The panel from the Committee on Commerce, consisting of Messrs. BLILEY, OXLEY, and DINGELL, is also appointed for the consideration of section 3174 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference.

The panel from the Committee on Science is also appointed for the consideration of section 1044 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about welfare reform, because the action today taken by the House I think is very significant. In both bills that were debated today there were common elements.

Both bills created a single welfare block grant, a cash block grant, to replace the traditional AFDC, aid to families with dependent children program. Both bills limited the spending for the block grant at $16.4 billion for this next fiscal year. Those bills created a $2 billion contingency fund for States to use to meet their needs in time of recession. Both bills require work of welfare recipients, and both bills have a cutoff from welfare after 5 years.

So what is the difference between the Republican leadership bill and the bill that I supported, the bipartisan Republican and Democrat compromise, the Castle-Tanner bill? The difference in the bills is very, very important.

I supported a bill that requires work for all welfare recipients. I supported a bill that would limit the spending for welfare. I supported a bill that provides help to States in times of recession. I supported a bill that was better for kids but strict on their parents. And I supported a bill that met the Republican budget requirements to cut $53 billion from the existing welfare program.

While the Republican bill and the bill that I supported both had common elements of work, of limitation of spending, of assisting States in time of recession, there are some important differences in these bills, because the Republican bill requires work but does not provide the resources. Indeed, the CBO estimated that many States would not be able to comply with the work requirements. That becomes very important in a State like West Virginia with rural areas with high unemployment, where we want people to work but if we cannot provide the jobs for them, they are not able to work.

I also supported a bill that says that after they cut somebody off—because the bill that I supported has a lifetime period, they can only collect welfare benefits during their entire lifetime for no more than 5 years—the bill that I supported, though, would still say that the children in those families could receive vouchers for their most important needs: diapers, for instance, nutritional supplements, those kinds of things. The Republican bill would not do that, would not permit the Federal funds to pay for that.

The bill that I supported had help during a recession far more than the Republican bill, so that if this country goes into a recession and they have their caseload pickup, they are able to deal with it.

Also, the Republican bill had an unfunded mandate estimated to be as high as $12 billion. That is saying to States, ''This is what we want you to do but we're not providing the resources.'' The bill that I supported put in resources for work, put in resources for job training, put in the resources necessary for child care.

In West Virginia there are almost 37,000 families presently receiving aid to families with dependent children, the monthly check. There are 115,000 people receiving food stamps who are on public assistance. There are another some 190,000 that are not on public assistance but receiving food stamps, for a total of 308,000 out of about 1.8 million.

The fact is that in the Republican bill there were not adequate resources for the work requirement that everybody agrees ought to be in there. And for a rural area with high unemployment, requiring work but not supplying the resources so that people can work I think is not fair.

There were no vouchers in the Republican bill. That means that when a family that has been on welfare for as long as 5 years, and that is the cutoff period, when that family has been on welfare for 5 years, there is no assistance for the children afterward and there is no help in a recession.

Mr. Speaker, I supported a bill that very simply says that they have to work, requires work for welfare recipients. I supported the bill that says that they receive benefits for no more than 5 years, and after that they are cut off. I supported a bill that provides help to States in recession. I supported that bill that is better for kids, because it says that yes, they can continue to get vouchers even after their parents may have been cut off. And I supported a bill that meets the Republicans' own budget requirements that we cut $53 billion out of welfare.

All of this was done in our bill. The only difference is, in our bipartisan compromise bill we were much kinder on kids, we were stricter on parents, we were tougher on requiring work. We actually put the resources in there. We saved the same amount of money that the Republicans said they wanted to save, but we did it in such a way that we were not being unnecessarily mean.

I think that people want reform in welfare, I think that they want people to be working whenever possible, but I do not think they want this to be a war on children, either. So I hope that those issues come back to this House and we have another chance to vote again another day.

TWA FLIGHT 800

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today has been clearly a day that will cause many of us to reflect, one, on the goodness of America, but as well the sadness of some of what has occurred today.

Let me first of all start my remarks by acknowledging the tragic loss of life of TWA Flight 800, gratified of certainly the astounding and outstanding search-and-rescue effort of the Coast Guard and others and as well recognizing the many individuals that will be needed to be able to determine the cause of this great tragedy.

I know personally that the people of Houston, the State of Texas and this Nation will be saddened by one who was a member of our community, Pam Lynchner, a co-founder of the victims' rights organization, Criminal Justice Reform. She and her 10-year-old daughter Shannon and her 8-year-old daughter Katie were on this flight. Many times we have seen such tragedies occur in America. I can only be grateful to God that Americans will always rise to the goodness of what we represent. We will join in and embrace each other. We will give comfort to