

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 im-

portant, 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?