

that in some instances the Governors and the State legislatures which initially requested those waivers no longer want to implement them. In South Carolina, it cost millions of dollars to go through the waiver process, and when that waiver was finally approved it was so modified that the State of South Carolina deemed it no longer effective.

We Republicans in Congress over the last 18 months, as the new majority in the Congress, have twice passed genuine welfare reform that would eliminate the need for States to have to go through the cumbersome counter-productive waiver process. But President Clinton, who as Candidate Clinton in 1992 promised to end welfare as we know it, has vetoed the welfare reform legislation not once but twice.

This welfare reform controversy illustrates a key difference between Republicans and Democrats and between Bob Dole and President Clinton. Bob Dole and Republicans think it is absurd that the States, which really are the laboratories of democracy nowadays, and where the only genuinely successful welfare reform efforts have taken place, must come begging to Washington, to the very people who are the architects and protectors of the failed status quo, our current welfare system. It is Washington's disgraceful mess, after all, that the States are having to clean up.

Mr. Speaker, although Wisconsin has been the Nation's leader in successfully reforming welfare, witness again the President's promise in his radio address a couple of months ago, and again President Clinton and congressional Democrats still think that Washington knows better than the people of Wisconsin how to fix their welfare program. They think that power, money, and resources should stay in Washington.

The American people are sick of our disgraceful welfare system, which traps people in lives of dependency, illegitimacy, and despair, and which has led, according to the most recent statistics in America going back to 1993, to almost one-third of all births, 31 percent of all births being out of wedlock. The American people are sick of a heavy-handed Federal Government that thinks it is so much smarter than everybody else. And most of all, they are sick of a President who will say literally anything that the polls tell him the people want to hear, and then turn around and do just the opposite.

THE ESSENTIAL 30-DAY COMMENT PERIOD IN WISCONSIN BEFORE ACTION ON WELFARE REFORM WAIVER REQUEST

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the following one-word reply to the gentleman who just spoke: Baloney. A two-word reply: Double baloney.

I represent Wisconsin. I take a back seat to no one in wanting to see massive welfare reform. I know that taxpayers are tired of seeing people collect money on welfare who are not willing to work to earn it, and I know that people are tired, and justifiably so, of seeing people in this society who often have their hand out but who are not willing to go to work in order to improve their own condition. I believe in personal responsibility, and I believe that people ought to be willing to accept the consequences of their own actions in their own lives.

But I want to make a few remarks that correct some of the wildly inaccurate statements just made by the previous speaker. There is no 30-day deadline for the President to consider Wisconsin's W2 program. There is simply, thanks to the fact that the Congress did not eliminate it, as the majority party tried to do, there is still the protection in law that allows every single one of my constituents in Wisconsin to have at least 30 days to comment on the deal that the politicians put together at the State level in Wisconsin. That 30-day requirement is simply a 30-day minimum requirement during which the public has a right to speak out before the politicians and the bureaucrats make their final decisions. I make no apology for insisting that that 30-day public comment period be retained. My citizens have the same right to comment that citizens from every other State have had before waivers were granted for their welfare reform proposals.

I wonder if the gentleman knows that in the original W2 waiver request which this party demanded that we pass, sight unseen, without any Member having read it on this floor, I wonder if the gentleman knows that Wisconsin later had to, at least the Governor and the welfare director, had to indicate they made a mistake in the presentation they made to the national government, and they recognized it needed to be amended.

Why? Because the press discovered during that 30-day public comment period that they tried to wipe out on that side of the aisle, the press in Wisconsin discovered that the W2 waiver proposal would have allowed employers to cut the hours of their regular workers, to cut the benefits of their regular workers, in order to make room for welfare workers in those plants.

It also inadvertently would have allowed employers to cancel promotions for their regular workers and, instead, give those promoted jobs to welfare recipients newly hired by the company. The State admitted that that was a mistake, but that mistake would not have been corrected if this House had rammed through the Senate the legislation which the majority party tried to ram through.

You bet workers are tired of seeing tax dollars gobbled up by people on welfare who will not work. You bet taxpayers are tired of that. But I can

tell the Members something taxpayers do not want to see even more. They do not want to see their jobs gobbled up by welfare recipients.

So if we are going to solve welfare reform, let us solve it by correcting the behavior of people whose behavior needs to be corrected. Let us not solve it by whacking the ability of workers to maintain their wages, to maintain their hours, to maintain their benefits at work, and to maintain their rights to be considered for promotion before newly hired workers who just the day before were on the welfare rolls.

I would simply say that I want Wisconsin's welfare program to be approved, but only after my constituents have had ample time to examine that waiver request to make certain there are no other mistakes which wind up threatening the welfare of workers.

REVISED 602(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY LEVELS

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 606(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Budget Act), as amended by the Contract with America Advancement Act (P.L. 104-121), I hereby submit revised 602(a) allocations and other appropriate budgetary levels. Section 606(e) of the Budget Act provides for an adjustment in the various budgetary levels established by budget resolutions to accommodate additional appropriations for conducting continuing disability reviews (CDRs) under the Supplemental Security Income program.

Section 606(e) of the Budget Act directs the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to revise the discretionary spending limits, 602(a) allocations, and the appropriate budgetary aggregates when the Appropriations Committee reports appropriations measure that provides additional new budget authority and additional outlays to pay for the costs of CDRs.

For fiscal year 1997, the adjustment reflects \$25 million (and \$160 million in outlays) specified for additional CDRs in the report accompanying H.R. 3755, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and related agencies, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations on July 8.

These revised levels will supersede those established by H. Con. Res. 178 and the accompanying joint statement of the managers (H. Rept. 104-575) and shall be binding for purposes of enforcing sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The revised allocations and other budgetary levels are as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary spending limits	492,692	535,699
602(a)/302(a) allocations	497,375	538,772
Budget aggregates	1,311,309	1,307,081

If you have any questions, please contact Kathy Ormiston or Jim Bates at extension 6-7270.