

LaHood	Paxon	Shuster
Largent	Pease	Skeen
Latham	Peterson (PA)	Smith (MI)
LaTourette	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Lazio	Pickering	Smith (TX)
Leach	Pitts	Snowbarger
Lewis (CA)	Pombo	Solomon
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Souder
Livingston	Portman	Spence
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Stump
Lucas	Quinn	Sununu
Manzullo	Radanovich	Talent
McCollum	Ramstad	Tauzin
McCrary	Redmond	Taylor (NC)
McDade	Regula	Thomas
McHugh	Riggs	Thornberry
McInnis	Riley	Thune
McIntosh	Rogan	Tiahrt
McKeon	Rogers	Traficant
Metcalf	Rohrabacher	Upton
Mica	Roukema	Walsh
Moran (KS)	Royce	Wamp
Morella	Ryun	Watkins
Nethercutt	Salmon	Watts (OK)
Neumann	Sanford	Weldon (FL)
Ney	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Northup	Scarborough	Weller
Norwood	Schaefer, Dan	Whitfield
Nussle	Schaffer, Bob	Wicker
Oxley	Sessions	Wolf
Packard	Shadegg	Young (AK)
Pappas	Shaw	Young (FL)
Parker	Shays	
Paul	Shimkus	

NAYS—191

Abercrombie	Gordon	Moran (VA)
Ackerman	Green	Murtha
Allen	Gutierrez	Neal
Andrews	Hall (OH)	Oberstar
Baesler	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Baldacci	Hefner	Olver
Barcia	Hilliard	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Hinchev	Owens
Becerra	Hinojosa	Pallone
Bentsen	Holden	Pascrell
Berman	Hooley	Pastor
Berry	Hoyer	Payne
Bishop	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Blagojevich	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Blumenauer	(TX)	Pickett
Bonior	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Borski	John	Price (NC)
Boswell	Johnson (WI)	Rahall
Boucher	Johnson, E.B.	Rangel
Boyd	Kanjorski	Reyes
Brown (CA)	Kaptur	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Kennedy (MA)	Rodriguez
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (RI)	Roemer
Cardin	Kennelly	Rothman
Carson	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kilpatrick	Rush
Clayton	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Clement	Kleczka	Sanchez
Clyburn	Klink	Sanders
Condit	Kucinich	Sandlin
Conyers	LaFalce	Schumer
Costello	Lampson	Scott
Coyne	Levin	Serrano
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Cummings	Lipinski	Sisisky
Danner	Lofgren	Skaggs
Davis (FL)	Lowe	Skelton
Davis (IL)	Luther	Slaughter
DeFazio	Maloney (CT)	Smith, Adam
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Snyder
Delahunt	Manton	Spratt
DeLauro	Markey	Stabenow
Deutsch	Martinez	Stark
Dicks	Mascara	Stenholm
Dingell	Matsui	Stokes
Dixon	McCarthy (MO)	Strickland
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Stupak
Dooley	McDermott	Tanner
Doyle	McGovern	Tauscher
Edwards	McHale	Taylor (MS)
Engel	McIntyre	Thompson
Etheridge	McKinney	Thurman
Evans	McNulty	Tierney
Farr	Meehan	Torres
Fattah	Meek (FL)	Towns
Fazio	Meeks (NY)	Turner
Filner	Menendez	Velazquez
Ford	Millender-	Vento
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Visclosky
Frost	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)
Furse	Minge	Waxman
Gejdenson	Moakley	
Gephardt	Mollohan	

Wexler	Wise	Wynn
Weygand	Woolsey	Yates

NOT VOTING—22

Callahan	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	Mink	Smith (OR)
Doolittle	Myrick	Smith, Linda
Eshoo	Nadler	Stearns
Gonzalez	Poshard	Waters
Harman	Ros-Lehtinen	White
Lantos	Sawyer	
Linder	Schiff	

□ 1723

Mr. MURTHA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the second motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

If a recorded vote is ordered on the first motion, relating to House Concurrent Resolution 202, that vote will be taken after debate has concluded on that motion.

If a recorded vote is ordered on the second motion, relating to Senate 927, that vote will be postponed until Thursday, February 12, 1998.

DAYCARE FAIRNESS FOR STAY-AT-HOME PARENTS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 202) expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government should acknowledge the importance of at-home parents and should not discriminate against families who forego a second income in order for a mother or father to be at home with their children, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 202

Whereas studies have found that quality child care, particularly for infants and young children, requires a sensitive, interactive, loving, and consistent caregiver;

Whereas most parents meet and exceed the aforementioned criteria, circumstances allowing, often parental care marks the best form of child care;

Whereas the recent National Institute for Child Health and Development study found that the greatest factor in the development of a young child is "what is happening at home and in families";

Whereas a child's interaction with his or her parents has the most significant impact on their development, any Federal child care policy should enable and encourage parents to spend more time with their children;

Whereas nearly 1/2 of preschool children have at-home mothers and only 1/3 of preschool children have mothers who are employed full time;

Whereas a large number of low- and middle-income families sacrifice a second full-time income so that the mother may be at home with her child;

Whereas the average income of 2-parent families with a single income is \$20,000 less than the average income of 2-parent families with two incomes;

Whereas only 30 percent of preschool children are in paid child care and the remaining 70 percent of preschool children are in families that do not pay for child care, many of which are low- to middle-income families struggling to provide child care at home;

Whereas child care proposals should not provide financial assistance solely to the 30 percent of families that pay for child care and should not discriminate against families in which children are cared for by an at-home parent; and

Whereas any congressional proposal that increases child care funding should provide financial relief to families that sacrifice an entire income in order that a mother or father may be at home for their young child: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress recognizes that—

(1) many American families make enormous sacrifices to forgo a second income in order to have a parent care for their child at home;

(2) there should be no bias against at-home parents;

(3) parents choose many legitimate forms of child care to meet their individual needs -- an at-home parent, grandparent, aunt, uncle, neighbor, nanny, preschool, or child care center;

(4) child care needs of at-home parents and working parents should be given careful consideration by the Congress;

(5) any quality child care proposal should reflect careful consideration of providing financial relief for those families where there is an at-home parent; and

(6) mothers and fathers who have chosen and continue to choose to be at home should be applauded for their efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House Concurrent Resolution 202, the equitable child care resolution, which I introduced on January 27, 1998, to ensure that any child care proposal that this Congress may consider this year addresses the needs of parents who choose to stay at home to care for their child. Almost all of the child care proposals in Congress focus solely on expanding commercial child care, despite the fact that only 30 percent of preschool children are cared for by paid child care providers. And of that 30 percent, an even smaller percentage are in commercial child care. We know the majority of preschool children are cared for by their mother or father who stay at home for that purpose. Yet Federal child care proposals would indicate that we should not consider those who stay home as child care providers. It is inconceivable to me that the Federal Government would tell

families that institutional care is the only way to rear their children.

If we want to help families with their child care needs, we should help give parents more time to spend with their children and give them back more of their own money so parents can afford the child care that best meets their needs.

This resolution, the Equitable Child Care resolution, sends a clear signal to the American people that we, the Congress, recognize there are a lot of families out there making huge sacrifices so that one of the parents can remain at home to care for their child.

□ 1730

Federal child care policy should no longer discriminate against at-home parents. We already have the problem with the marriage penalty in our income tax. Federal child care policy should not discriminate. Parents make big sacrifices if they stay at home in order to rear their children. It is time we recognize those sacrifices.

The resolution does not deny or discredit families where both parents are working hard to support their families, rather the purpose of the resolution is to simply recognize that at-home parents are child care providers also and should not be forgotten in any kind of child care discussion that may go on this year.

No child care proposal that discriminates against families based on their particular choice of child care should be actively considered. Families should be treated equally, and I would urge my colleagues to make sure all families with child care needs are treated fairly and to make sure that at-home parents are not forgotten in any child care debate.

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

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

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, this is a nice resolution but it is just a resolution, not a solution. I rise in protest not to the content of the resolution but to the manner it was brought to the floor.

The bill itself is innocuous. Mr. Speaker, we have a bill before us today which has never been marked up in a committee; has never been the subject of a hearing. Only 2 weeks ago the resolution was scheduled to be marked up by the Committee on Education and the Workforce. In fact, just prior to the consideration of the bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the committee, postponed the markup subject to the call of the chair.

Unfortunately, people on that side of the aisle are now disregarding the committee process by rushing this resolution to the floor. I think that is very wrong. It puts us in a position of this side and that side. Consideration of

this bill should be bipartisan in nature. Our consideration of this bill under suspension of the rules denies the members of the committee and the House an opportunity to amend this legislation and include other child care priorities.

I am confident that all the Members in this body are deeply concerned about the quality of child care received by our Nation's children, and discussions about this topic are a worthwhile endeavor. However, the narrow theme of this legislation is certainly one of the many topics which should be discussed when we are talking about child care. This resolution's narrow focus highlights none of the vital issues which should be a part of a national debate on child care.

I, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), had intended to offer amendments to the bill which would include those topics. We were not able to because it was not marked up in the committee.

The families that we consider for child care are not those who choose to have one parent at home, as the resolution deals with; these are families in which both parents must work in order to afford the expenses of daily life. There are families coping with the transition from welfare to work who need child care. These are the families truly in need of child care assistance; these are the families to which we should be directing our attention. Unfortunately, the procedures under which this legislation has been brought to the floor denies us an opportunity to discuss that.

Our committee has traditionally operated in a bipartisan fashion, but the consistent manner and movement in which the majority is now moving legislation to the floor, without proper committee consideration, is becoming a frequent practice. I can assure the chairman that I consider this a blatant override of the committee's process, and it is irresponsible and unjustifiable. I can only assume Election Year politics has once again gripped the majority and incited their need to create an agenda.

I urge all Members, whether the majority or minority, to protect the process which this House uses for thoughtful consideration of legislation.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), a gentleman I worked very closely with last year to make sure that Republicans provided far more money than the President asked to make sure that child care was available so that the transition from welfare to work would work.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very generous words.

President Clinton's \$22 billion child care initiative creates the impression there is a national child care crisis and that the Federal Government needs to

intervene even further than it has in local child care markets. The facts are that 73 percent of preschool children are cared for primarily by their parents or relatives and that the Federal Government already sponsors a host of child care programs. Five of these programs also provide direct payments or subsidies for child care totaling about \$11 billion this year. At the same time only about 30 percent of American families with preschool children use paid child care while parents work. Consequently, around 70 percent of the families, many with low incomes, who are struggling to provide quality care for children at home, would receive no support from the Clinton child care initiative.

If there is money to spend, it should go to all families with children. We should acknowledge that all mothers work, whether they decide to work at home with their children or remain employed outside of the home.

As part of the 1996 welfare reform law, we made two major reforms to child care programs: First, block grants totaling several major programs so that the States and localities would have flexibility in using Federal child care money; second, giving States \$20 billion over 6 years to help pay for child care for poor and low-income families.

CBO estimates that between 1997 and 2002 spending on child care will increase by 38 percent without any additional legislation. In response to the changes made by the welfare reform, States are now revamping and expanding their child care programs, especially to make them more effective in helping mothers who leave welfare. Let us give the States a chance to get their child care systems in place.

The child care credit in the Tax Code is open-ended spending available to all Americans who pay Federal taxes. This source of Federal support for child care is also expected to grow substantially without the need for additional Federal legislation.

The child care market is working well. Most parents report that they are satisfied with their current child care arrangement. The bottom line is that if there is money to be spent by helping families raise their children, it should be available to all families with children and not mandated from Washington.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the ranking member of our committee.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Once again the Republican majority is running roughshod over House procedures. The resolution before us today was never considered by the Committee on Education and the Workforce. It was rushed to the floor to produce sound bites for the 6 o'clock news.

This resolution focuses on the child care needs of at-home parents, parents that, as the resolution states, have

foregone a second income to stay at home with their children. Certainly the issue is worthy of discussion, however it ignores the great needs of working families where both parents work, it ignores the need to expand the Family and Medical Leave Act, and it ignores parents who are transitioning from welfare to work.

If this resolution were fair, it would reflect the priorities of working parents as well as the at-home parents. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the majority's abuse of the legislative process bars us from having this discussion today.

Last Congress, Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority voted to cut Head Start, to cut child nutrition programs and to eliminate the school lunch program. The Republican majority on our committee last Congress actually voted to cut child care by \$2.5 billion, despite the chairman's boasts of the Republican accomplishments in the field of child care.

Mr. Speaker, now the Republican majority offers only empty resolutions instead of real solutions to the Nation's child care needs. Instead of just passing resolutions, this Congress should be acting to ensure that all children, including those children whose parents must work, receive affordable, high quality day-care. Instead of passing empty resolutions, we should be taking up President Clinton's call for investing \$21 billion in helping all Americans meet the challenge of raising a family.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, just merely to say that the free lunch program continues primarily because of the present chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce who had to fight constantly to make sure that they did not do away with the amount of money that comes from, quote, the paying customer. Otherwise the school lunch program ends if providers do not get that money and then there are no free lunches. So I want to make sure of that.

And secondly, again I want to repeat, we Republicans gave \$4 billion more than the President asked for in the whole child care effort last year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS), a member of the committee.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to respectfully and politely take issue with the comments of the ranking member of the full committee who just a moment ago said Republicans are not concerned about helping working parents.

To the contrary; that is why we made the House's top priority House bill 1, the compensatory time bill, which would allow working parents to exchange overtime for time off in lieu of wages or income. It would give them more flexibility to meet the demands of their personal family situation and would give them the same rights that their public sector counterparts have had for years.

Secondly, the Republican-led Congress have provided tax relief for working families through a \$500 per child tax credit that we would like to expand in this session of Congress, at the same time eliminating the marriage penalty in the Tax Code.

But the real reason for this resolution, Mr. Speaker, being on the floor tonight, is the Clinton administration's proposal shows a predisposition in favor of institutionalized day-care, a continuation of paternalistic government, nanny government, and a discrimination against families, working families where one spouse chooses to be at home.

We submit, Mr. Speaker, that as a matter of public policy we want to make it more simple, not more difficult, for families who choose to have one spouse remaining in the home for the benefit, for the welfare, for the nurturing, for the upbringing of their children, we want to make it a little easier for families to do that rather than to continue this dependency on big government; rather to continue to believe that paternalistic nanny government is the solution rather than policies that are truly family friendly.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today we are being offered a resolution in support of parents who stay at home with their children who are young. There is no dispute about the benefits a parent staying at home with his or her children can bring to that family, and on that basis alone this resolution should, and will, pass with a bipartisan majority.

What is most notable and most troubling, however, are the issues not addressed in this resolution. First and foremost is the issue of wages. Too many Americans are not earning enough to support their families with just one income. Half of America's families with young children earn less than \$35,000 per year. This includes families in which both parents work full time at the minimum wage and earn only \$21,400.

These are the families who have been left behind in the boom economy, families whose salaries have been flat-lined and benefits have been cut back while the stock market and the CEOs' salaries have skyrocketed. These are the families who are forced to send both parents into the work force, the many single parents who are forced to work more than one job.

Temporary employment agencies report that most of our employees are second breadwinners in the family and that 75 percent of the people they employ are working because they have to.

□ 1745

Families are in a bind over child care because they simply cannot earn

enough despite working so hard. It is true that where the second family income is marginally helpful to the family, then a small boost in a tax credit or some other form of assistance may help. But since the reality for most families is that a second income is essential, it is essential for buying basic needs like food, rent, and health care, than a small payment to stay-at-home parents will not resolve the problem of most working families, that both parents must work, and that child care is either too expensive, too far away, or too low quality, there are only two places that workers can go to get assistance and basic family needs, either from the wages their employers pay to them or from the government.

But with this resolution, the Republicans once again are opposing the requirement that wages be sufficient to provide for the essentials of a family.

This resolution is also further puzzling because in recent actions of the Congress to eliminate Federal welfare assistance, Congress voted last year to stop paying poor mothers to stay at home with their children, instead to go out and get a job, because we believe that the mothers of the children of our country would be better off. But now the Republican majority wants to use another tax-based subsidy to pay mothers or fathers to stay at home, and these are parents that are much better off than the working poor or those mothers that are on welfare. Somehow there is a consistency gap here.

Focusing on stay-at-home parents is part of an effort to deceive the public into thinking that providing a small taxpayer subsidy to parents to stay at home is the equivalent of providing a small taxpayer subsidy to working parents that need that money to provide for child care so they can stay in the work force.

In the first solution, the additional income is not enough to keep parents from having to work. But in the second instance, the additional support is crucial if these parents are going to be able to hold on to the jobs that provide the wherewithal for their families.

So while I welcome this opportunity to work together on child care, I wonder why it is that the majority cannot grasp the larger picture of the child-care needs of America's families.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), my neighbor.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my neighbor and colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding this time to me, and I congratulate him on bringing this issue to the floor.

It is an important issue. And if we accomplish nothing more during this debate than to notify the public and to spread the word that we are concerned about child care, and particularly about those families that sacrifice in order to have one parent remain home with the children, then we have succeeded. No matter what the opposition

might say or what final vote may be cast against this resolution, the American people will know more following this about our concern about child care than would otherwise be the case.

In every issue that we have ever had concerning taxation or its subordinate tax credits, the cry of the American people is, is it fair, is there an element of fairness in what you are about to do? Well, when we start to consider tax credits for child care, the American people will immediately recognize that those individuals who choose to have their children at home who will not be benefiting from a child-care tax credit program immediately will cry foul, it is not fair play. After all, a family who sacrifices should not be put in a worse position than a family who chooses a professional, commercial child-care situation to care for their children.

In the name of fairness, in the name of avoiding foul play, we ought to support this resolution.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ 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, I am sorry to see this resolution on the floor today because I think that it would have benefited from the Committee on Education and Workforce markup that was scheduled and then canceled.

Since other members of the committee and myself had amendments to offer to H.Con.Res. 202, I truly had assumed that the committee would mark up and have it rescheduled. Silly me. I should have known that the majority would not give members of the committee an opportunity to improve the resolution so that it would actually acknowledge the importance of all families.

Certainly we should honor families who can choose to have one parent at home with their young child. Certainly we should honor families where parents get up and go to work every day, but cannot afford child care. And we should also honor the people that were covered in my amendment, those who give up or would be forced to give up their sole source of income because of the lack of child care, keeping them from fulfilling their work requirements under the new welfare law.

Had there been a committee markup, I would have offered an amendment expressing the sense of Congress that we must increase from age 6 to age 11 when a single parent would be forced to leave a child home if they were unable to find an appropriate child care.

Mr. Speaker, our current law allows this exception only for single parents with children under 6 years of age. This means that some parents with children as young as age 6 are forced to leave their children home alone before and after school, during school vacations, and all summer long. Or if the parents choose to stay at home with their young children, they lose their temporary assistance for needy families.

As we take time today to applaud the lucky parents who can stay at home with their children, I wish we were also protecting working parents who risk the loss of their sole source of income because they do not have child care.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I rise in support of this resolution.

Let us review some facts about child-care options available to today's parents and what they are choosing. Fifty percent of parents choose to have one parent stay at home to raise their children, most often the mom. Twelve percent of parents tag-team by staggering their jobs so one parent is always at home. Thirteen percent of parents have grandparents, aunts, or uncles care for their children. Eleven percent pay neighbors, nannies, and informal day-care providers. Only 16 percent of parents choose formal day-care centers.

Washington must not discriminate against the 50 percent of parents who sacrifice a second income so one parent can stay home to raise their children. These parents are making financial sacrifices. Two-parent families, where one parent stays home to care for the children, have an income that is \$20,000 per year below their two-earner counterparts. But those families choose to pay that price because they know it is important to their children. Clearly, most parents prefer informal day care or staying at home with their kids.

I am troubled by the President's proposal. It discriminates against stay-at-home parents.

A December 12th, 1997, New York Times article discusses new trends in the 1990s that we must take into account. The article states, "While the story of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s was married women stampeding into the labor market, the demographic sea of change is now in the process of reversing." There are still twice as many two-income marriages as one-earner families, but the gap is narrowing and "it is a long-term trend." Richard F. Hokenson, chief economist at the brokerage firm Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, believes that growth already has been substantial enough to explain some otherwise puzzling business developments. After the last fall in mortgage rates, in his view, families used the savings to allow one earner, usually the wife, to work part-time or leave the job market altogether.

Let us give parents what they want. Let us reduce the tax burden so parents can care for their children as they see fit.

If the child tax deduction had kept pace with inflation over the past 30 years, it would be worth more than \$7,500 per child today instead of \$2,400. Let us pass this resolution.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution draws our attention to an important need. Unfortunately, it could divide instead of uniting us. Our purpose should be to ensure that all children should have the best care, whatever the economic and family situations of these children are.

The administration has shown its commitment to quality care for children. In 1996, early versions of welfare reform bills were vetoed in part because of inadequate attention to child care. This year, the administration has proposed a series of child-care initiatives. It has signaled its willingness to work together on a bipartisan basis to address the issue of stay-at-home parents. Indeed, a number of us are working on ways to provide further assistance to families that would make it easier for a parent to stay at home with a young child.

Perhaps because the Democrats' report on the importance of family care for children is clear, the real purpose of this resolution may be to protect a weak political flank of the majority.

One example of this vulnerability occurred when we battled over the long-standing program of SSI for families with severely disabled children. All of us agreed that we needed to get rid of abuse in the program, but there were some in the majority who tried to end a modest cash payment to families with a truly handicapped child, even when the clear effect of that modest help allowed one parent to stay at home with the child.

Let us not create an artificial wedge that pits working parents against those who stay at home with their children. I urge Democrats to vote for this resolution, but I also urge Republicans to join us in trying to improve child care wherever it is needed.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to enact meaningful, comprehensive child-care legislation that addresses the needs of both working and stay-at-home parents and their children. This is not an either/or proposition. In this respect, America should be one family.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, just again to remind everyone in the Chamber and anyone listening that it was the Republicans last year who saw the need to increase funding for child care in order to make the transition from welfare to work. We provided \$4 billion more than the President asked for. And you cannot rebut that no matter how many times you go down in the well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS).

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 202 introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman

BILL GOODLING. And I commend him on this important initiative in behalf of America's families.

For millions of American families where both parents work or single parents work, finding quality day care is always a great challenge and often a great expense. When parents make the day-care choice, it is not done lightly or without serious financial planning. That fact is clear or should be clear to every Member of this body.

However, the fact that we are often not clear on this is when parents elected the other option. The other option is taking care of their children at home, the option that most American families choose. That decision is also not made lightly, nor is it made without serious financial planning, because in most cases, this is the most expensive option. Giving up a second income is a great financial burden to any family.

So I strongly agree with my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania that when we talk about providing financial relief to parents of young children, we must not discriminate against those who bear the greatest cost.

And House Concurrent Resolution 202 recognizes the importance of at-home parents and their financial sacrifices. And I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. KENNELLY).

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us suggests that those who choose to stay at home with their children, do so, and I agree. But we should remember that some parents just cannot do that.

We have single heads of households that have to go to work and have to leave their child in day care. In fact, it was not that long ago that we all agreed and decided to have our people who were on welfare go to work and have to use day care.

We should also remember that an increasing number of couples both work because they want to carry out that American dream of owning their own home.

□ 1800

In short, what we are talking about, what we really need to do, is make sure we have child care safer, better, and more affordable. If you doubt this, consider the figure that I think is absolutely correct, and that is 60 percent of mothers who have children under the age of 6 do work outside the home. I am planning on introducing legislation for day-care to improve access to quality child care for parents in my home State and across the Nation. What we really should be talking about here is care for children, good care for children, safe care for children, whether they are at home or in day-care.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. FOX).

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the intent of the Goodling resolution is to ensure that any future child care initiatives recognize that all parents have child care needs regardless of whether they choose to have an at-home parent, grandparent, neighbor, nanny or day-care center, care for their child.

The intent is to simply bring at-home parents into the child care dialog. There is no intent to favor at-home parents over child care centers.

Seventy percent of preschool children are in families that do not pay for child care. Many of these children are low-to middle-income families that struggle to provide home care for their children. Child care initiatives should focus on families that pay for child care as well as at-home parents who provide child care.

Parents should not be penalized for the type of child care they choose. Circumstances do not always permit many parents, especially low-income parents, to be at home with their children, and Republicans have supported and were successful in earmarking \$4 billion more over the 6 years, \$20 billion total, for States to provide for child care. This is a great first step.

The House, of course, will revisit this issue with regard to tax credits and, of course, the child development block grant, but the Goodling resolution is a great first step, and I hope Members will support H. Con. Res. 202.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we were so fortunate in our family that my wife Libby could stay home with our two young daughters during their youth, pursuing her graduate degree and devoting most of her time to them. There is no doubt that that is the most important investment that our family has ever made. There is absolutely no complete substitute for the care of a loving parent to a child.

But, increasingly in this country, we find single parent families and we find two parent families where both parents face economic barriers, and the only way they can provide for their children is to both be out in the work force. And I know very few families in this country, certainly not mine, where a spouse is willing to stay home, and able economically to stay home for 18 years.

So it is that we come to this very strange resolution. You see, the President and our Democratic Caucus has had the courage to come forward and recognize that not all American families are like mine or any other individual family. There are many families with diverse needs, but there are few families in this country who do not at some time in their life need child care. And there is a vast void in America and shortage across America in quality child care to meet the needs and to support loving parents.

Mr. Speaker, this particular resolution has one thing in common for all parents, whether they are stay-at-home, single-parent, or two working-parent families: This resolution will do absolutely nothing for any of those families. It is a true do-nothing resolution. It seeks to create a false dichotomy between families in this country and to pit one group against another, which is your typical Republican approach. It does nothing in terms of assuring families, whatever their status, any additional support or assistance, direct or indirect.

We have nearly a child care crisis in parts of this country. It is a crisis for any working family that cannot find quality child care, as is true of millions of families across this country. Instead of dealing with this crisis in a bipartisan way, this Republican leadership is simply coming through with another phony resolution instead of a real solution.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware, (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I have some prepared remarks, but I would just like to focus for my minute on what we are dealing with here, because I am becoming increasingly concerned about what the Federal Government's role in child care should be.

I support the intent of this resolution to make sure stay-at-home parents are part of the child care debate, but I am increasingly bothered by the fact that the President will come forward and say that we need to spend an additional \$21.5 billion on child care, and we just spent some \$22 billion over 5 years in the welfare reform bill. I am concerned that we are putting stay-at-home parents with child care needs up against those that have out-of-home child care needs, and we are going to get into some sort of battle which we are going to escalate higher and higher in terms of the cost of what we are doing.

I hope we as a Congress will sit down and not get divided on a political basis in this particular circumstance, but sit down and try to determine what the real child care needs of Americans are, both at home and those who are not in the home, with respect to helping the kids. Keep it within a cost basis that we can manage within our balanced budget and go forward from there. I urge all of us to think carefully about what we promised to deliver, lest we raise expectations unrealistically or throw our balanced budget out the window.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind Members that the welfare bill reported out of our committee in 1995, under the leadership of the chairman, would have left 800,000 children without child care and cut \$2.5 billion in funding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the mothers and fathers who have the financial means or who make the financial sacrifice necessary to stay at home with their children. I regret that this resolution has chosen to focus on one group of parents, while excluding the families who, in order to provide for their children, must have both parents in the work force. This resolution sets up a false conflict between working parents and stay-at-home parents.

More than 3 million children whose parents stay at home choose to send their young children to preschool. They want their children to benefit from the social and intellectual growth that preschool can provide. Talk to most any parents, whether working or at home. Their concern is about finding and affording safe, high-quality educational care for their children.

We need to support all parents in their child care choices. Helping parents who need to find good child care so they can work and helping parents who stay at home should be complementary and not competing efforts.

Last October, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and I introduced a resolution honoring the child care givers who provide safe, educational care for children of working and stay-at-home parents. Its companion was introduced in the Senate by, among others, Republican Senators ROBERTS and JEFFORDS. That bipartisan resolution, which has twice as many House cosponsors as the resolution we are discussing today, is designed to recognize and promote high-quality care used by stay-at-home and working moms and dads.

Why has the Republican majority refused to move that resolution forward? Why has it chosen to pit one group of parents against another?

Whether parents stay at home or go to work, quality child care is a crucial issue. Parents know their children need safe educational care. CEOs know that high educational care must be important for their work force and a strong economy. Police officers know that high-quality child care provided early in life and before and after school reduces juvenile delinquency and chronic crime. Across our Nation, churches and synagogues donate classrooms to make quality child care more affordable and more accessible to millions of families. Parents, business leaders, law enforcement officers and religious communities across this country recognize the importance of safe, educational child care. We in this Congress must do that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to stop the divisive practice of setting up parents against each other. Let us work together. Let us pass legislation this year that helps provide parents with the best possible educational care for all of the children in this country who need it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Mrs. JOHNSON.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, this is an important resolution because in the process of making public policy in Washington, we have focused a lot of time, attention and resources on the cost of day-care, making day-care affordable for women coming off of welfare, helping families with the cost of day-care through, for example, the dependent care tax credit, but we have given entirely too little attention to the struggle of young families to try to stay home and take care of their own children.

For those of you interested in this resolution, I hope you will take a look at the tax bill I introduced that would provide to stay-at-home moms during the years when their kids are 0 to 3, 50 percent of that tax credit for staying at home, so they get some economic relief for staying at home and providing that very important educational quality of care that is necessary to the strong development of children in their early years.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is pain in this Chamber today. The reason being, there are gentlemen here, and women, who have come and advocated on behalf of families and children. We would want to be able to stand on the floor of the House and say that any resolution that comes before us dealing with the need of millions and millions of American families, those that work and those who have made the sacrifice to stay home, is the kind of resolution that we would like to support.

But, frankly, I am disturbed, because what this resolution does, albeit Members will decide for themselves, is it pitches one group against another. It pitches those single parents and working families who cannot do anything else but work hard, long hours and get up on the buses at 4 a.m., and they need child care.

Do you know who else it talks about? It talks about those welfare mothers that we debated 2 years ago when we said they do not need to stay home with their children, they simply need to get up and get out.

Now all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about those parents who want to stay home with their children, and I am as well. As a member of the Congressional Children's Caucus, we join together to say we promote children as a national agenda. Therefore, I support the idea of making sure we have the right kind of child care.

This resolution, however, is a divisive one. I would much prefer that we came to the floor of the House and had the kind of structure and structures to

make sure we have quality child care, so that anyone who works part-time, stays at home, who may ultimately need child care, cannot worry about their child having a loss of life or being injured.

Yet what we say in this one is we negate what the President has done with the billions of dollars for child care for working parents, and we put a resolution that falsely represents to those that this is something good for them if they stay home.

I want parents to be able to stay home. I applaud those who can stay home and sacrifice. But I find it divisive that we did not give the same care and tenderness to those welfare mothers who need to stay home as well.

I hope we can resolve this in a manner that promotes child care and families and children and mothers together in unity and not dividable.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to make sure that it was not the author of this resolution that pitted one group against another; it was the President of the United States. It was the President of the United States who proposed \$22 billion additional dollars only for paid day care. He said nothing about the parent that stays home.

□ 1815

My resolution does not tell anybody we must do something about child care. Nor does it say we should not do anything about child care. It does not say, this is the way you do it. All this resolution says is that if someone is going to discuss child care, if there is going to be child care legislation, then let us think about all parents, let us think about all children. That is all the resolution says. Since the President only talked about those families who pay for child care, this resolution merely says think about the families also.

So I would hope everyone would support the resolution because it has nothing to do with much of what we have heard; it has only to do with the fact that all parents and all children should be considered in any debate, any discussion, any legislation that we may enact this year.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, Congress will vote on DayCare Fairness for Stay-at-Home Parents, a resolution recognizing the importance of stay-at-home parents and the care they give their kids.

I plan to support H. Con. Res. 202, because I believe that the Federal Government has for too long discriminated against parents who choose to stay at home to raise their children. We as lawmakers need to recognize the sacrifices these parents make to be at home with their kids, and encourage the kind of care that only they can give.

But a sense of Congress means nothing unless we back these words up with action. We should pass legislation that brings real tax relief to parents who stay at home.

The keystone of our child care effort should be to reverse current federal tax policy which effectively discriminates against parents who choose to stay at home to raise their children.

That is why I am introducing legislation today that will universalize the Dependent Care Tax Credit (DCTC) to give stay-at-home parents tax relief equal to that received by parents who choose to leave their children with an outside caregiver. Under my bill, parents who stay at home with their pre-school age children will receive credit on \$2,400 of expenses for one child, and \$4,800 for two or more children.

The Dependent Care Tax Credit (DCTC) is currently available only to working parents for expenses related to non-parental child care. In effect, the DCTC subsidizes parents to leave their children in the care of others. In my view, this is a fundamentally misguided and harmful policy.

While I support H. Con. Res. 202, parents who sacrifice a second income to stay at home with their kids deserve more than just a pat on the back. Let's show stay-at-home parents that we mean what we say. Support extending the Dependent Care Tax Credit. American's families and our children will be better off for it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support H. Con. Res. 202, legislation designed to ensure that parents who choose to stay home and provide child care are not excluded from any future child care tax credits.

Our children are our most important resource for the future. Studies show that quality child care from a loving and interactive caregiver is imperative to the growth and emotional development of infants and young children. Parents are the most significant influence on their children. They are often the best caregivers, combining love and attention in the comfort of the child's home.

Parents who choose to stay at home and care for their children often sacrifice a much needed second full time income. The average income of two parent families with a single income is \$20,000 less than the average income of two parent families with two incomes. At least 70 percent of preschool children are in families that do not pay for child care and many of these families are struggling to make ends meet. These families should not be discriminated against for their decision to put their children first. Any congressional proposal that increase child care funding should also provide financial relief to families that choose in order that a parent stay home and care for their young child.

Therefore I support H. Con. Res. 202, a resolution that will protect a families' choice to have one parent stay at home and care for a small child. I urge my colleagues to join in support of H. Con. Res. 202.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution offered by Chairman GOODLING.

Each and every day, Americans struggle to balance the competing demands of work and family. That's why this Congress has a responsibility to address the growing child care crisis in America in a common-sense, fiscally prudent, "real-world" way.

But as we move to craft legislation that addresses the needs those families who must have both parents work due to economic necessity, we also must be careful to recognize those families who have decided to pursue on another course.

This resolution makes sense for the American people. It is important that we acknowledge the importance of stay-at-home parents and we should not discriminate against families who make the economic sacrifice to stay at home with their children.

There can be no doubt. In this day and age such a decision carries and economic price. If a mother stays at home there has got to be some recognition in the tax code for her contribution.

For my way of thinking, we need to make it more attractive for a family to make the decision for one parent to stay at home. It is a struggle, but one that is worthwhile.

Stay-at-home parents are carrying on the traditions of our mothers and grandmothers. Those of us who were fortunate enough to have enjoyed the luxury of having our mothers stay-at-home realize what a great gift this was. This is our opportunity to show the value we place on the loving care that only a parent can provide.

I chose to stay-at-home full time with my children. We need to help make such a choice available. While there are many who are not able to afford allowing one parent to stay-at-home, we must help make it more equitable for those trying to be full time homemakers.

We need to remember both the parents who must place their child in care outside the home, and the parents who are struggling to afford keeping their child in care in the home.

This is only the beginning of what I believe will be a constructive debate on this subject of those who need affordable quality child care.

Support the Goodling resolution.

Lets not forget the stay at home moms.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 202, the Equitable Child Care Resolution, which ensures that all families with children will be included in future discussions on child care proposals.

It is important to recognize that all parents have child care needs, whether they choose to stay home, depend on a family member or utilize a day care center for their child. The fact that more than seventy percent of children are cared for by an at-home parent or relative, while most of the proposals before Congress focus solely on commercial child care, reveals the need for such a resolution.

Furthermore, this resolution states that any financial relief considered for parents who work outside the home should also be contemplated for families with at-home care givers. There should not be a bias against at-home parents, who many times forego a second salary to be home with a child.

This resolution will start the child care debate off on the right path by emphasizing the fact that there are many forms of child care. In seeking a federal policy, we should not favor one form of child care over another.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, as a working mother, I can identify with the millions of parents across this country who find themselves torn between the competing responsibilities of work and family. For many families, there is no choice harder to make than whether to work, and put your child in the care of others, or to forego a second income to care for your child yourself.

The majority of mothers I have talked with would prefer to work part time, or not work at all, in order to care for their children. Unfortunately, that choice is not financially feasible for

most Americans. High taxes limit parents' freedom and ability to address the needs of their families. Mothers and fathers don't need experts and polls to tell them what they already know in their hearts to be true. What parents really need is more time to spend with their children, and more money to meet the financial needs of their family.

President Clinton has proposed a child care package that ignores these fundamental concerns of parents. His plan creates a bias against mothers who have sacrificed an income to raise their children at home. Instead, we should make it possible for as many children as possible to enjoy the benefit of full-time parental care during their early years. Non-parental care is second-best for young children and in some cases can even be harmful. This resolution is a first step toward making sure Congress passes laws that are good for children, not bureaucrats.

Families should not be penalized by Washington, DC for the personal choices they make, since parents—not bureaucrats—know what is best for their children.

As responsible legislators, we should not take away the choice of parents to stay home and take care of their children. We ought to enable an average family to survive in ordinary comfort on a single income. We can no longer guarantee this choice, however, because of the crushing tax burden on families raising children. To the extent that our tax policies are squeezing parents and forcing both into the work place, we are inflicting real harm on children.

I encourage this Congress to continue in our efforts to give all families the flexibility, choice, and freedom they need to provide for their families and raise their children in the manner they see fit, and we can only do so by promoting policies of equity that place value and trust in the ability of parents to do what is right for their children.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise some concerns I have regarding House Concurrent Resolution 202. This year President Clinton has brought to public debate the most pressing dilemma for American families. That dilemma is finding and affording appropriate child care. In the State of New Jersey, an estimated 56 percent of all women with children ages 6 and younger are employed and 75% of mothers with children between the ages of 6 and 11 work outside the home. Unfortunately, the cost of affordable care can be between \$4,000 and \$10,000 annually. We must also take into account the fact that if both parents work at full time minimum wage jobs they together will earn only \$21,400 a year. The need for some type of guidance and relief could not be more apparent in New Jersey and nationwide.

Unfortunately, the resolution we will consider today does not address the issue of access to quality child care. Instead it requires that we focus our attention on parents that choose to stay at home rather than go to work. I am pleased that some parents have such an option and I salute their commitment to their families. However, this resolution does not address the real problem that most concerns parents which is affordable child care. I believe we must first address the need of those parents who do not have a choice to stay home and supply them with the best options to find appropriate child care. I am also

concerned that this resolution includes a misrepresentation of facts that does not accurately reflect the reality of the child care dilemma in this country. It also largely ignores those who are committed to caring for children who are relatives but not immediate family members. These individuals are also important and deserve recognition by Congress in child care legislation. For example, a study conducted by the Department of Commerce found that grandparents and other non-parental relatives provide about 35% of the primary care for African American and Hispanic families. This resolution only focuses on stay at home parents and ignores other individuals that have a need to be compensated for their commitment to caring for children.

I must finally remind my colleagues that the U.S. House of Representatives voted to send millions of stay at home parents back into the workforce only three years ago by passing welfare reform legislation. This resolution sends the message that while we will encourage middle and upper class parents to stay at home we do not believe that the value of a stay at home parent is as important for low income children. This message is a disturbing one and not one that I will support.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, before we take the vote, if this resolution passes, what would be the next step in this legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the concurrent resolution is adopted in the House, it will go to the Senate.

Mr. HEFNER. It will go to the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, it will. This is a concurrent resolution.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 202, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, answered “present” 3, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]
YEAS—409

Abercrombie	Baldacci	Becerra
Ackerman	Ballenger	Bentsen
Aderholt	Barcia	Bereuter
Allen	Barr	Berman
Andrews	Barrett (NE)	Berry
Archer	Barrett (WI)	Bilbray
Army	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Bachus	Barton	Bishop
Baesler	Bass	Blagojevich
Baker	Bateman	Bliley

Blumenauer	Blunt	Boehkert	Boehner	Bonilla	Bonior	Borski	Boswell	Boucher	Boyd	Brady	Brown (CA)	Brown (FL)	Brown (OH)	Bryant	Bunning	Burr	Burton	Buyer	Calvert	Camp	Campbell	Canady	Cannon	Cardin	Carson	Castle	Chabot	Chambliss	Chenoweth	Christensen	Clay	Clayton	Clement	Clyburn	Coble	Coburn	Collins	Combest	Condit	Cook	Cooksey	Costello	Cox	Coyne	Cramer	Crane	Crapo	Cubin	Cummings	Cunningham	Danner	Davis (FL)	Davis (IL)	Davis (VA)	Deal	DeFazio	DeGette	DeLahunt	DeLauro	DeLay	Deutsch	Diaz-Balart	Dickey	Dicks	Dingell	Dixon	Doggett	Dooley	Doyle	Dreier	Duncan	Dunn	Edwards	Ehlers	Ehrlich	Emerson	Engel	English	Ensign	Etheridge	Evans	Everett	Ewing	Farr	Fattah	Fawell	Fazio	Filner	Foley	Forbes	Ford	Fossella	Fowler	Fox	Franks (NJ)	Frelinghuysen	Frost	Furse
------------	-------	----------	---------	---------	--------	--------	---------	---------	------	-------	------------	------------	------------	--------	---------	------	--------	-------	---------	------	----------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	-----------	-----------	-------------	------	---------	---------	---------	-------	--------	---------	---------	--------	------	---------	----------	-----	-------	--------	-------	-------	-------	----------	------------	--------	------------	------------	------------	------	---------	---------	----------	---------	-------	---------	-------------	--------	-------	---------	-------	---------	--------	-------	--------	--------	------	---------	--------	---------	---------	-------	---------	--------	-----------	-------	---------	-------	------	--------	--------	-------	--------	-------	--------	------	----------	--------	-----	-------------	---------------	-------	-------

Gallegly	Ganske	Gejdenson	Gekas	Gephardt	Gibbons	Gilchrest	Gillmor	Gilman	Goode	Goodlatte	Goodling	Gordon	Goss	Graham	Granger	Green	Greenwood	Gutierrez	Gutknecht	Hall (OH)	Hall (TX)	Hamilton	Hansen	Hastert	Hastings (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Hayworth	Hefley	Hefner	Henger	Hill	Hilleary	Hilliard	Hinchey	Hinojosa	Hobson	Hoekstra	Holden	Hooley	Horn	Hostettler	Houghton	Hoyer	Hulshof	Hunter	Hutchinson	Hyde	Inglis	Istook	Jackson (IL)	Jackson-Lee	(TX)	Jefferson	Jenkins	John	Johnson (CT)	Johnson (WI)	Johnson, E. B.	Johnson, Sam	Jones	Kanjorski	Kaptur	Kasich	Kelly	Kennedy (MA)	Kennedy (RI)	Kennelly	Kildee	Kilpatrick	Kim	Kind (WI)	King (NY)	Kingston	Klecza	Klink	Klug	Knollenberg	Kolbe	Kucinich	LaFalce	LaHood	Lampson	Largent	Latham	LaTourette	Lazio	Leach	Levin	Lewis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Lipinski	Livingston	LoBiondo	Lofgren	Lowey	Lucas	Luther
----------	--------	-----------	-------	----------	---------	-----------	---------	--------	-------	-----------	----------	--------	------	--------	---------	-------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	--------	---------	---------------	---------------	----------	--------	--------	--------	------	----------	----------	---------	----------	--------	----------	--------	--------	------	------------	----------	-------	---------	--------	------------	------	--------	--------	--------------	-------------	------	-----------	---------	------	--------------	--------------	----------------	--------------	-------	-----------	--------	--------	-------	--------------	--------------	----------	--------	------------	-----	-----------	-----------	----------	--------	-------	------	-------------	-------	----------	---------	--------	---------	---------	--------	------------	-------	-------	-------	------------	------------	------------	----------	------------	----------	---------	-------	-------	--------

Maloney (CT)	Maloney (NY)	Manion	Manzullo	Markey	Mascara	Matsui	McCarthy (MO)	McCarthy (NY)	McCollum	McCrery	McDade	McDermott	McGovern	McHale	McHugh	McInnis	McIntosh	McIntyre	McKeon	McKinney	McNulty	Meehan	Meek (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Menendez	Metcalf	Mica	Millender-McDonald	Miller (CA)	Minge	Moakley	Mollohan	Moran (KS)	Moran (VA)	Morella	Murtha	Neal	Nethercutt	Neumann	Ney	Northup	Norwood	Nussle	Oberstar	Olver	Ortiz	Owens	Oxley	Packard	Pallone	Pappas	Parker	Pascrell	Pastor	Paul	Paxon	Pease	Pelosi	Peterson (MN)	Peterson (PA)	Petri	Pickering	Pickett	Pitts	Pombo	Pomeroy	Porter	Portman	Price (NC)	Pryce (OH)	Quinn	Radanovich	Rahall	Ramstad	Rangel	Redmond	Regula	Reyes	Riggs	Riley	Rivers	Rodriguez	Roemer	Rogan	Rogers	Rohrabacher	Ros-Lehtinen	Rothman	Roukema	Roybal-Allard	Royce	Rush	Ryun	Sabo	Salmon	Sanchez	Sanders
--------------	--------------	--------	----------	--------	---------	--------	---------------	---------------	----------	---------	--------	-----------	----------	--------	--------	---------	----------	----------	--------	----------	---------	--------	-----------	------------	----------	---------	------	--------------------	-------------	-------	---------	----------	------------	------------	---------	--------	------	------------	---------	-----	---------	---------	--------	----------	-------	-------	-------	-------	---------	---------	--------	--------	----------	--------	------	-------	-------	--------	---------------	---------------	-------	-----------	---------	-------	-------	---------	--------	---------	------------	------------	-------	------------	--------	---------	--------	---------	--------	-------	-------	-------	--------	-----------	--------	-------	--------	-------------	--------------	---------	---------	---------------	-------	------	------	------	--------	---------	---------

Sandlin	Snyder	Solomon	Souder	Spence	Spratt	Stabenow	Stark	Stearns	Stenholm	Stokes	Strickland	Stump	Stupak	Sununu	Talent	Tanner	Tauscher	Tauzin	Taylor (MS)	Taylor (NC)	Thomas	Thompson	Thornberry	Thune	Thurman	Tiahrt	Tierney
---------	--------	---------	--------	--------	--------	----------	-------	---------	----------	--------	------------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------	----------	--------	-------------	-------------	--------	----------	------------	-------	---------	--------	---------

Torres	Towns	Trafficant	Turner	Upton	Velazquez	Vento	Visclosky	Walsh	Wamp	Waters	Watkins	Watt (NC)	Watts (OK)	Waxman	Weldon (FL)	Weldon (PA)	Weller	Wexler	Weygand	White	Whitfield	Wicker	Wolf	Woolsey	Wynn	Young (AK)	Young (FL)
--------	-------	------------	--------	-------	-----------	-------	-----------	-------	------	--------	---------	-----------	------------	--------	-------------	-------------	--------	--------	---------	-------	-----------	--------	------	---------	------	------------	------------

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—3

Frank (MA)	Martinez	Payne
------------	----------	-------

NOT VOTING—18

Callahan	Lantos	Obey
Conyers	Linder	Poshard
Doolittle	Miller (FL)	Schiff
Eshoo	Mink	Smith (OR)
Gonzalez	Myrick	Wise
Harman	Nadler	Yates

□ 1836

Mr. BERMAN and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: “Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government should acknowledge the importance of at-home parents and should not discriminate against families who forgo a second income in order for a mother or father to be at home with their children.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I was called away on a family matter and was unable to be here to vote on H. Con. Res. 202, the Daycare Fairness for Stay-At-Home Parents.

I ask that the RECORD reflect that had I been here I would have supported this measure and voted “aye.”

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 202.

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

There was no objection.