look to program reform that is both realistic and puts principles and values back into our families.

The Deal substitute, which I helped to write and cosponsor, puts more people to work than the current system, while making it possible for people to find a job and stay in it. We offer more job training and more child care than the status quo, and for the first time we set a lifetime limit of 2 years on welfare.

Your choices are simple, if you look beyond party lines. Put more people to work in less time, or put fewer people to work over more years. Put these options with another favorite theme, greater State flexibility, and you have an even easier choice.

The substitute that will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], myself, and other conservative Democrats allows States to tailor welfare to fit their needs. We give States the option of denying benefits to teenage mothers, we let the States decide whether to continue giving more money to mothers who have more children while on welfare. We also let States decide whether they want to keep people in welfare programs for a additional 2 years under community service. And we give them the option of recycling a few needy people back into the welfare rolls after their time limit has expired.

We are also the only plan that dedicates the moneys that we save to deficit reduction. You will hear more about our plan and the differences between the Deal substitute and the other welfare reform plans that are offered. I encourage you to think of your constituents before your party identification and to look at the reality of our plan and what it does for the future not only for us, for this country but for our children and our children's children.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time remaining to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. DOOLITTLE). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debate from this side of the aisle, you would think that one of the words that really sticks in my head was one of the speakers, the gentlewoman from Illinois, for whom I have a great deal of respect, referred to our idea as something having to do with Attila the Hun. I hear the gentleman from Tennessee refer to us as mean. And I hear the other speakers refer to us as being tough on children and weak on work.

I would notice, however, a resounding silence in this Hall when it comes to anybody defending the system that we have today, defending the system that we were unable and unwilling to change while the Democrats controlled this body.

You look back at some of the good welfare proposals that have come down the pike, some that really helped. Take the earned income tax credit. That was a Republican proposal. Take the child care that has been put in place. And remember the great fight that we had with the committee, and we worked together on that particular bill. That was bipartisan in nature, and it was signed into law by a Republican President.

Now the time has come to change the balance of the program, to change, truly change welfare as we know it today. For the Republicans to carry forward, to fulfill the 1992 platform pledge of the Democrat Party.

□ 1600

This is the Republicans carrying through on the pledge of the Democrats because of the Democrats' failure to do this. We are going to, I hope and pray that we do pass a welfare bill, that we get rid of the cruelest system that has ever been known.

The cruelest system that is out here on the floor is existing law and we must change it, we must work together, we must move this process forward.

We have worked long and hard on the Republican side in order to change welfare. The bill of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], which will I understand be offered as a substitute sometime later this week, that bill itself comes a long way from where the Democrat party was just a few short months ago when we could not get a bill to the floor, when we could not reform welfare.

A few short months ago in the last years when the Democrats were in charge, we would have been glad to come forward and work on a bill such as that. But I tell all of my colleagues to read it carefully; come in with specifics. The Republican bill is weak on work? Read the Deal bill. The Republican bill is the bill that stands for work. It stands for real reform and it stands for the empowerment of people.

Let us break the chains of slavery that we have created with welfare in this country and let us work together for a better America.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, does the rule we have just adopted make in order general debate on H.R. 4 or H.R. 1214?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule makes in order debate on H.R. 4.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the committees of jurisdiction reported out three other bills, none of which is before the House today. Am I correct that H.R. 4 has not been reported out by any committee of jurisdiction?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, continuing that inquiry, is it true that the Budget Act points of order which are designed to assure that the budget rules we established for ourselves are adhered to apply only to measures that have been reported by the committee of jurisdiction?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair observes that sections 302, 303, 311, 401, and 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 all establish points of order against the consideration of bills or joint resolutions as reported. That is, in each case the point of order against consideration operates with respect to the bill or joint resolution in its reported state. Thus, in the case of an unreported bill or joint resolution, such a point of order against consideration is inoperative.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we had followed the regular order and reported either H.R. 4 or H.R. 1214 from the committees of jurisdiction, several points of order would have applied. To get around those rules, the majority has instead put before the House an unreported bill making it impossible for those of us who believe the House should be bound by the rules it sets for itself to exercise those rights.

Mr. MCINNIS. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House has just adopted House Resolution 117.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. It is my understanding that we went around the rules because we did not follow the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCINNIS. A point of order, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was a parliamentary inquiry, not a speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 117 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4.

□ 1604

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will each be recognized for 1 hour; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] will each be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican welfare revolution is at hand. Today begins the demise of the failed welfare state that has entrapped the Nation's needy for too long. Today we begin to replace that disaster in social engineering with a reform plan that brings hope to the poor of this Nation and relief to the Nation's taxpayers. Working Americans who carry the load will get relief.

Government has spent $5.3 trillion on welfare since the war on poverty began, the most expensive war in the history of this country, and the Census Bureau tells us we have lost the war. The bill we bring to the floor today constitutes the broadest overhaul of welfare ever proposed. The status quo welfare state is unacceptable.

Today we have the chance to move beyond the rhetoric of previous years of endless campaign promises to end welfare as we know it. Today there must be no doubt. The rhetoric is stopping, the solution is beginning.

Our bill is constructed on three principles which strike at the very foundations of the Nation's failed welfare state. The three principles are personal responsibility, work, and returning power over welfare to our States and communities where the needy can be helped the most in the most efficient way.

The first and most fundamental principle captured by the title of our bill is personal responsibility, the character trait that build this country.

The current welfare system destroys families and undermines the work ethic. It traps people in a hopeless cycle of dependency. Our bill replaces this destructive welfare system with a new system based on work and strong families.

Virtually every section of the bill requires more personal responsibility. Recipients are required to work for their benefits. Drug addicts and alcoholics are no longer rewarded with cash payments that are often spent on their habit. Aliens who were allowed into the country because they promised to be self-supporting are held to their promise; fathers who do not live with their children are expected to pay child support or suffer severe consequences; and welfare can no longer be a way of life. After 5 years no more cash benefits will be provided.

This bill will reverse the decades-long Federal policy of rewarding unacceptable and self-destructive behavior. We will no longer reward for doing the wrong thing.

The second underlying principle of our bill flows naturally from the first. Able-bodied adults on welfare must work for their benefits. Here it appears that the Democrats have surrendered completely to Republican philosophy. On work we are all Republicans now, but it was not always so.

During the welfare debate of 1987 and 1988, Democrats perpetuated a system in which able-bodied adults could stay on welfare year after year after year without doing anything. Now the Clinton administration and Democrats in the House are finally claiming they want mandatory work too, but the substitutes they will offer later do not require serious work.

That is not surprising. Conflict among Democrats on the basic issue of work was one of the reasons they did nothing on welfare reform in the last Congress. Another was the fact that it took the President almost 2 years to write a welfare bill, which he then let die without so much as a minute of debate in the House or the Senate.

If the Democrats were serious about welfare reform, they would have taken action last year when they had the chance. To the Democrats, welfare reform is not a policy objective, it is a political platform. It is an empty promise, it is a campaign device that is put on hold once they get elected.

House Republicans signed a Contract With America that promised we would provide a vote on the House floor on true welfare reform, and we are now fulfilling that promise within less than 80 days. We are proud to move forward to change America's failed welfare system.

The third principle which forms the foundation of our bill is our commitment to shrink the Federal Government by returning power and flexibility to the States and communities where the needy can be helped the most. My own mayor in Houston, TX, a Democrat, talked to me several weeks ago and said you can cut the amount of Federal money coming to Houston by 25 percent, but give me the flexibility without the Federal regulations and I will do more with 25 percent less.

Some say, however, that only those in their ivory towers in Washington care enough to help the needy and aid the poor; the only caring people in all of government throughout the United States are only here right in Washington. That is what they say. They say you cannot trust the States. These people seem to think that the Governors are still standing in the schoolhouse doors not letting people in. But rather it is the Democrats in Washington who are standing in the doors of our Nation's ghettos and not letting people out.

The current regulatory morass is shown on the chart standing next to me. It shows that the welfare system Republicans inherited consists of at least 336 programs in 8 domains of welfare policy. The Federal Government expects to spend $125 billion on these programs this year. Here it is, proof of the ridiculous tangle of overlapping bureaucratic programs that have been thrust upon the Nation since the beginning of the war on poverty, and the worst part is that the American taxpayers, working Americans are paying the bill.

But these 336 programs are only the tip of the iceberg. Imagine how many regulations had to be written to implement these 336 programs. Just let me show you. These are the regulations from just 2 of the 336 programs. They are standing right next to me here on the desk. They weigh 62.4 pounds. I guess I could probably lift them, but it would be easier with a fork truck.

I can think of no more fitting symbol of the failed welfare state than these pounds of Federal regulations. It is time to remove the Federal middleman from the welfare system. We can cut these unnecessary regulations, eliminate Federal bureaucrats and give our States and communities the freedom they need to help their fellow citizens. Our bill will end 40 of the biggest and fastest growing programs and replace them with 5 block grants. By ending counterproductive overlapping and redundant programs, we will win half of the battle. We are proud, though, that we have hit upon a much better approach to helping the poor than this top-heavy Federal system.

Our new approach recognizes that the action on welfare reform today is in the States already. While Washington twiddled its thumbs for the last several years, States all over the country were engaging in actual welfare reform.

The laboratories of democracy are in the States, not Washington, DC. Block grants will bring the decisions closer to the people affected by them, they will give Governors more responsibility and