, I have a lot of faith in the people of Wisconsin.

My colleague who just spoke in opposition to this from Wisconsin, I have to ask the gentleman, do you not have confidence in Representative Tim Carpenter, a Democrat from your district who voted for this bill, and Representative Dave Cullen, Democrat in your district who voted for this bill, Representative Jeanette Bell in your district, another Democrat?

□ 1100

The point here is that both the Democrats and the Republicans in the State of Wisconsin want this to happen. I see absolutely nothing that would lead me to believe that the people here in Washington, DC can Washingtonize this Wisconsin plan and make it better than the people in the State of Wisconsin. I believe the people in the State of Wisconsin have the knowledge, the wisdom, and the compassion to pass a good welfare reform plan for the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman who asked me a question but did not give me time to respond, I have tremendous confidence in them. I have tremendous confidence in every elected official in the State of Wisconsin. That does not mean I have tremendous confidence in every elected official in the State.

Here we see this horrible chart about 28 waiver requests currently pending back to September 1993. There is not a single Wisconsin waiver request that is more than a week old. So if this is your concern, then we should have a bill before us dealing with all those waiver requests. But, no, this is not about waiver requests. This is 100 percent about Presidential politics and sticking it to the President.

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

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the President's statement here, how he is in favor of the Wisconsin plan, he is in favor of the makings of this plan, but let me read what he actually said. He says, ''All in all, Wisconsin has the makings of a solid, bold welfare reform plan. We should get it done. I pledge that my administration will work with Wisconsin to make an effective transition to a new vision of welfare based on work that protects children and does right by working people and their families.''

So he did not say he is going to rubber stamp anything that Wisconsin comes in with. That is why it is so important that HHS have this, to go over it and make sure that it is the proper thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 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, the goal of welfare reform is to move recipients into permanent jobs and make their families stronger. Will the Wisconsin plan do that? How can we know?

The Republicans are rushing through these waiver requests without giving the administration or Members of Congress time for review. Even worse, they are not giving the citizens of Wisconsin time to comment on the plan.

In the 1 week since the Governor of Wisconsin delivered the request for these waivers to the White House, the administration has received more than 300 letters commenting on the effects of the waivers, letters that will not be considered. I received a letter from the Wisconsin Conference of Churches. Their letter expressed strong opposition to any bill which bypasses the normal 30-day comment period.

Could it be that the Governor of Wisconsin and some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not feel the Wisconsin plan will hold up under normal scrutiny? Do they share the concern of the Children's Defense Fund, the Wisconsin Conference of Churches and others that a timely review of the Wisconsin welfare plan will reveal that this plan will weaken the safety net for poor children?

I do not know the answer to this question. The truth is that no one does. There has not been enough time to review the waiver requests, to fully understand their effect on poor children in Wisconsin.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, shortly the gentlewoman will be asked and 434 other Members of Congress will be asked to vote for and to approve 88 waivers for this welfare plan. Has she had an opportunity or has her office received a copy of these waivers?

Ms. WOOLSEY. No; we have not.

Mr. KLECZKA. Does the gentlewoman mean to tell me that she is going to be asked to vote on a major, major piece of legislation today and she has never read what she is voting on?

Ms. WOOLSEY. That is the case. That is not fair to the children of Wisconsin. Let us vote against this bill. Let us take time to shed light on the Wisconsin plan. Let us be sure that the children of Wisconsin have a chance to grow into healthy, responsible adults. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Obey substitute.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, would you inform the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and myself about the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 14 minutes remaining and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] who presented a great case at the Rules Committee yesterday.

Mr. KLECZKA. I thank the ranking member of the Rules Committee for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do is first of all talk about the rule, since we are on the rule, for a brief time, and then we will talk about some other things.

We were not accused, but it was noted at the Rules Committee yesterday that the Democrats who were there asking for a substitute amendment were very animated and there was pounding and clapping, and one of the Republican senior Members made note of that. My response was that for the Democrats to get an opportunity to offer a substitute amendment comes so infrequently and is so rare that we thought if we did a lot of animation, we would have a rule that would provide for a substitute amendment. I want to thank the gentleman because it worked.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLECZKA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman knows that the minority, whether it be Republican in the past, Democrat now, they always get their substitute. We do everything we can to bend over backwards 90 percent of the time, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. KLECZKA. Let me reclaim my time and indicate to the membership, who know better than I do, that substitute amendments to legislation coming before the House are rare this

session under Republican control. The best we can do is a motion to recommit, and there are not 3 people sitting out there watching C-Span who know what the heck that is, but it is good cover.

But as far as the rule goes, I do want to thank my good friend from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, for permitting a substitute amendment which we will offer in a short time before this body. But let us review and try to set straight what is at issue here. What are we doing?

Well, the Governor of the State of Wisconsin has asked the President and the administration to approve 88 separate and distinct waivers so Wisconsin can implement a welfare change, a change which I should add that I support for the most part. But the issue today, Mr. Speaker, is not welfare reform, and it is not welfare reform because we are going to have that debate within a couple of weeks on this floor.

There is a product being developed as I speak in the Committee on Ways and Means, where I serve, that will provide for a radical change in the welfare laws of this country. It is a redo of a product that has been vetoed, and as far as I am concerned, and as my Republican colleagues know, I supported the last welfare reform bill and I will probably be supporting this one.

So the issue before us is not whether or not we should reform welfare. That is not the issue today. Let us not make it the issue today. The issue today is nothing other than process.

The Governor a week ago has asked the administration to approve 88 distinct waivers. Normal process would be that there is a 30-day comment period. For what reason? So the public, who is paying the tab, can come forward and have their opinions noted.

If in fact we pass what the Republican majority has put before us today, what is going to happen is Congress, or the House of Representatives, will rubber stamp all 88 waivers. As I asked the gentlewoman from California a few minutes ago, has she read the waivers? She said no. The simple fact, Mr. Speaker, is there is not anyone in here except maybe four or five from Wisconsin who have read the waivers.

Let me show what has been passed out for today's debate. Here is a copy of the rule, a short one-paragraph. That provides for the consideration of the rule. Then here is the actual resolution, which is 2½ pages, which indicates that Congress knows all, we are going to rubberstamp this, we are going to deem this done, the rubber stamp this, we are going to deem this done, the public be damned. Then here is a resolution that accompanies the rule report, and that is it.

So for the Members from California, the one Member from Alaska, the good Members who represent the State of Florida, they do not know what we are doing. Oh, a copy has just been handed out right now to the gentleman from Wisconsin, but it is not made available to the Members with the documentation that is available in the back room for all of us to decipher.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLECZKA. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Does the gentleman know of any waiver from Wisconsin that was sent to the administration on welfare that was ever denied?

Mr. KLECZKA. No. In fact there have been, I believe, nine submitted for approval and all nine have been expedited. So the question before us is not whether or not these waivers are going to be granted or whether or not they are going to be expedited. The main issue before us today is to cut off any public comment like a letter I received from the Catholic bishops, who asked that they be heard on this issue. They will not be heard.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLECZKA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. For the gentleman's edification, a listing of the waivers that were requested by Governor Thompson appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, 1996, at page E992. So every Member of the House of Representatives, and for that matter the public at large, by 9 a.m. yesterday morning had the list of the waivers that were requested. I am sorry that many of the Members, including the gentlewoman from California, decided not to look at them before making her speech.

Mr. KLECZKA. Reclaiming my time, let me indicate that usually the calendars are in the back of the hall here. I did not see any there. But to contend that the general public have all received a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday is totally ludicrous.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KLECZKA. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. In referring to the gentleman from Wisconsin who just took a seat, I think if he looks, and unless I am mistaken, the matter that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, was just listing the title of the waivers. There was no explanation of what they were. So that really informs people a lot, so they can just look at the title of 88 waivers but does not say one thing about what those waivers are.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLECZKA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, we seem to be radically off track in this debate. Those waivers were developed and debated. The program was developed in Wisconsin for 18 months and was debated for 18 months in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I am just talking about statements made here that are not completely true. To say that the waivers are listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and all you find when you look are titles of waivers and no explanation, I just think that is not debating this matter the way it should be debated.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, if I might continue, when we get into general debate on the bill, I will read through a whole bunch of these waivers and then I will see if any Member of the House can explain it to me, or since a contention has been made that the general public is totally knowledgeable on this, let me maybe call some of my constituents, or better yet maybe I will call some from Racine and see if they can inform me and the other Members what some of these one-liners mean. But nevertheless, the whole issue today is not welfare reform. It is one of process, whether or not we are going to have the public come forward and make their views known on 88 specific waivers. The contention has been made, ''Well, the legislature passed the bill.'' They sure did. But also there were 27 vetoes that were made to the bill by the Governor. It took him 5 or 6 weeks after the legislature passed the legislation to sign it, if we are talking about rush, but as far as the legislature, they do not know to this day what any of the 88 waivers are.

I served in the legislature. I know a little bit about State legislative enactments. My colleague, TOM BARRETT, served in the legislature, as well as JIM SENSENBRENNER.

Mr. Speaker, in the legislation which is now chapter, law, something or other, State of Wisconsin, there was no listing of the waiver. The legislators who voted for this do not know what waivers are being requested. So let us clean up the nonsense that we are trying to redo the legislation. That is totally not the case.

Let me talk about a couple of other things. The President does support the initiative by the State of the Wisconsin. But never in his radio comments did he say, ''And I will sign without reading all 88 waivers.'' It was not said. I think he should have an opportunity to digest them, also.

Let me talk about the rush here. The rush is that this program does not go into effect in the State of Wisconsin until October 1, 1997, a year and a half from now. And to show how ludicrous the rush job is that we are being told to engage in, that was one of the vetoes. The legislature said to the Governor, ''We want this on line and running September 1, 1977.'' The Governor vetoed that September 1 date, making it September 30, so he delayed it by his own pen some 30 days.

□ 1115

We have to do this within 3 days, without reading it, with no Member knowing what is in the waivers.

Why is this before the Federal Government? That was asked and we talked about that at the Committee on

Rules. Welfare in this program, Mr. Speaker, is a national program. If the State of Wisconsin was putting 100 percent of their dollars, raised from the taxpayers, into the program, they should have complete say, and no one would disagree with that on this floor. But the taxpayers of this country pay 60 percent of this program, and so I think that the taxpayers from Georgia and Arizona and New Mexico have a say in this, and that is why we have this public process, so if, in fact, they are so moved they will have a say in it.

This is not a rewriting of the State legislative enactment. That is the law in Wisconsin. This is the next step, because 60 percent of it is paid for by the national taxpayers. And if we are going to advantage the State of Wisconsin or give them more money, I think the other States should have a say in it, and that is why these waivers do come here for approval.

Again, is someone dragging their feet? Clearly not. The Governor indicates he wants this approved August 1 of this year. The substitute amendment which I will be producing with my colleagues, the gentlemen from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY and Mr. BARRETT, will do exactly that. The substitute amendment is, instead of rubber stamping it sight unseen, like the Republicans want to do, the substitute is very common-sensical. What it says is we sill print the waivers in the Federal Register, and not just one line, the whole thing; and then we will give the public, the people of the country who pay the tab, 30 days to be heard.

I ask my Republican colleagues, why do they fear the public coming out and saying something on this? They are paying for it. They have a right. And then the resolution that expedites consideration and provides July 31, it will be done.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume so that, for the record, I can inform my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA], that we have had 120 bills brought to the floor under rules in this Congress; 85 percent of them were given substitutes for the minority. And when we subtract the continued resolutions that do not have substitutes, it runs over 90 percent. That is very fair, and I appreciate the gentleman for commending us for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to bring the debate back to where it belongs. This debate is about whether we want Washington interference in the Wisconsin plan. The Wisconsin plan was debated for 18 months, it was passed by a two-thirds majority, and the question is do we really want the Washington bureaucrats, 900 miles from the State of Wisconsin, to now Washingtonize the Wisconsin plan? That is what this debate is about.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Menomonee Falls, WI [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], a gentleman that came here with me back in 1978. He is one of the most respected Members of this body.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY, for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the rule and also the legislation.

The previous speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA], I think has put a lot of red herrings into this debate. There are some very fundamental and core issues here. First is where should the real decisions be made on what type of welfare reform we have in the State of Wisconsin. Should they be made by Washington bureaucrats in dealing with these waivers or should they be made by the people of the State of Wisconsin and their elected legislators dealing with this issue in Wisconsin?

This issue has probably gotten more public debate in the State of Wisconsin than any other issue in the history of the State. From the time the legislation was first formulated, the State legislature had 30 public hearings or town hall meetings in Wisconsin on the issue of W–2. There were 120 hours of public debate in sites all throughout the State on the legislation and over 2,000 residents of Wisconsin participated in these hearings.

Now, what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZA] says is let us forget all about that, that does not count at all. Let us end up having some public hearings out here in Washington and then let us have the Secretary of Health and Human Services or the bureaucrats under her control rewrite these waivers and pick and choose which waivers we want to grant and in what form. And the fact is that very few of the waivers that have been submitted by Wisconsin or other States have been approved in the form in which the Governors have submitted them.

It is an extensive process of negotiation between the State and the Department of Health and Human Services, and we do not want that to happen here.

I do not see why we ought to ask the 2,000 people who participated in the public debate on W–2 to have to figure out a way to make their voice heard in Washington, DC, 900 miles away, when they were able to give their input in places like Madison and Milwaukee, Oshkosh, Appleton, Beloit, Wausau, and LaCrosse.

The second red herring that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZA] decided to throw into this debate is about the cost of the program. We all know that the Federal Government spends about 60 percent of AFDC costs. Granting these waivers is not going to cost the Federal taxpayers one additional dime, because there is a provision in this bill, for anybody that decides to read it, that says very plainly that the total grant of the State of Wisconsin shall not exceed the amount of the grant that Wisconsin would have gotten had these waivers not been approved at all.

Now, the President has come on board in saying that he is in favor of W–2. In his radio address, which was after Governor Thompson issued his line vetoes and signed the bill, he said in conclusion, ''In all, Wisconsin has the makings of a solid, bold welfare reform bill. We should get it done.''

Today, we are getting it done here, and I would hope that this issue would not be obfuscated and not be clouded. Wisconsin is leading the way in welfare reform, Washington should not stand in the way, and that is why this bill should be enacted.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. TOBY ROTH. I mentioned that the other gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], had come to this Congress with me back in 1978. This is another Member from Wisconsin who came here at the same time, and he has been really one of the most dynamic Members of this body. He is going to be retiring this year at a very young age, of his own volition, and we just commend him for it. He is a great man.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time, and may I say this, the gentleman from New York has done a super job as chairman of the Committee on Rules and we appreciate his dedication and service. In fact, he was working on this legislation way into the night last night and we want him to know we appreciate it.

I think it is important to focus in on the issues rather than to draw off to one tangent or another. Basically, the reason we are here, as has been said so many times, is that the President has said in his radio address to the American people that he is in favor of the Wisconsin plan. And I think when the President says that in a nationwide address, I think we should be able to take the President of the United States at his word, that he is not just making these Saturday pronouncements as a political campaign speech, that he is talking to the American people and he is talking to them about vital issues that face our country.

Now, when we called the White House this morning, we asked what was their position. They have no position. Now, we have to have some intellectual integrity in this place. And if the President of the United States is not going to supply the intellectual integrity, then we, as the board of directors of this country, have to supply that integrity.

Our answer to the White House basically is this: Lead, follow, or get out of the way. We have a job to do and we are going to do that job.

Everyone here on this side of the aisle and on that side of the aisle always says we have to give more power

back to the States. We are living in a transition. We are living in change. We have to have the States have more responsibility. My friends, that is exactly what we are doing here, is we are giving the people of the State of Wisconsin that power, and rightly so, not only because of the issue but historically.

Seventy-five years ago the great debate on the floor of this House was what is Wisconsin doing? Because Wisconsin was and is one of the great laboratories for historical change in legislation in this body and in this country.

We moved from the agricultural society into the industrial society. Today, we are moving from the industrial society to the information age. And what Bob LaFollette and other progressives had said at that time, Tommy Thompson and the Republicans are doing today. So we are again in our historic mode of doing what is necessary, not only for the State of Wisconsin but for this country.

What we are doing basically is saying that the welfare office is going to become an employment office. By the year 2000 we will not have welfare offices in the State of Wisconsin. We want to restore some dignity back to the people again. And all of our futurists are saying this: That the individual is more empowered today than he or she has ever been. And we are funneling that information, that power back into the individual again.

The people of this country have a right to have some dignity. Welfare has destroyed the family, has destroyed the dignity of the individual, and what we are saying is we want to restore that esteem again.

The big issue here, and the reason it is being fought so much, is not because of Wisconsin or is not because of all the reasons that have been mentioned; the big issue here is are we seeing the death knell of the liberal welfare state. Because when we destroy welfare as we know it in America today, we are changing the Government of America.

So this is a very basic issue. It goes beyond what is said of the rules or process. What we are saying here today is we are changing the way we are governing. We are changing the way the people of America are living. That is why this is such a deep issue.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very fine gentleman from Williamsville, NY [Mr. PAXON], one of my colleagues.

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, it was just 3 weeks ago that President Clinton said he supported giving States the opportunity to reform their poverty programs, and he said that if the States sent in waivers that he would sign them. Unfortunately, when we take a look at the record, it seems that politics is driving the administration ration than the needs of poor people in our States.

Take a look at the Medicaid waiver requests made by our Nation's Governors. This chart reveals politics and party determine whether or not these reforms will be approved. Eight of the 11 Medicaid waivers approved by the administration went to States with Democrat Governors. Seven Republican Governors are still waiting for their waivers to be approved.

In fact, two of the Republican Governors have been waiting 20 months, Mr. Speaker. My own State of New York has been waiting 14 months for the administration to act. No Democrat Governor ever had to wait longer than 11 months to get their waivers approved.

Now, the President says he is for reform, but, in fact, he is blocking it and making it harder for our States to serve low-income families. I urge the President to stop playing politics and approve these reforms.

We should pass this rule and pass this bill, and send a message, a loud, and clear message, to the White House.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I just have to point out that it is amazing to me that we have speaker after speaker who talk about these waiver requests that have been denied. Why are we not dealing with them now? Why are we dealing with the waiver requests from a State that has had every single waiver granted? It does not make any sense.

The reason is they want to embarrass the President. They want to make a bipartisan issue a partisan issue. That is the only explanation. Otherwise, they would be coming in with a waiver request from the State of Michigan or from the State of New York. But here we have a Republican Governor in the State of Wisconsin, who has had every waiver that he has asked for granted.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], and I can think of no one better to rebut that last statement than this gentleman.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately in this case, my colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. BARRETT, is wrong. Actually, in one fairly significant fight with the Clinton administration, Wisconsin originally asked, under the work not welfare waiver request, that every county in the State be covered. By the time Washington got done with it, only two counties in the entire State were covered.

□ 1130

That is typical, because every time we find ourselves in a waiver application situation, Washington wants to rewrite the rules.

My sense is, what this debate comes down to is, whose judgment do you trust, the people of Wisconsin, two-thirds of the State assembly, three-quarters of the State senate voted for this measure. As you heard from my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], countless hours of hearings all across the State.

Here is the bottom line, again, the track record of the Clinton administration on waivers, of the three waivers, Illinois, Massachusetts, Wyoming denied; three States, New Mexico, Ohio, South Carolina, all pulled back their waiver applications because the Clinton administration wanted to rewrite it.

The following States currently have waivers they are waiting for: California, of course, the interesting question, when the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] was up here criticizing the Wisconsin plan, has she done anything to help California's waiver application which is now pending; Florida; Georgia, Democratic Governor; Hawaii, Democratic Governor; Illinois; Indiana, Democratic Governor; Iowa; Kansas; Maine; Maryland, Democratic governor; Michigan; Minnesota; New Hampshire, waiting since 1993; Oklahoma; Pennsylvania; South Carolina; Tennessee; and Utah.

The fact of the matter is, the administration says, we will grant you these waivers, and we wait 6 months and 1 year and 1½ years and 2 years and 2½ and 3 years.

Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Madison, WI, SCOTT KLUG. SCOTT, you seem to indicate that in a work not welfare program that the State was asking to have all 72 counties in the State covered. My recollection is the legislature only provided for 2 counties, 2 small counties. When the legislature was debating the issue, many wanted Milwaukee County, the largest county in the State, included in this trial test. The Republican legislature said no. So going for waivers was only the 2 counties that were finally tested. There never was a request from the State legislature for the whole State.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The Chair advises Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to Members, particularly in given names.

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

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress the Republican majority claimed that the House was going to consider bills under an open process. I would like to point out that 66 percent of the legislation this session has been considered under a restrictive process. At this point I include for the RECORD the following material: