United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2002 No. 62

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 15, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JACK QUINN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Lenny Stadler, Weddington United Methodist Church, Weddington, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, I come to You in the matchless name of Jesus Christ. I give thanks to You for our great Nation. I thank You for the vision You gave to our forefathers and the divine plan by which to govern our Nation.

I pray for these representatives who have been placed in authority by the people of our Nation. May they seek Your guidance in all deliberations. May they invoke Your wisdom in making the right decisions concerning the social welfare, the economics, and the protection of our Nation.

I pray that You would instill within this gathered body the desire to be motivated by Your just cause rather than by political or partisan causes.

Finally, I pray that You will help all of us realize that the cost of inconvenience is a small price to pay for the safety of our families and of our Nation in a time of uncertainty. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCNULTY. 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. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. REHBERG led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 15 1-minute speeches per side.

WELCOMING DR. LENNY STADLER

(Mrs. MYRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to welcome Dr. Stadler from Weddington, North Carolina, to the House of Representatives. He is one of those people who is very dynamic and a true leader in our city and our area today.

It may be hard to believe, but he used to be a rock musician. That was before he decided that ambition left him spiritually empty, and he decided to pursue the call of Christ in his life.

He graduated from Duke University Divinity School and Asbury Theological Seminary, and he served in the Western District of the North Carolina Conference of the United Methodist Church for 23 years.

He is joined in his ministry by his wife, Shanna, and their children, Shalen and LenPaul. He has been a senior pastor in Weddington since 1989. Under his leadership, the church has become one of the fastest growing Methodist churches in the southeastern part of the United States.

He is very straightforward and powerful in his preaching, and he always is challenging his parishioners to rediscover the joy of a personal relationship with Jesus Christ. I thank him for being here with us today.

WELFARE REFORM IS ROUSING SUCCESS

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the welfare reform bill we passed in 1996 has been a rousing success. Republicans should be proud that we helped welfare recipients achieve independence through work. We should be proud that we have protected children, strengthened families, and helped millions achieve success. If Members do not believe me, let me define success in the terms of the Republican-led welfare reform legislation.

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 3 million children have been lifted from poverty. Work among mothers most likely to go on welfare has risen by 40 percent. Nine million people left welfare, a 60 percent drop. That, Mr. Speaker, is the definition of success.

Welfare reform is working, but in order to get more people from welfare to work, we must continue to improve the system. In the past 6 years, we have seen welfare cases fall by 14 million to just 5 million people. By reaching out to Americans in need, we have changed our society for the better, and have changed the lives of millions of Americans forever. We are making progress. Let us not rest on our laurels. Let us strengthen the path towards independence by empowering people to support themselves. Vote yes on H.R. 4700.

SPACE FLIGHT PROGRAM IS ADRIFT

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise every day to talk about Ludwig Koons and our need to return him from Italy to the United States, and I want to digress from that story, but please remember how important it is that we concentrate on bringing our children home.

Today's message is about human space flight. America's human space flight program is adrift with no clear vision or commitment to any goals after the completion of the International Space Station.

Today I will be introducing the Space Exploration Act of 2002 to provide a vision and a concrete set of goals for the Nation's human space flight program after the International Space Station. This legislation sets forth specific incremental goals that are exciting, challenging and that build capabilities and infrastructure needed for an ultimate human mission to Mars.

Once America gets started on achieving the first of the human space flight goals listed in the bill, we have gotten over the highest hurdle to success in the entire initiative. We will once again be moving outward beyond low Earth orbit, and in the process, we will revitalize our space program, energize our industrial and academic sectors, create new opportunities for international cooperation, and inspire our young people.

MARRIAGE IS SAFEST PLACE FOR WOMEN

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we live in a world that has changed drastically since the 1950s. Couples are getting married later in life, and almost 40 percent of first marriages end in divorce. And yet every day, men and women all over the country pledge to spend their lives together.

Despite what some people believe about marriage, the facts say one thing: Marriage is still the safest place for women.

Mr. Speaker, studies from the Department of Justice show that never-married women are twice as likely to be abused by their partner than married women. Violence occurs more often in homes where the couples are unmarried compared to wed couples, with unmarried women three times more likely to become victims of violence than married women.

Mr. Speaker, these are disturbing statistics. As we consider welfare reform in the coming days, we must encourage and support programs that will provide safety and security for women. It is clear that a society that promotes marriage promotes women.

AMERICAN FAMILIES NEED TOOLS TO BREAK WELFARE CYCLE

(Mr. SANDLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, we need to pass a welfare reform bill that allows American families to have respect and hope for the future. The goal of the original welfare reform bill was to move people permanently off the welfare rolls and into good-paying jobs. However, the bill proposed by our friends on the other side of the aisle does not accomplish that goal. If we really want to support the dignity of American families and support family values, we need to give families the tools through education and training to get off welfare and break the welfare cycle.

The States need flexibility to address these goals for themselves, not unfunded mandates that violate States rights. Let us stand up for the dignity of American families and support education. Let us support job training. Let us support States rights to address their own problems, and the problems of their State citizens. Vote no on H.R. 4735.

WELFARE REFORM OFFERS SELF-SUFFICIENCY

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of welfare reform back in 1996, we moved from a welfare system that bred dependency to one that offers self-sufficiency, and probably even more important, allowing those individuals to regain some of their self-respect. Rather than just being given something for nothing, now they are working.

Since 1996, Michigan, like the Nation, has reduced its welfare caseload by 60 percent. I have been inspired and encouraged by the many success stories in my congressional district of individuals going from welfare to work. Darryl Grubbs is one, and Kendra Norton is another that I have met with whose lives have been turned around thanks to the encouragement of the 1996 welfare reform. These people now have a better life for themselves, and very importantly, better lives for their kids. They tell me that their children are now more proud of their parents, that they are actually doing better in school than they did when they were on welfare.

In conclusion, as the House takes up welfare reauthorization, we should be continuing a system that helps people. I urge Members to make a good program even better by supporting this bill today.

H.R. 4700 WILL TURN BACK CLOCK ON WELFARE REFORM

(Ms. WATSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, do Members hear the children crying? We will surely hear them cry if we vote to support the administration's proposal to reauthorize TANF. The primary goal of most Democratic Members of Congress has been to reduce poverty and to ensure the well-being of children in the welfare system.

The proposals in H.R. 4700 would adversely affect hundreds of thousands of welfare recipients. The administration's welfare reform proposals are restrictive, and will severely limit the State of California's ability to respond effectively and efficiently to the needs of its welfare recipients. The long-term fiscal impacts of this legislation will cost California $2.8 billion over a 5-year period because these proposals do not include increases in the TANF block grants. California's options for funding the projected costs will be limited to using State resources. This will essentially mean deep reductions in the TANF programs, and this is not right.

Quite simply put, H.R. 4700 will turn back the clock on welfare reform. Please vote no.

WELFARE REFORM IS ABOUT REAWAKENING SPIRIT OF AMERICAN FAMILY

(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, in 1996 Congress acted to fundamentally reform America's welfare system from the broken entitlement program it had become into the streamlined temporary assistance program we now have today.

Since the historic Republican-led reforms of 1996, more than 3 million children have been lifted out of the depths

of poverty and given the opportunity to achieve their fullest potential. Welfare rolls have been reduced by more than 60 percent nationally, and by more than 50 percent in my home State of Montana.

There are those who argued 7 years ago that reforming welfare would put children out on the street. History has proven them wrong, and they are wrong now to use the same negative rhetoric. Welfare reform is about reawakening the spirit of the American family that has only known the disappointment of a government handout. Congress must act to keep the American entrepreneurial spirit alive, to invest in our children's future, and to secure the social and economic backbone of the great American experiment in democracy. I urge Members to vote yes on welfare reform.

CORPORATE TRAITORS CHOOSE PROFITS OVER PATRIOTISM

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention this morning to Bermuda, and the practice of American companies reincorporating to a foreign country to avoid paying U.S. income taxes, which is inconsistent with American corporate citizenship, patriotism, and unfair to those individuals and businesses who pay their fair share in taxes.

To address this problem of corporate inversions, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MALONEY) and I have introduced H.R. 3884, the Corporate Patriot Enforcement Act.

□ 1015

This legislation currently has 50 bipartisan cosponsors, and support for it continues to grow as Members and citizens alike become aware of what is happening.

Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY have also introduced similar legislation and the Treasury Department acknowledges it has become a huge problem.

Mr. Speaker, since H.R. 3884 was introduced on March 6, a number of companies such as the all-American Stanley Tools Company of New Britain, Connecticut, have filed to reincorporate overseas. So, they just get a phony address and they avoid paying corporate income taxes that the rest of their competitors all have to pay.

The impetus for my support of this issue did not come from the AFL–CIO; it came from the competitors of these corporate expatriates who are saying, ''If we paid, they ought to pay.'' In this time, with the country feeling so good in the aftermath of September 11 by our patriotic response, everybody should do their part. Bermuda ought not to be an address for these companies; America should.

SUPPORT WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, helping the American people is why many of us ran for Congress. I think life is getting better in America every day, but there are still people who are having a tough time making ends meet. We need to help as many of those people who are truly in need as we can. I think the welfare reform bill we have before us today will help those people by giving them the tools they need to make their dreams become a reality.

Since 1994, welfare caseloads have fallen by 9 million. Today, only about 2 percent of the population of the United States is on welfare. With this bill, we can reduce this number even further by helping people become productive. As a body, I believe we need to do what is best for this great country. Voting for this bill is a vote for a better and stronger Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues who supported the successful 1996 bill to keep up the good work and vote for this landmark reform legislation, and I urge those who voted ''no'' last time to take another look. You cannot argue with success. Let us put our people before politics. Vote ''yes'' for H.R. 4700, the Personal Responsibility, Work, and Family Promotion Act of 2002.

CORPORATE EXPATRIATION

(Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, in September, Stanley Works of New Britain, Connecticut, announced that it was closing its hardware manufacturing facility and moving it to China. In February, Stanley Works announced that its board had approved a plan to modify its corporate structure to reincorporate in Bermuda. Last week, a shareholder vote approving this expatriation was effectively invalidated due to improper proxy procedures. A new shareholder vote will have to be scheduled.

Corporate expatriates are former U.S. companies who set up paper headquarters in tax havens in order to avoid U.S. taxes. Stanley intends to use a third country with which we have a tax treaty in order to avoid virtually all U.S. taxes, including on products made and sold here in the United States. In fact, such expatriates continue to reside in the United States, take advantage of our education system, our public utility systems and, of course, our national defense. In this time of war, they are saying, Thank you but we aren't going to pay our fair share.

This is outrageous. Congress must act expeditiously to close this loophole and stop this unpatriotic tax dodge. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) and I have introduced legislation to do exactly that. I call on this House to take the appropriate action and pass this legislation promptly.

SUPPORT WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago we took a welfare system that nobody thought could be fixed and put it to work. The results have been overwhelming. Welfare reform lifted nearly 3 million children from poverty and 9 million people left the welfare rolls altogether.

Republicans led a welfare reform effort that has proved successful in replacing welfare checks with paychecks. We created a system that fostered independence, boosted personal income, and improved the well-being of children. By promoting work, recipients were encouraged to join the workforce. By redefining compassion, welfare recipients were given a new sense of hope. By passing welfare legislation, people were guided down the path of independence.

We must guard against those who want to erode the progress that we have made, especially on so important an issue as changing the culture to promote strong families and a strong work ethic. Join me today and vote for H.R. 4700.

CLOSING LOOPHOLE FOR CORPORATE TAX DODGING

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, what a year it has been. We now have proof that Enron was manipulating West Coast energy prices to simply gouge consumers of their hard-earned money while its auditor, Arthur Andersen, took the term ''cooking the books'' to a whole new level. We have also learned how Fortune 500 companies take out life insurance policies on their rank-and-file employees to enhance compensation for senior executives.

Speaking of corporate tax avoidance, try and keep a straight face when you tell your constituents that it is perfectly legal for a company to rent a post office in Bermuda and avoid paying taxes. This is utterly ridiculous. One of the effects of corporations not paying their taxes is that we cannot give seniors and working families a prescription drug benefit, or that we cannot fund the President's education bill or hire more cops. Moreover, we are in the middle of a war, and we are effectively permitting U.S. companies to place a higher value on earnings than on patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to close this loophole. It is time to crack down on tax evasion. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 3884.

SUPPORT WELFARE REFORM TO MAKE THE PROGRAM EVEN BETTER

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, over the past 5 years we have all witnessed how well our Nation's welfare system can work. Taking a look at this chart, we can see that in 1996 we had over 14 million welfare cases on the books, and in the year 2002 we now have 5 million. Nine million Americans have moved from welfare to work, a success story. We have heard the success stories from thousands of Americans who have moved from the welfare-to-work process. Now these former welfare recipients have the ability to support their families, hold down jobs and pay their bills. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, they have recovered their dignity and self-esteem that was once lost to the bureaucracy of welfare.

We promised America 6 years ago that welfare reform would get people back to work. Despite the doubts and naysaying of our critics, we have kept that promise. And while the latest welfare reduction statistics are very impressive, there is always room for improvement. This is our chance to reach out and do the right thing again to the people in need. We owe it to the millions of people that we have already gotten off the welfare rolls, and we owe it to the next million eager to join them.

I urge Members to support H.R. 4700, and I urge them to stand up today and do the right thing.

SUPPORT COMMONSENSE WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, our President speaks often about changing the tone in Washington. To help him do that, we, with commonsense control of the Congress, were able to change some policies in Washington. For the better part of a half century, the Federal Government evaluated success by the number of people who were added to the welfare rolls. We said, that has fundamentally got to change, that true compassion is making sure people find jobs, that at the end of the day when all is said and done, the best social program for any American is a job. Welfare reform, enacted over a half decade ago, has put us on the road to that commonsense measure, where the real measure of compassion is the number of people who leave the welfare rolls and find work, where honest compassion is providing educational opportunity and child care opportunities to enable people to leave welfare and go to work.

And despite some of the mean-spirited catcalls of over a half decade ago about children being thrown into the streets and all sorts of other things that I will not repeat because they are so beneath the dignity of this House, we have restored the basic dignity to millions of Americans who now derive satisfaction from a day's work and a day's pay. We need to continue this battle and continue welfare reform.

I ask my colleagues to join with me on a bipartisan basis with that type of vote today in this House in favor of continuing commonsense welfare reform.

VOTE ''YES'' FOR WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have good news to report. The good news is that today we are going to vote on the welfare reform bill which will constructively change the lives of millions of people. In 1996, Congress passed legislation that opened the door of independence, and today it is critical that we vote to keep that door open. We must continue the successes that started with Republican leadership 6 years ago.

Welfare reform's new goal will be to spur States and welfare recipients to even greater levels of success. Through employment, work-related services, child support reform and counseling for healthy family relationships, America can continue down the path of independence. We made a historic and positive change in our society 6 years ago when we passed welfare reform legislation, but we have just turned the corner. Our work is far from done. Let us make sure we keep the door of independence open for those in need. Let us get willing people back to work. There is nothing more satisfying than the smiling faces of success.

Vote ''yes'' for welfare reform reauthorization.

SUPPORT DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE TO WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I note some degree of irony here. Just a few days ago on the floor of this Chamber, the House approved a massive repudiation of one of the Contract with America, the Gingrich Revolution, in terms of the Freedom to Farm Act. It was a massive welfare program for a few of the Nation's farmers in a few States. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we are coming forward here today considering additions and changes to the welfare program that ironically are opposed by the majority of the Nation's Governors, Republican and Democrat alike. I am hopeful that there will be strong support for the efforts that have been offered by the Democrats, my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), to be able to maintain flexibility, maintain approaches that work on the State level; and hopefully we will not continue the hypocrisy where we provide welfare for those who need it the least and have mean-spirited Federal intervention from the Federal level for those who actually need our help.

SUPPORT WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am cursed with a memory full of useless information, some of which were the comments made by Democrats in 1996 when we passed welfare reform.

Marian Wright Edelman, president of the Children's Defense Fund, said the bill was an outrage that would hurt and impoverish millions. The Urban Institute predicted welfare reform would push 2.6 million more people into poverty. And the National Organization for Women said 12.8 million people on welfare would risk sinking deeper into poverty.

We have heard this morning on this floor, Mr. Speaker, the same. There they go again. The truth is that the vicious cycle of poverty has been broken. There are 2.3 million fewer children living in poverty today than before the 1996 welfare reform bill and 4.2 million fewer living in poverty across the board. The reality is the 1996 welfare reform bill worked. Let us be sure in Congress today to deal and to assist the neediest among us by continuing this important reform with the welfare bill before the Congress this week.

SUPPORT WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, nearly 9 million people have gone from welfare checks to paychecks, thanks to Republicans.

□ 1030

Let me give an example of a constituent in my district, and I will call her Janice. She is a single mother of a 5-year-old, and last spring Janice lost her job in a soft economy. With a tight labor market and no college degree, Janice could not find a job to support her family. But thanks to welfare reform and the good people at a Texas Workforce Center, Janice applied for welfare the very next day. She did not want to stay on welfare; she wanted to find a job. The center helped her organize her options and find a job at a manufacturing plant. They also helped her find child care. Mr. Speaker, eventually, they helped her find a job in the Garland Independent School District.

She now has self-sufficient pay, a regular schedule, full benefits, and

even retirement. After 6 months of steady work, Janice and her family moved from welfare to work. Janice is a story of determination. Janice is a story of hope. I salute her and an even better welfare reform bill today.

THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY, WORK, AND FAMILY PROMOTION ACT OF 2002

(Mr. TANCREDO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, success has 1,000 fathers and failure is an orphan. This is especially true and it comes to mind when the ex-President of the United States recently claimed credit for the passage of the Welfare Reform Act after, of course, he twice vetoed the bill. The reason that Mr. Clinton now wants to be a parent of the bill is because it works. It is wildly successful. Nearly 3 million children have been lifted from poverty and the child poverty rate is at its lowest level since 1978.

When we reaffirm the dignity of work and the reality of welfare reform, it is not about a social program, but rather it is about a job. I hope that everyone joins me today and votes for the Welfare Reform Reauthorization.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 397 and H.R. 3799

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 397 and H.R. 3799.

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

There was no objection.

NECESSARY CHANGES FOR WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to my friends on the other side talk about the debate we are going to be having today on welfare reform. Unfortunately, the rule that the Committee on Rules is recommending will not let us have a full debate, will not let us bring up amendments to a bill that is extremely important to our States, in not only getting people off of cash assistance welfare, but getting people real jobs.

Mr. Speaker, my concern is that if we look at the Republican bill that we will be debating later, it moves backwards. If welfare has been such a success, why are we imposing new restrictions on our States? Why are we telling our States that they cannot provide education and training to the people that are on welfare today? Why is education important for everyone in this country, except for people that happen to be on cash assistance and on welfare?

Mr. Speaker, we will have a debate on welfare today, and I hope that we will be able to make some changes in the bill that comes forward so that we all can agree that the next chapter of welfare reform should be getting people out of poverty.

CONTINUING ON THE PATH OF SUCCESS

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand before my colleagues today to encourage all of the Members of this body to vote ''yes'' for H.R. 4700, the Welfare Reform Reauthorization. It is important that those who need government assistance get it, and those who can work get work.

Our 1996 welfare legislation was very successful, and there is no reason why the legislation we are voting on today will not be just as successful.

A few years ago, the Republicans voted three times to pass a welfare reform bill that revolutionized the lives of welfare recipients. In the past 3 years, over 3 million children have been lifted from the depths of poverty. Former welfare recipients and their children are now achieving their independence from the welfare system. We have taken a large step in the right direction, but it is critical that we continue our progress.

The House must finish the work we started 6 years ago. Let us continue to follow the path of success and continue to help change for the better the lives of millions of people. Vote ''yes'' on welfare reform.

FAILURES ON THE PATH OF SUCCESS

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the limited time that I am here this morning, I have heard a significant number of Members speak to the subject of welfare reform. In 1996, allegedly, we were supposed to move people from welfare to work. In the State of Florida that I represent, it did not work. So for all of those coming here talking about welfare reform being an unqualified success, let me suggest to my colleagues that there were some failures along the path of their alleged success.

One thing needs to be understood by this body. If we do not have child care, no matter what we do in here with reference to welfare, it is not going to work. If one does not have educational benefits, if one does not have training for people, then what we are going to do is lead people into dead-end work that leads to dead-end lives.

Enough already. We have trapped people in this program, and what we are preparing to do is to trap them even more and create that cycle.

COURAGEOUS REPUBLICANS REFORM WELFARE

(Mr. SCHROCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, before 1996, it was evident to most Americans that the welfare system was out of control and needed immediate and meaningful reform. So in 1996, the Republican-led Congress had the courage to reform welfare, making work the centerpiece for the new law, providing a hand-up, not a handout. Since then, millions of Americans have left the welfare rolls, child poverty rolls have dropped, and the poverty rate among African Americans is at a new all-time record.

Welfare reform has required millions of poor Americans to obtain employment, leading them from dependency on the government to personal independence and from low self-esteem to self-respect and self-confidence as they lifted themselves out of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, now this Congress is tasked with the reauthorization of the Welfare Reform Act. We must continue our progress by strengthening the path towards independence through work. Welfare reform has given millions of Americans a second chance at the American dream, and they are achieving it. Let us not turn back the clock on these wonderful achievements. Let us stay the course, ensuring life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all Americans.

MOVING FORWARD WITH WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, in 1996, Congress did a very good thing: they reformed welfare and it was said at the time that it would throw children into poverty and a lot of people would be worse off than they were before.

Let us look at the figures. Mr. Speaker, 4.2 million fewer Americans live in poverty today than they did in 1996, and 2.3 million fewer children live in poverty today than in 1996.

Now, the other side of this debate says that those are the ''alleged benefits.'' Those are not the alleged benefits; those are the facts. People are better off, everyone: children, women, minorities. We are all better off today than we were in 1996.

What it all comes down to it, we can look at individuals. There is a great story here. Tanya, a single mother, went on public assistance when her twin girls were a year old. Since completing her work with Calworks last

year, she has been able to earn enough money to purchase her own home. It is success stories like this, individuals that bring the meaning to us, that prove that we need to reauthorize this program and to continue to move forward.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3994, AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2002

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 419 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 419

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3994) to authorize economic and democratic development assistance for Afghanistan and to authorize military assistance for Afghanistan and certain other foreign countries. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by title rather than by section. Each title shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 419 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3994, the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. It is a fair rule and allows ample opportunity for all Members to present their views on this very important underlying legislation.

Since the beginning of the war on terror in Afghanistan, the Bush administration has made a continuous point that this is not a war against the people of Afghanistan. It is in reality quite the opposite. The Commander in Chief has worked to include the people of Afghanistan in our efforts to rid their country of terrorist networks and he has met this challenge with extraordinary success.

Now that the roots of freedom are in place, we should work to ensure that the people of Afghanistan and the interim government have resources to ensure that Afghanistan remains a full member of the democratic community.

The passage of the Afghanistan Freedom Promotion Act reiterates our commitment to peace and stability in the region. It authorizes over $1 billion over the next 4 years for development, economic, and security assistance for Afghanistan. It also provides President Bush with needed flexibility in allocating assistance to take into account the fluid situation in Afghanistan and the corresponding needs there.

It is important, however, that we realize that this is not a blank check, this legislation, without verification. It conditions reconstruction and development assistance on the Afghan government, providing full support for counternarcotics efforts and implementing the commitments to peace and pluralism that were made in Germany last December.

The bill also earmarks $15 million annually to support the UN Drug Control Program activities in Afghanistan and $10 million annually for supporting a traditional Afghan assembly. The underlying legislation also provides assistance to meet urgent humanitarian needs such as food aid and disaster relief and emphasizes the need to assist refugees in returning to their communities when it is safe to do so.

This is a good bipartisan bill, Mr. Speaker. It preserves the successes that have been achieved in Afghanistan. The legislation provides for the national security of the United States as well as other friends and allies by helping the effort to eliminate Afghanistan as a source of terrorism and instability in the region.

I urge my colleagues to support both this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), my good friend and neighbor, for yielding me this time.

The rule itself is fair enough in that it is an open rule. I would also like to at this time thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the House Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for their extraordinary work on this legislation.

As a former 9-year member of the Committee on International Relations, I well know how hard that committee works to bring sensible legislation to the House floor that is sound public policy for the United States and equally sound globally. So again, I want to recognize the hard work of the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act, is a good bill as far as it goes. I appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), for saying that the circumstances in Afghanistan are fluid, and that is without question my opinion; and I would echo his sentiments in that regard.

This bill also authorizes a broad range of development, economic and security assistance for Afghanistan including more than $1 billion in various assistance activities over 4 years, and urges the President to appoint a special coordinator to oversee overall U.S. assistance. And I think that that area should be underscored.

The bill also conditions assistance in certain regions to counter narcotics efforts and links future assistance to the furtherance of the ''Bonn process'' which provides a frame work for Afghanistan's political factions to decide their country's political future.

I read a summary of the bill last night, Mr. Speaker, which notes that this bill, and I quote, ''includes strong language on the provision of assistance to meet the educational, health, vocational needs of women, endorses the needs for increased security throughout Afghanistan,'' housing, infrastructure.

Candidly speaking, I wish we had the money to do all the same things in my district and the rest of this country, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, I have read the Republican welfare bill, and I fear the House today may very well be doing good for Afghans, as rightly we should, and more for them than we are for some Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I only half jokingly refer to this bill as ''welfare for warlords.'' The cold facts tell me that sending this amount of money to a region that is still war-torn and rife with organized crime may be a dangerous thing to do. Peacekeepers in that region for a substantial period of time are going to be a must. Accountability is absolutely essential.

I am, however, very encouraged; and I spoke actively during the runup of

this bill with the gentleman from California's (Mr. LANTOS) office and allows that the bill includes language to try and stem the serious narco-trafficking that is rampant in Afghanistan. What we see on a day-to-day basis now that spring has sprung in Afghanistan is more and more poppy seeds, less and less tomatoes and potatoes; and what we are witnessing is right in the area that we are getting ready to send a lot of money are drugs being drawn up and grown up that will ultimately arrive at our shores and elsewhere in the world.

I have seen a couple of these crop replacement programs, one in Chiang Mai, Thailand. I do not think it worked there. I do not think it worked in Bolivia when we tried that; and I do not think it is going to work in Afghanistan, for the practical reason that growing tomatoes and potatoes is not as lucrative as growing poppy. And until such time as we understand that dynamic, we are going to find ourselves on the short end of yet another war on drugs while we are trying to stop a war on terror in an area where drugs are being grown as we prepare to send money there.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, the bill is good as far as it goes and is a good start. And I think the authors have done all that they could under the circumstances. I hope some of the concerns I just mentioned can be addressed sooner rather than later. Ultimately, this bill deserves our support. I only wish that they would deal with many of the same problems domestically in the manner that we do this and that our domestic matters would enjoy the same bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am eager for this Chamber to deal with the subject at hand with the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act. We are leading an effort as a country in a global struggle against terrorism, and this legislation can be critical for that effort. We all know that the world changed since the September 11 attacks, and a number of those changes actually have been positive. I am pleased that the United States is more engaged in the Middle East, working to try and stop the violence in Israel. We have toppled a brutal, repressive regime in Afghanistan. And now we are finding that the term ''nation building'' which some were dismissive of during the last presidential campaign, is no longer a term of derision. It is something that people understand the United States has a responsibility in which to be engaged.

I am thankful that we are turning our attention to the struggle for the hearts and minds of hundreds of millions of people, particularly in this troubled region, people who do not get the full story about the role that the United States plays and wants to play in the future. There are some who obviously have their grievances against us, but there are millions more who are born to poverty and despair. Now more than ever before the United States needs to have the full range of tools available to deal with these multiple challenges. Part of it is military, and we have approved one of the most generous bills in the history of this country to give tools to our Armed Forces who have already proven that they are the finest in the world.

We have in the person of Secretary Powell somebody leading the diplomatic efforts and I think someone who commands the respect and confidence of Congress and the American people. We need to craft an aid package that will help us build up and repair.

Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns I have with this piece of legislation is that while it speaks to issues, for example, of reconstructing the damaged infrastructure in the countryside, in agriculture, while it speaks to the buildup of commerce, it does not speak to the reconstruction of the cities in Afghanistan damaged beyond repair in some requests unless we step forward. And it is silent, I am afraid, to the hundreds of innocent victims, innocent villagers in Afghanistan who were mistakenly attacked, killed, injured children who were traumatized. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that these innocent citizens in Afghanistan are every bit as innocent victims like we lost in the World Trade Center and here in the Pentagon in Washington, D.C.

I have been visited by people who lost loved ones in this country who urge Congress to reach out to the innocent victims in Afghanistan. And I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that this House will use the flexibility under the rule to make adjustments to this bill to make sure that we are rebuilding the damaged cities in Afghanistan and that we have the flexibility to reach out, to aid the innocent victims of our activities in that country. There will be no more powerful signal to people around the world about how the United States is different, how we are trying to live our values than if we reach out to help these innocent people.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), a genuine expert not only on foreign affairs but especially the war on narcotrafficking.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for his standing in defense of freedom constantly around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, and I rise in support of this important and time-sensitive legislation.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform and one of the Chairs of the Speaker's Task Force on a Drug Free America, I would like to commend the Committee on International Relations for its excellent work on this bill in expediting authorization for counternarcotics assistance to the interim Afghan government. I want to take time in this debate to emphasize the potentially critical nature of the next few months in Afghanistan with respect to drug control.

Historically, Afghanistan has been the main worldwide source for elicit opium and heroin production worldwide, accounting for as much as 70 percent of the total worldwide crop. But the historical political instability of the region has long prevented meaningful efforts at control and crop eradication.

As John Walters, the director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, recently commented, now is the first opportunity in recent history to influence the worldwide opium problem by working with our allies to eradicate and disrupt this trade. The bill expressly recognizes that counternarcotics efforts such as poppy eradication and the disruption of heroin production must be a high priority of U.S. assistance to Afghanistan, as well as the importantly, equally vigorous assistance and contributions from the European Union for the same purpose. The vast majority of the opium and heroin produced in Afghanistan has been historically consumed in Europe rather than the United States, so it is critical that our European allies take a leadership role and meaningfully support this effort, as well as have the governments of the United Kingdom and Germany.

There can be little doubt, however, that Afghan heroin also threatens the United States and that a meaningful blow to such a large source of worldwide opium will undoubtedly reduce availability around the world. The UNDCP, which has been heavily involved in drug control efforts in Afghanistan, estimated at an interparliamentary drug conference in Tokyo last month that as many as 2,700 metric tons of new opium could be produced in Afghanistan this year if the crop is left unchecked. Enough to fill the annual demand for European markets nearly three times over.

Although Chairman Karzai clearly seeks to ban production and control of the narcotics trade, as he assured me personally several times, this simply cannot do it without the assistance provided in this bill. We must decisively take advantage of a potentially historic opportunity to stem the flow of heroin around the world.

As our subcommittee; President Bush; Director Walters; and our former colleague and now DEA administrator, Asa Hutchinson, have so vocally recognized, the bill also recognizes the critical link of drug profits to international terrorism.

The Taliban received as much as $40 million annually in profits derived from the Afghan opium crop which the United Nations concluded had gone directly to financing of terrorist organizations. In addition to its importance

for narcotics control, we must also eliminate Afghan poppy for the simple reason that it otherwise would continue to have the potential to serve as a ready source for a huge flow of illicit drugs to any terrorist or insurgent groups that might be able to take power in Afghanistan in the future.

I would also like to take this opportunity to address two important issues raised by this bill with respect to overall U.S. drug control efforts in Afghanistan. First, the bill today contains a provision encouraging the President to appoint an executive branch coordinator for all American assistance to Afghanistan, including counternarcotics assistance. As this provision is nonbinding and relatively narrow in scope, I will not object to it. As chairman of the authorizing committee for the Office of National Drug Control Policy, however, I want to express my view that this provision does not affect the otherwise existing legal authorities and prerogatives of ONDCP with respect to all government narcotics drug control programs. I also expect that any such coordinator appointed for Afghanistan would coordinate counternarcotics assistance through and in consultation with ONDCP and its Office of Supply Reduction.

Second, I would like to express on the record my concern with recent media reports that the U.S. Central Command had refused to participate in efforts to eradicate opium poppy in Afghanistan. As I mentioned earlier, opium eradication is key not only to global drug control but also to cutting off sources of economic support to potential military opponents. The military interest in cooperating with this mission should be clear as a matter of both law and policy when it can be accomplished without risking American troops, as the Committee on Armed Services recognized last week in its report for next year's authorization bill. I strongly support the committee's position and will continue to closely monitor the extent and nature of Central Command and the Department of Defense participation in these essential national missions.

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize again that we are potentially at a crossroads with respect to worldwide heroin trade. I look forward to discussing the DEA's new global heroin strategy in the near future in our subcommittee and reviewing the overall world situation with respect to Colombia and other source countries. For now, however, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this important and potentially historic bill.

□ 1100

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1817

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the following order:

House Resolution 419, by the yeas and nays;

Approving the Journal, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second vote in this series.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3994, AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 419, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boozman
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky

Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Blunt
Burton
Cannon
Clement
Deal
Hall (OH)
Honda
Keller
McKinney
Murtha
Pickering
Quinn
Rangel
Sabo
Sherwood
Stupak
Toomey
Traficant
Wicker

□ 1840

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. LAHOOD). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on each question on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 352, noes 55, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

AYES—352

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Sullivan
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—55

Aderholt
Baird
Baldwin
Borski
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
English
Filner
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holt
Hooley
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (MN)
Kucinich
LaFalce
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LoBiondo
Markey
McDermott
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Moore
Moran (KS)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Peterson (MN)
Ramstad
Shadegg
Slaughter
Stark
Stenholm
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weller

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—26

Blunt
Burton
Cannon
Clement
Cunningham
Deal
Emerson
Fletcher
Hall (OH)
Matheson
Miller, George
Murtha
Napolitano
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Quinn
Rangel
Reyes
Riley
Sabo
Schaffer
Sherwood
Stupak
Thornberry
Traficant

□ 1851

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4737, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY, WORK, AND FAMILY PROMOTION ACT OF 2002

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–466) on the resolution (H. Res. 422) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4737) to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 346

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of House Resolution 346.

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

There was no objection.

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 420 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 420

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of Wednesday, May 15, 2002, providing for consideration or disposition of a bill to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Early this morning, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules met and passed this resolution waiving clause 6(a) of rule XIII, requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules against certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules.

The resolution applies the waiver to a special rule reported on or before the legislative day of Wednesday, May 15, 2002, providing for consideration or disposition of the bill H.R. 4737, the Personal Responsibility, Work, and Family Promotion Act of 2002.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are aware, this legislation builds on our successes from 1996 to further protect children, strengthen families, increase State flexibility, and continue the decline in poverty. In fact, yesterday the Committee on Rules received testimony on this bill from a number of Members in anticipation of reporting a rule to bring this legislation to the floor.

With final negotiations regarding this important legislation now finally complete, adoption of this rule will simply allow us to move forward and consider this important welfare reform proposal today rather than holding up consideration of this bill until tomorrow or even next week.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and allow the House to complete its work on the business at hand.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. I wish I could tell my colleagues that this measure stemmed from a need for flexibility rather than a need to cover up ineptitude, but I would not be telling the truth.

Quite simply, this is the most stunning display of incompetence I have witnessed under this leadership. In fumble after fumble, the leadership kept attempting to move a flawed bill, failing miserably, then going behind closed doors to try it one more time.

The House of Representatives has ground to a halt, and the call for regular order sounds like the punch line to a cynical joke. This is a disgrace, and I am at a loss to explain why we are once again preparing to circumvent the rules of the body and cram a controversial measure down the throats of our colleagues.

What aversion does this leadership have to the House rules? This is an extremely heavy-handed process, even for this leadership. Under the rules of the House, a two-thirds vote is required to consider a rule on the same day as the Committee on Rules reports it. But the martial law procedure before us allows a rule to be considered on the same day as it is reported with a majority rather than a two-thirds vote. This rule would waive the one day layover requirement, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. Speaker, we went into the Committee on Rules yesterday in full good faith at 4 p.m., left there around 8 p.m. until midnight to hear the final disposition of this bill. Later today, we went in again about 4 p.m. this afternoon to find the bill on which we had held a hearing had been changed. My side was given 30 minutes to look at it. And I simply want to say again that that is a dreadful way to run this House, and I find it terribly inept.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and in stronger opposition to this Republican bill.

First of all, with respect to the rule. John Adams once said that we have a Nation of laws, not of men. And when we make laws, a bill comes to the floor and it is not perfect from the Republicans, and it is not perfect from the Democrats. So there is the opportunity to offer amendments.

Members from different parts of the United States can come to the floor and represent their constituents and offer an idea that Indiana has done since we gained waivers on welfare reform in 1994. But this rule does not allow that. Or a Member from California could come to this great hall and offer an amendment on child care, to increase the amount of money as we increase the workload on parents. We need to make sure we take care of their children for those added hours. This rule does not allow that. We cannot offer an amendment to increase child care.

There is a vote for a Democratic substitute, a vote for recommittal, and a vote for the Republican bill. No amendments to the Republican bill in order. We should defeat this rule. The minority rights are being degraded and taken away day by day and week by week.

Lastly, about the Republican bill itself. I helped get waivers for Indiana in 1994, and welfare reform succeeded then because we had State flexibility. I voted for the Clinton reform package in 1996. That succeeded because it was tough love. We have moved from State flexibility to tough love to sanctions and sticks. Now we are short on compassion and real long and hard on conservatism.

□ 1900

Where is the conservative passion in this Republican bill? We do not have enough in this bill for child care. I am for better worker requirements, longer hours to work, but we must make welfare reform work by taking care of our families and our children. We must make sure that vocational education can be included in. We must make sure that States get credit for getting people into work, not just off of welfare. Let us make sure that States get credit for getting people into jobs and taking care of our children, not just lopping people off the welfare rolls and having no concern for their children's day care responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am adamantly opposed to this rule because it inflicts harm on minority rights. I am adamantly opposed to this bill, although I supported welfare reform in a bipartisan way 5 years ago on a bill that is working, which has resulted in people going to work, which has resulted in a State like Indiana getting approximately 30 percent of their people off welfare, that has resulted in the lowest poverty rates for Hispanic and African American families. Let us continue the success of the Clinton bipartisan welfare reform, not sanctions and sticks.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to go over a few details. The gentleman referred to the last welfare package as the Clinton welfare reform bill. That welfare reform bill was sent to President Clinton three times before he signed it. Three times.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, the bill that I referred to, as the gentlewoman from Ohio knows, was a Clinton proposal that came to the House for three different votes. It passed with bipartisan support from Democrats and Republicans working together, not excluding and prohibiting people from working together and offering amendments. It was a bipartisan proposal that worked in States like Indiana.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, I do not know that it was a Clinton proposal that came to the Hill. It was a product of the work of this House of Representatives, Republican controlled.

At the same time, I would like to add that this rule provides the Democrats two bites of the apple while only affording the Republicans one. We have the base bill which we will be voting on; the Democrats have a substitute and a motion to recommit. That proportion is 2 to 1, and I do not see anything unfair or partisan about that.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentlewoman from Ohio, we will trade our two bites for what the gentlewoman has over on her side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this so-called martial law rule. By definition, martial law is an improper process.

I also rise in opposition to the underlying bill. In 1996, I voted for welfare reform because it made sense and it put people to work. It was a legitimate, bipartisan effort. This bill, unfortunately, moves us backwards. First of all, it is an unfunded mandate. My State of Maryland will have to pay an additional $144 million because of this bill. It requires more people working longer hours and does not provide adequate child support, and I think that is a grave mistake.

Second, on the subject of child care, we have 15 million young people now who are eligible for child care under welfare reform who cannot get it. This bill makes the situation even worse. They give us a paltry $1 billion. We need $11 billion to take care of all of the young people who need child care as a result of their parents going to work.

Third, they eliminate vocational education. Look, we do not need a generation of career burger boys. The object of welfare reform is to give people training so they can get into meaningful, decent, well-paying jobs. This bill will not allow them to do that. There are three good reasons to reject the underlying rule and one major reason to reject this rule, because it is martial law.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there is some good news here. If the House votes against this rule, we do not have to be in until the wee hours of the morning. We do not have to debate one of the major bills of this session so late at night that it is difficult for us all to have the type of debate that is worthy of this body. I urge as a matter of fairness that we reject this rule. Welfare reform and TANF reauthorization deserves to be heard during normal hours of this body. It is wrong for us to have to consider it this late at night.

Second, I do not know how many Members are aware when we started today we had H.R. 4700 as the welfare bill. Then it was changed to H.R. 4735; and now tonight it is changed to H.R. 4737. We have had three bills submitted to us for welfare reform. I wonder how many Members of this body are aware of what is in the legislation that they are going to be asked to vote on tonight.

Let us vote against this rule so we have a chance to at least read this rule before Members vote on it. How many Members are even aware what was added to this bill, not by any of the committees, but by the Committee on Rules, a provision that will take Medicaid administrative funding away from our States. Each one of our States are going to lose some revenue. Do Members know how much their State is going to lose? Give the Members a chance to know what is in the bill. That is the reason we have a one day layover on rules, and that is why this martial law should not be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, how many Members know what has been done to the super waiver. I ask Members to read the language that the Committee on Rules added to the super waiver. We do not have a super waiver the way Members think it is. It has been changed dramatically. I have heard the President say we are giving additional flexibility to the States. We are not in the Republican bill. We are taking it away, less flexibility on how to get the workforce to work, less flexibility on education.

The President brags about the super waiver. Do Members know what is in the bill? That is changed now. If we approve this rule, we are going to be taking up another rule that is a closed rule in that it does not allow us to offer amendments to the Republican bill. There are issues that deserve the debate of this Chamber, whether we should make it easier for the States to provide education and job training to people on welfare. That deserves the right to be heard as a separate amendment.

I asked the Committee on Rules as the ranking Democratic member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources that it be made in order. It is not made in order. Child care is an unfunded mandate on the States. We should have an opportunity to debate that issue, but the underlying rule does not give that to us. Legal immigrants, whether they should be continued to be discriminated against; that should have a separate vote on this floor.

What is wrong with the democratic process so the will of this body can be had, so the majority can rule? No, the Republicans are afraid to let the majority rule. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to remind the gentleman that his motion and amendment in the nature of a substitute was made in order. That is the Democratic substitute. I do not know what is wrong with that. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has been made in order by the Committee on Rules, as is proper. He will have an up or down vote on that. We were very pleased to do that.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for doing what is normal policy, to let the Democrats offer a substitute; but I asked for an amendment, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) asked for an amendment concerning a credit to the work requirements. The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) asked for an amendment dealing with legal immigrants. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) asked for an amendment dealing with child care.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, many Republicans asked for an amendment, too. This is a process that is fair to both sides.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule because it does not provide opportunity for the kind of discussion, the kind of debate, or even for the kind of amendments that are necessary to deal with something as serious as providing temporary assistance to the needy families of this country.

When we think of those who are needy, who could be more needy than individuals who have been arrested, the hundreds, the thousands who have been arrested for drug offenses, and yet this legislation gives States the option to deny them benefits under TANF. Individuals who may have had some difficulty when they were 17, 18, 19 years old, and now cannot find a job, cannot get into school, cannot get decent housing, and yet they are denied benefits under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation goes backwards from the original legislation rather than moving us forward. I

hope that we vote to reject the rule and reject the legislation that will not provide assistance to some of America's most needy families.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the issue that we are debating is whether to give the majority martial law authority. I think my colleagues and the public should know what martial law authority is. It is absolute authority to control when to bring something to the floor without even allowing the Members of Congress to read what is being brought to the floor.

I was thinking about it, I really could not think of anybody I would less like to give martial law authority to than the majority in this House, particularly after we have been here all day. We came into session at 10 a.m. this morning, stayed in for 45 minutes, and then recessed subject to the call of the Chair, and we have been sitting around in our offices all day until 7:15 tonight. This group now comes and says give us martial law authority, complete authority, to bring a bill and control the House.

Well, if they cannot get a bill together all day and they go through three different iterations of the bill they are bringing to the floor, why would I want to give them martial law authority to control the whole process? It is undemocratic, and I cannot think of anybody I would less like to give martial law authority to.

Second, the whole concept of martial law authority implies some kind of emergency. What is the emergency to pass a welfare reform bill? What is the emergency that we are dealing with that would bring us into session at 7:15 at night and keep us here until 2 in the morning under martial law. What is the emergency? I do not see any emergency about passing a welfare reform bill. We have a welfare reform bill that is the law in this country right now that will continue to be the law until we pass another one.

There is no reason for us to be here at midnight, 1, 2 in the morning, debating an important piece of legislation that none of us has had an opportunity to even look at and review. And I should give the majority martial law authority? Give me a break.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, there is an old story, and a lot of Members have heard this before.

A farmer wanted to borrow an ax from his neighbor one night. He went and knocked on the door and said, I need to borrow your ax. The neighbor said that he could not lend the farmer his ax tonight. The farmer said, Why not? The neighbor said because I am making soup.

Making soup, what does that have to do with me borrowing your ax or not? The neighbor said not a thing, but when you do not want to do something, any excuse works.

□ 1915

That is what we are hearing tonight from my good friends on the other side of the aisle. They do not like the bill. They do not like welfare reform. They did not like welfare reform in 1996. I did not know this was the Bill Clinton welfare bill until a few minutes ago, for example. I remember him vetoing it twice. In fact, I only remember him signing it when his campaign consultant, Dick Morris, told him he needed to do it in order to get reelected. And, as I recall, he did it in the middle of the night. Does anybody here remember going to the bill signing ceremony?

I am proud of the gentleman. Next time see if you can get me one of those invitations. I did not get one.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me yield to my friend from Massachusetts. Maybe he can help me.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, are we going to pass this bill in the middle of the night to commemorate him signing it in the middle of the night?

Mr. KINGSTON. That might be good. The gentleman has a good point. We are just going to continue that great Democratic tradition.

Here is the situation with welfare reform. I do want to say, some Member has suggested we have sat around here all day long and done nothing. We actually as a Capitol, as Democrats and Republicans, as Representatives, commemorated police officers from all over America. As Members know, there was a huge demonstration of sorts on the Mall today in support of our police officers like my friend, Kevin Jones, from Brunswick, Georgia, who came up here today because a while back there was a car rolling down a hill, he jumped into it, the driver had had a medical seizure, and he stopped the car and saved the driver's life. He was one of hundreds and thousands of police officers here today. So to me it has been a worthwhile day. I know some people probably have been sitting around, though.

I want to talk to you about some of my friends, also, since we have gone down the history trail on what was said in 1996. I will not repeat the names of some of the Congressmen, but they are on here and these are documented statements going back in time, pushing your remote.

''I am saddened that today it seems clear that this House will abdicate its moral duty and knowingly vote to allow children to go hungry in America.'' 1996, a Member of the U.S. Congress.

Another Member, 1996: ''The only losers we have now are the kids.''

Here is Patricia Ireland, not exactly known in Republican precinct circles as friendly. NOW President Patricia Ireland predicted that the 1996 law would put ''12.8 million people on welfare at the risk of sinking further into poverty and homelessness.''

And then a former Clinton administration official resigned over welfare reform, probably not one of those who was invited to the midnight signing ceremony, either. He said, ''More malnutrition and more crime, increased infant mortality and increased drug and alcohol abuse.''

And then there is the good old conservative Urban Institute that predicted the 1996 law would push 2.6 million people, including 1.1 million children, into poverty.

The Children's Defense Fund predicted in 1996 the law would bring a 12 percent increase in child poverty.

I only remind people of this not to bring up partisan bitterness from the past but to say, when we passed this historic piece of legislation in 1996 there were naysayers. I do believe there were a lot of Democrats who did come on board finally. But initially it was an uphill battle.

Here is what has actually happened. Since 1996, work among welfare recipients has tripled. Employment of single mothers is now more than 70 percent, an all-time high. Since 1994, welfare caseloads have fallen by 60 percent, leaving less than 2 percent of the U.S. population on welfare.

Here is another result: the wage gains for single moms. Again I will not go into the chart, but it shows an increase of 73.5 percent. This is one on child care funds. Remember, welfare reform was supposed to hurt children in particular; but in fact, it increased child care funds from $3 billion to $9.4 billion. That is comparing the 1995 to the 2000 level.

What are the principles of this bill? Promoting work, improving child well-being, promoting healthy marriages and strengthening families, fostering hope and opportunity.

This bill requires welfare recipients to put in a full workweek. There is nothing harsh about that. It requires the States to have 70 percent of welfare families working, again, leaving it up to States to have flexibility. All of this stuff sounds very legalistic, but the real proof is to people like Bruce Mullins who lost his home and entered the welfare-to-work program in September 1998, and now he has built a life of joy and promise for himself and his two kids because of these training programs. He has had a chance to live with great dignity and not be dependent but be independent. And then there is Tonya, a single mother. She went on public assistance when her twin girls were 1 year old, but since completing her program with Cal Work last year, Tonya has been able to earn enough money to purchase her own home. These are real people with real accomplishments. And then there is Judith Brown. She is working her way off welfare reform and is moving into a new home in Cincinnati.

Mr. Speaker, this is what welfare reform is all about, real people.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the good gentleman from Georgia, I had the opportunity to commemorate and celebrate our very fine law enforcement officers today and felt the great emotion of this day of tribute. I also spent a lot of time working. We were working. But that is not the issue, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, let me also say to the distinguished gentleman, I noted that he emphasized what the welfare reform bill was in his mind, promoting work. That is the issue here. I oppose the martial law rule because we have no emergency. This bill does not expire until September. In fact, his point of promoting work is a very key element to the difference, if you will, between those of us who understand that there is no shame in being a parent.

Just a few days ago I represented the United States at the U.N. special session on children, the first time this world discussed children in 12 years. We come to the floor of the House now and all the Republicans want to do is brag about how the welfare reform is about promoting work. None of us are afraid of work and those on welfare are not afraid of work. But this bill is an unfunded mandate. It is in the midnight hour; we do not know what is in it. In addition, let me tell you that it is three different bills. I wonder if my good friends on the other side of the aisle would allow a waiver for those of us who flew in here, got in late and wanted to put in amendments, good amendments that would help the young teenagers that are on welfare to get parenting skills or financial skills, but those amendments were denied. Yet in the dark of night we want to debate something that is absolutely not an emergency because we want to go home and brag that we are about promoting work.

What about promoting caring for your children? What about promoting child care? We always think that the poor people are deadbeats and do not want to work, but we allow those that have good money in the bank to stay home and mother their children. This is an outrage. This is a bill we do not need to hear about.

Let me tell them if they do not know, we have a bad economy, we have unemployment, there are no jobs and those women who got that work, those were entry-level jobs, those jobs do not exist; and my constituents are telling me not only are they losing their jobs but they are losing health care and child care benefits. If we care about Americans who are trying to transition from poverty into work, we would not put this bill on the floor tonight. This is an outrage of a bill, this is being don in the midnight hour; and it is for people who do not care about the poor people in America who every day all they want is an opportunity. It is a disgrace. Vote against this martial law rule. Let us finally work for the good of all the people of the United States of America. I want to let Members know this as I go to my seat, people are unemployed.

This bill will create more unemployment, because it focuses on work over valuable job training for welfare recipients so they can qualify for jobs they can grow in and keep rather than low-wage temporary jobs.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 4737. It is good work that this Congress is reauthorizing this program. America needs it.

Today's vote comes at a critical moment in our country. At this time 6 years ago, interest groups were pouring into Washington saying that Congress would impoverish millions of children, that we would cause women and children to starve, that millions of families with children would lose income and be pushed into poverty, that the streets would be filled with the homeless, and that passing welfare reform would lead to increased infant mortality, increased drug and alcohol abuse, increased family violence and increased child and spousal abuse.

Today, those claims are somehow forgotten. They are an embarrassment to the makers of those claims, knowing that welfare reform has led to fewer individuals and families dependent on the government, fewer teen pregnancies and a smaller caseload for State welfare workers. This is great news for America. H.R. 4737 builds on the success of the past and maintains full funding for TANF and investing in new programs that show promise for families and children.

Congress maintains TANF funding, although the need for that funding has decreased. Every State has reported fewer cases of individuals and families needing assistance. But this should not be viewed as an opportunity to cut funds. Instead, Congress is prepared to provide more assistance to those who need it the most. Let me make it clear: the same level of TANF funding plus fewer caseloads means more resources available to those who need it.

Because we know the job is not finished, H.R. 4737 provides additional authority, particularly with respect to promoting stable marriages and promoting and strengthening the role of fathers in the lives of their children. These programs directly speak to the well-being of children because of the toll that broken marriages, father absence, and out-of-wedlock births has on our culture and society. The reason that this vote today is so important is because it confirms that the reforms put in place in 1996 were the right thing and they continue to be the right thing today.

After the last few years of implementation, each of us has heard from our States and talked to our constituents. We have been able to look at the data ourselves. The evidence is in, and welfare reform is a tremendous success.

Here are the facts: 2.3 million fewer children living in poverty; 4.2 million fewer adults living in poverty; the lowest rate of poverty among single mothers in United States history; twice the rate of employment for single young mothers; a 60 percent increase in employment of mothers who lack a high school diploma; fewer children living in single-mother families; more children living in married-couple families; no increase in out-of-wedlock births. I could go on and on and on.

In my State of Florida, an 84 percent reduction in the welfare caseload, the total number of individuals receiving cash assistance, has declined by 76 percent, and the total number of cash assistance cases has dropped from nearly 220,000 Floridians to less than 70,000 needing government assistance. Need I say more?

What is exciting about all these statistics is that they represent people who have transitioned from dependence to independence. They represent children whose lives have been destined in the past to repeat the cycle of poverty but who are now watching their mothers, their fathers work and receive a paycheck. They represent young people who are changing their behavior, avoiding sexual activity and embracing their futures by refusing to be another teenage mother or father. These changes are positive, they breed hope, and they must be continued.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this is an amazingly unfair process we are dealing with tonight. It is a continuation of the shameful conduct of the majority in this House last week when we were doing the defense bill. Last week at an unprecedented time in our Nation's history when we are fighting terrorism and we were doing the defense bill, senior members of the Committee on Armed Services were denied the opportunity to offer amendments merely because they were Democrats. Why? To avoid difficult votes in an election year for certain Members. But debate and arguing and voting are democracy. It is the essence of our democracy. If you do not want to be a part of this great debate here, find another job, but do not deny Americans the right to hear their Representative offer amendments to bills, even if they are Members of the minority. Tonight it is a continuation of the same process. No amendments are to be allowed in the consideration of this very important welfare reform bill. This is a corruption of our democracy occurring in this great House tonight, Mr. Speaker. There is a rot

going on in the decision-making process of the Republican leaders who make these decisions to deny debate.

□ 1930

The American people will tire of this tyranny, Mr. Speaker, and hold the majority accountable for this corruption of our sacred democracy.

I have many friends on the Republican side of the aisle, and I care about them deeply, but tonight I am embarrassed for them that their leadership forces them to vote for this shameful, shameful process. Vote ''no'' on this rule.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I 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, the Republican leadership is turning what should be a people's House into a one-party House, into a one-party House. I am afraid they do not want a bipartisan bill, they want a partisan issue.

In 1995, there were 13 hours and 20 minutes of debate on welfare reform, but here we have just a pittance. My Republican colleagues dwell on their version of the past instead of building for the future. They speak from a program. They malign President Clinton's efforts. There were two vetoes. Why? Over day care and health care. He had promised in 1992 to reform welfare. The bills that came out of here did not have adequate day care or health care, so he vetoed them. There was adequate day care and health care at that time put into the bills, and then it passed on a bipartisan basis.

Look, my colleagues say their bill just fine-tunes, but of the survey answers, 41 of 47 States said the Republican bill would require ''fundamental change.''

This is about where welfare goes from here. The Republican bill wants people to work while they are on welfare; our bill says what the States want. We want people off of welfare into long-term, productive work and true independence.

This is a sad day. Debating a major issue in the wee hours, in the wee hours. Why do it? I repeat: my Republican colleagues want a partisan issue instead of a bipartisan product. My Republican colleagues are turning this proud people's House into a one-party institution. In the end, they will fail.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the majority. Their degradation of democracy has been so consistent and so thorough and so successful that they have anesthetized the media.

We are in the midst of a disgrace. We are debating very important public policy. Yes, the welfare reform bill was a significant change and it has had some good points. There ought to be a chance to debate it fully and to offer amendments.

I must say I was disappointed to hear the gentlewoman from Ohio say dismissively to the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee well, why are you complaining? We gave you one substitute. And then when he pointed out that there were individual issues of great importance that ought to be debated and that the Members ought to take a public position on, she said to him, well, this is a fair process; we turn down amendments from the Democrats and the Republicans. This is an odd definition of fairness in a democracy. We have shut off the debate on both sides. That is an odd thing about which to be proud, that you have equally suppressed Democrats and Republicans.

I would also congratulate the majority on the submissiveness they have managed to instill in their own Members. In fact, I would like to propose that next year we change the Rules of the House. We call being in recess ''being in recess subject to the call of the Chair.'' It ought to be, obviously, ''being in recess subject to the beck and call of the Chair,'' because that is where the majority Members have placed themselves.

We come in ready to debate a very important issue. There is some dissension over jurisdiction and turf lines. What happens? This majority, which professes to believes in democracy, shuts the doors. They take the only important and relevant debate about this and have it in closed session for many hours. There will have been more hours of private, secret Republican deliberations about this than we will have a public debate. And then, hours later, late in the evening, they come in and rush it through and we cannot have any amendments. Why? People ask what the emergency is. I will tell my colleagues what the emergency is. Tomorrow afternoon. We are due to be out by 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

We are being denied the chance to debate what level of day care we should have. There is a super waiver in there that will change very important public housing policies. There is no chance to debate a vote on those. We are talking about whether the work requirement ought to go up and what education ought to be. We cannot debate those because we have to make planes tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible derogation of the democratic process. For the gentlewoman to say, well, we are fair, we would not let anybody offer an amendment, this turns the world upside down.

We are here as an elected body of the people to debate and to take votes, and my Republican colleagues revel in the success and the ease with which you extinguish the democratic impulse.

I wish the Republican Members were not quite so submissive. I used to be in the majority. I voted against the rules. Do my colleagues know what? When you vote against the rule because you think it is too unfair, you still get to go to sleep at night and you still have breakfast in the morning. This is the most shameful refusal to allow the democratic process to work that I have encountered and it is, unfortunately, becoming a pattern.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the underlying democratic substitute.

Assuring the availability of quality, affordable child care is an essential component of any welfare reform proposal. The current child care system is already severely underfunded. While Los Angeles County spends over 27 percent of its budget on child care, 280,000 children remain on the wait list for child care services.

The $1 billion the Republicans have added in the child care funding only covers inflation for a program that is currently failing to meet the needs of 6 in 7 eligible families. Without restructuring and funding child care, the costs for California are projected to increase an average of $130 million a year for the next 4 years. Simply put, more children will be without proper care while their parents work minimum wage jobs. These children's lives are at risk.

Physical abuse is one of the leading causes of death among small children.

Mr. Speaker, children's lives are valuable. They are our future. We must care for our children. Let us defeat the rule, and let us vote for a bill that is comprehensive and sincerely helps our families and their children.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), who had a most important amendment that was not allowed.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I hope everyone votes against the rule, votes against the previous question and, certainly, we should oppose martial law, because it is not deserved.

We are being asked to vote in the blind because we never had a chance to read this bill. We are having our voices silenced because we have not been offered an opportunity to present amendments in the people's House to debate what is very important to the American people, and we are being told that we should cast a vote in the dark of night when most Americans will be asleep because we have something to hide in this Chamber.

What is it that this majority has to hide with regard to this so-called welfare reform bill that is before us? Well, first of all, we have a bill before us that provides inflexible and unfunded mandates: Inflexible because the States

will not have much choice on how to manage their welfare rolls and to use what they have learned through best practices to try to decrease their rolls; and unfunded because those requirements do not give the States the flexibility to use the monies where they believe best.

Two quick examples. This welfare reform bill does child care on the cheap. We should understand that one out of every seven American children who qualifies for day care gets it, the other six do not. It tells American children that you must do with what you have, because the States will be provided a pittance over the next 5 years to try to accommodate that growing number of kids that we know is out there that needs child care, especially for welfare mothers who are being told that they will have a full workweek of 40 hours. How do we do that? Well, in California, with close to 300,000 kids right now not in day care but on waiting lists, we would need over $1 billion to implement this Republican welfare bill, just on child care.

Do we know how much money this welfare bill gives to child care over the next 5 years? One billion dollars. So every single dime that is provided in this bill for child care could be used by one State, the State of California. Mr. Speaker, we need a lot more. We cannot do child care on the cheap the way this bill does.

Inflexible and unfunded mandates. Right now we are trying to undo an injustice that was done 6 years ago in 1996 to legal immigrants; lawful, permanent residents who reside in this country by law, pay taxes, do everything they are supposed to do under the law, some 20,000 to 40,000 right now serving in the Armed Forces as legal immigrants, and we are in this bill not going to do a thing to correct an injustice done in 1996. At least give the States the flexibility to do what 23 of them already do, and that is to provide services under TANF to legal immigrants. But the States will not be allowed to do this under the majority's bill, because it is inflexible and does not permit that to happen. Twenty-three States on their own have already said, let us do this.

Mr. Speaker, in 1996, we told many people in this country who are trying to fight for the American dream, who are fighting for this country, many of whom have gone to Afghanistan; we are talking about people who have won the Medal of Honor in our Armed Services, today who are fighting in our uniform, American uniform, that they do not count. Secretary Thompson of the Health and Human Services Department under the Bush administration has said, we should give States the flexibility to offer legal immigrants that support. The Governors of the States are saying, we should give that flexibility because 23 of our States already do this, and yet this bill does not even give the States that flexibility.

I should say one final thing on that point. This flexibility to allow States to provide legal immigrants with services would cost not a single cent, not a single cent, yet we cannot get that in.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should not go through this House. This rule should not pass, because it is done in the way that we would not be proud as American people.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the rule and in support of H.R. 4737, the Personal Responsibility, Work, and Family Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, society benefits from helping the unfortunate lift themselves out of poverty and despair, and society benefits most if we put those people in a position to stay gainfully employed so that they become self-sufficient in as short an amount of time as possible, off the welfare rolls, onto payrolls.

In 1996, this Congress reestablished the notion that welfare was a temporary system to help those who had fallen on hard times, not a way of life. The warnings of what would happen, and we heard them then from the other side, predicted 2.6 million people would be pushed into poverty, 12.8 million people falling further into poverty and homelessness, that welfare reform represented the most brutal act of social policies since Reconstruction, stand in stark contrast to what has happened.

Child poverty has fallen by nearly 3 million people. More parents are working, and dependence has dramatically fallen with caseloads decreasing by 9 million, from 14 million in 1994 to just 5 million today.

□ 1945

These results are encouraging, but there is still much to be done.

Today, 58 percent of recipients are neither working nor training, and 2 million families remain dependent on welfare.

With H.R. 4735, we reinforce the belief that those receiving benefits are expected to work for them. The number of hours one must work or be engaged in job-preparation activities rises to 40 hours from 30. However, we also recognize the challenges that exist for a person to obtain quality work. We give States great flexibility in allowing beneficiaries the opportunity to obtain training or education to increase their marketability. Sixteen of the required 40 hours per week can be used for any purpose that the State deems appropriate, be it vocational training, post-secondary education, or caring for a disabled child. Furthermore, we stipulate that States have total flexibility in designing activities that can be considered work for 3 out of every 24 months, plus an additional month if the individual is pursuing education or training linked to an available job in the local area. I believe these are very generous terms and maintain the kind of State flexibility that has been the key to success for welfare reform so far.

In addition, we recognize that increased work requirements will require increased child care resources. To that end we authorize an additional $2 billion for the Child Care Development block grant.

Since its enactment in 1996, welfare reform has been a success. We have given a boost to many, many families that ultimately want the same things we all want: the dignity of a job that allows them to be self-sufficient, a home of their own, the means to improve the lives of their children. The vast majority of those on welfare want to work, and any system that creates disincentive to do so is not serving anybody.

I am grateful to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) for their hard work, and I urge adoption of this bill and rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce that has partial jurisdiction over the legislation, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the martial law rule, in opposition to the general rule to the base bill, and opposition to the Republican bill, and in strong support of the Democratic substitute.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious piece of legislation before our body this year. This affects many, many of our constituents in each of our congressional districts. Many of our Members on this side feel very strongly about the substance of this legislation, the impact it is going to have on individuals and families and young children throughout the country. But since the very beginning of the process of this legislation in the House, the minority party has effectively been shut out and excluded. And this is true at the subcommittee level, at the full committee level, and now at a time when this legislation is brought before the American people for debate and consideration on the House floor.

We were not allowed one amendment to be considered tonight for discussion and for a vote on the minority side. I guess the way the process works we should feel very fortunate and lucky that we are even offered a substitute, based on the way things have worked out. But this is an important piece of legislation. People do feel strongly about it because this is not about the old law now where we are going to hear a lot of speeches about the success of moving people off of welfare and due to the strong economy and due to the innovation in various States, including my own State of Wisconsin, there has been success in the last 5 years moving people off of welfare reform.

This is about the next generation of welfare reform. Dealing with the toughest recipients right now who are still on welfare due to some very good reasons, whether it has been domestic abuse or sexual assaults against them or cognitive disabilities or physical disabilities, these are the tough cases; and we need to think creatively in how we are dealing with that if we are truly interested in talking about individual empowerment and self-sufficiency and lifting people out of poverty. But, unfortunately, we will not have that debate today. We will not be offered the chance to offer constructive amendments to move the process forward on a bipartisan basis. And because of that, I encourage my colleagues to support the substitute and vote ''no'' on final passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 30 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that on behalf of the Democrat members of the Committee on Rules, we would be most grateful when bills of any magnitude come before the Committee on Rules and are given a hearing, that that bill be ready to go to the floor and that we will not see any more of this sitting around all night and waiting all the next day.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time, and I congratulate her for being the author of this extraordinarily important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by yielding to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader, for the purpose of making an announcement.

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say on this evening when the Colorado Avalanche is going to win the second round of the hockey play-offs, we are all very anxious about the night's events. I should like to announce the schedule for the rest of the evening and the rest of the week.

In just a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, we will be voting on this expedited rule. After that vote we will take up consideration of the welfare reform rule; and when we cast that last vote, it will be the last vote of this evening. We will come back in tomorrow morning and convene at our regular time, at 10 o'clock; and after our regular 1-minutes, we will move on to consideration of the welfare reform bill. We should complete that bill tomorrow with some recess time out of respect for the ceremonies that will be held in the rotunda in which we award the Congressional Gold Medal to Former President and Mrs. Ronald Reagan. Again, let me say we will have this vote, debate the welfare rule, vote the welfare rule, complete our work for the night, commence again at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, continue with the welfare bill, and the only possibility being a recess out of consideration for those ceremonies in the rotunda, we should complete our work sometime in the neighborhood of 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his announcement. I would like to close this debate, Mr. Speaker, by just making a few points.

For starters, if you look at the Great Society welfare program that was put into place, we have seen $5.2 trillion expended from the early 1960s up until the implementation of the 1996 welfare reform bill; $5.2 trillion. And we saw the poverty rate go from 14.7 percent to 15.2 percent during that period of time. So we saw those huge expenditures, obviously, do nothing but increase the poverty level in this country.

Now, I have been listening to rhetoric from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claiming that we do not care. Well, we care enough that we want to do the single most important thing for the American people who are struggling. We want to give them an opportunity to have a job. The 1996 Welfare Reform Bill is responsible for 7 million new jobs created for people who otherwise would have been relegated to poverty.

One of the most important parts of that bill has been the Child Development and Child Care Act, the provisions that have provided $4.8 billion. If you look at the $4.8 billion that is being provided for child development and child care, this President and this bill calls for an additional $2 billion in expenditures in the area of child care. And so I believe that this is a measure which does show compassion; and it does that most important thing, it is encouraging people to get on to the productive side of our economy. They want to be there. They want that kind of opportunity, and that is exactly what we are doing. We are building on the great success that we saw in the 1996 bill.

Let me make a couple of comments about this rule and the procedure through which we have gone. It is true that we have struggled to ensure that we maintain the opportunity for our Governors across the country for States to have flexibility when we look at the programs that have emerged from five authorizing committees that have worked on this. And I believe that it is the right thing for us to do, to provide flexibility for the States. But, Mr. Speaker, it is also very important for us to maintain our article 1, section 7 prerogative of our control of spending; and we, over the last day or so, have been working on that. That one provision which consists of 26 lines of a 140-page bill has been modified, and that led us to pass a rule calling for same-day consideration of the measure.

Well, based on the announcement that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) has just given, we will not be considering this bill tonight. We will be considering it during the day tomorrow. And so we are going to have a full opportunity for debate.

Now, someone said, why are we not making in order a wide range of amendments? One of the five authorizing committees involved in this process, Mr. Speaker, happens to be the Committee on Ways and Means. When a measure emerges from the Committee on Ways and Means, what is the procedure that both Democrats and Republicans alike have put in place for management of that measure on the House floor? It is a modified closed rule. We allow a Democrat substitute, which happens to be authored by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. And so this is a very fair and standard rule in that way.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are doing one of the most important things that we will address in this Congress: taking the American people who are struggling and we are going to enhance the opportunity for them to get on to the productive side of our economy, and we are going to be considering it in a very fair and balanced way, with 2 hours of debate tomorrow, another hour of debate that we will have on the rule itself; so there will be ample opportunity for Members to raise their concerns and talk about this.

But I have one message: we care, Mr. Speaker. We care because we want people to have the dignity of a job, and that is one of the most wonderful things that we as a body will be able to do. I urge support of this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 219, nays 200, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

YEAS—219

Abercrombie	Akin	Bachus
Aderholt	Armey	Baker

Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—200

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—15

Boucher
Burton
Gibbons
Hall (OH)
Kolbe
Mascara
Miller, George
Murtha
Napolitano
Peterson (PA)
Reyes
Stark
Stupak
Thornberry
Traficant

□ 2020

Mr. SKELTON changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. SMITH of Michigan and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4737, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY, WORK, AND FAMILY PROMOTION ACT OF 2002

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 422 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 422

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4737) to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate on the bill, with 50 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Cardin of Maryland or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 422 is an appropriate, but fair, rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4737, the Personal Responsibility, Work and Family Promotion Act of 2002.

This rule provides for a total of 2 hours of general debate in the House, with 50 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and, finally, 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

After general debate, it will be in order to consider the substitute amendment, if offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) or his designee, printed in the Committee on Rules report, which is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill as well as against the amendment printed in the report.

Finally, the rule permits the minority to offer a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to clarify for my colleagues that H.R. 4737 represents a new version of our welfare reform legislation and incorporates one new change. That first bill was filed on Thursday. The new legislation contains two new provisions. It continues to provide broad authority to the executive branch to waive provisions of law in an effort to streamline certain administrative and programmatic requirements of several programs related to welfare assistance. However, this bill now contains a new provision, G, on page 118, and H, on page 119, which basically maintains the congressional responsibility for this country's pursestrings, those set forth

in article 1, section 7 of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago many of us stood in this very Chamber surrounded by skeptical eyes and wary glares. The debate before us then was welfare reform. The day we voted on the final conference report, August 1, 1996, was also payday for many Americans. But unlike many Americans, and contrary to the central tenet of the American Dream, 14 million people who cashed their check that day did not work for that money. Such was the nature of our welfare state 6 years ago.

On that day, back in 1996, Congress passed one of the most historic reform bills of all time, one that truly changed the culture of the system from one of cynical dependence across generations to one of personal responsibility. Since 1996, we have witnessed welfare rolls drop from 14 million persons to 5 million nationwide.

In my own home State of Ohio, we were passing out welfare checks to the tune of $82 million per month. Post the reforms, the price tag has been reduced to less than $27 million a month, and it is going to those who really need the help. In one State alone that is a savings of $50 million a month of hard-working taxpayer money.

And while I speak with great enthusiasm about the extraordinary achievements of our friends and neighbors, those who have moved onward to the path of independence, I speak with equal pride of the compassionate Nation that we call home. We live in a country that is built on the rewards of hard work and the generosity of a society that offers assistance to those in need of a helping hand. The underpinnings of our democracy give us reason and incentive to take responsibility for our lives, but to ask for assistance if we really need it, and then be ready to get back on our feet, when we can, with the help of our neighbors and our community.

We will not turn our backs on those who need help. Instead, we will provide them with the tools and the resources they need to overcome adversity, to reverse course, and to rebuild their lives. We have before us today a tremendous opportunity to build on the success of welfare reform. H.R. 4737 is a product of strong reflection and cooperation between the House leadership and the committees of jurisdiction.

While I have the honor and distinction of introducing this legislation on behalf of the House, it is the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), chairmen of the committees and subcommittees of jurisdiction, and many others who have worked the long hours together to craft a bill that truly will protect children, strengthen families, and increase State flexibility. At the same time, it will support further declines in poverty through job preparation, stronger work requirements, and healthy marriages.

First, H.R. 4737 provides $16.6 billion for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, block grant, which is the program we created in 1996. Funding for this block grant goes directly to state-designated programs to help move more welfare recipients into productive jobs.

H.R. 4737 will require more welfare families to be engaged in work-related activities from the current 50 percent to 70 percent by fiscal year 2007. Increased work requirements are a critical aspect of welfare reform, because according to the Health and Human Services' ''Third Annual Report to Congress,'' 58 percent of welfare recipients are not participating in work activities as designated by Federal law.

Not only will this save money, it will help recipients achieve self-sufficiency, give them that pride that goes with responsibility, and then they can pass it on to their children and their grandchildren.

This bill also offers parents the tools and resources they need to secure a job and provide for their independence. In addition to the $4.8 billion support for child care through the Child Care and Development block grant, we have provided an extra $2 billion in child care money as well as an increase in the amount of money States can transfer to the block grant from 30 percent to 50 percent.

By providing access to reliable child care, recipients will have peace of mind knowing their child is safely cared for as they train for, find, and keep a job.

We all know that training and education are the backbone of advancing one's professional opportunities. Since the average workweek for most Americans is 40 hours, H.R. 4737 brings welfare reform up to par by requiring recipients to be engaged in work activities for 40 hours per week, up from the current 30. While 24 of the 40 hours must be spent in actual work, the remaining 16 hours may be defined by States and can include education and training.

□ 2030

This bill will also allow for up to 4 months during a 24-month period to be counted toward State work rate requirements if the individual engages in education or training programs leading to work.

Additionally, H.R. 4737 directs up to $300 million annually for programs that encourage healthy, stable marriages, and authorizes $20 million grant funds to support community efforts to promote responsible fatherhood.

Finally, H.R. 4737 gives unprecedented flexibility to States by establishing broad new State flex authority which has the support of the Nation's governors because it will provide the States and their governors with new and creative tools to meet their own State's needs. In an attempt to cut down on the arduous, costly and burdensome waiver application process, States will be able to improve program effectiveness by submitting a single application to tailor Federal education, child care, nutrition, labor and housing programs to fit their State's welfare needs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the reality of welfare reform success will silence the grumbles that echoed throughout this Chamber back in 1996. I wish to extend an invitation to my colleagues who may be hesitant to support this rule for partisan reasons to take a good look at where we were 6 years ago and where we have come today. Members will find hundreds of children and families in their districts that are better off now than they were 6 years ago. They are working, they are proud, they are teaching their children about the dignity of having a job and providing for their families. They see a better future for themselves and their loved ones, and they are encouraged to tell their stories.

A check in the mail every month will not teach responsibility, will not build confidence, and will not break the cycle of intergenerational dependence we witnessed for decades. A check in the mail for a job well done will open up the doors of opportunity and offer all Americans an endless supply of pride and self-worth for generations to come.

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

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

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill is one that impacts millions of Americans. Many of them are our most vulnerable constituents, but the process before us today shuts out any meaningful debate, and blocks consideration of important amendments affecting the elderly, mothers and children. This is not a welfare reform bill; this is spite.

Moreover, the entire legislative body is put on hold. The Committee on Rules, as I said earlier, was shut down at midnight and forced to postpone our vote on the rule until 8 this morning, but then we repeated the process a little while ago with yet another version of the bill. As has been pointed out, in 24 hours this bill has become three. Today's drafting and redrafting makes a mockery of regular order, and Mr. Speaker, this has got to stop.

It is duplicitous for the Committee on Rules to take testimony from our colleagues while they know full well that the bill before us will not be considered in its final form. I oppose this heavy-handed process and the cynicism it embraces, and urge my colleagues to defeat this ill-conceived rule.

In the light of day, we can see that the underlying bill is one that can desperately use some improvement, and is clearly not ready for prime time. In fact, the Committee on Rules went out of its way to ensure that these much-needed changes will not be considered.

Several critical amendments were struck down repeatedly on a party line vote in the Committee on Rules. In a slap to legal immigrants, the committee voted down efforts by the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) to protect legal immigrants from being singled out in the measure.

My colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), attempted to provide adequate funding for child care; but he, too, was rebuffed. And the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) found her years of work on the farm bill to protect food stamp recipients under attack only days after significant improvements to the program were signed into law by President Bush. The Committee on Rules saw fit to shut her out as well. Most of my colleagues' efforts suffered a similar fate.

Moreover, it is becoming clear that the underlying bill fails to address the most fundamental goal of welfare reform, moving recipients into real jobs and out of poverty. While caseloads since 1996 have fallen over 50 percent nationally, the poverty rate has decreased only 13 percent over the same period. This means that even during a time of historical economic expansion, many who have left welfare remain dependent on food stamps, WIC and other public assistance. Recipients are raising children without the education, training or child care that is necessary to move to real independence.

We have heard from governors, mayors, State legislators, welfare directors and poverty experts who all say the same thing: The bill is a step in the wrong direction. We have heard from a bipartisan group of Senators, led by Senators BREAUX and HATCH, that we should expand access to vocational education, give States credit for placing people in real jobs, maintain State flexibility, increase child care funding, and remove restrictions on serving legal immigrants. But, unfortunately, none of these proposals are contained in this bill. In fact, the legislation eliminates vocational education from the list of activities that count as work-related activity.

The message is clear: Education is the key to every American's future except for poor single mothers with children.

Child care also takes a hit. The new legislation stiffens the work requirements, but fails to increase the child care money beyond the additional $400 million a year that the House majority proposes. Instead, parents get care vouchers, and it is up to them to find the care. And how many welfare parents have been able to find accessible, high-quality child care near their homes, or care available on nights and weekends? How many vulnerable kids in our communities are now in what is known in the welfare reform business as self-care, which is to say, they go home after school, lock the door and stay inside. No one has any idea.

The Congressional Budget Office has informed us that implementing the new work requirements in the bill would cost States between $8–11 billion over the next 5 years. In addition, the Congressional Budget Office has indicated that maintaining the current purchasing power of the child care block grants will cost States another $7 billion over 5 years. This unfunded mandate could force States to cut child care funding for the working poor in order to finance the additional day care costs in the workfare programs.

Moreover, new requirements in this bill will focus States on placing recipients in make-work activities, rather than in real jobs. In fact, 41 of the 47 States surveyed by the National Governors' Association indicated that the proposal would require them to make fundamental changes to their welfare programs.

A recent study by the University of Washington found that States' workfare program had much less impact on the wages of former welfare recipients than preemployment training did.

This research is one of the reasons that very few States have implemented large workfare programs over the last 6 years. Some jurisdictions that did create work experience programs are now beginning to scale them back. For example, New York City enrolled less than 10 percent of its adult caseload in work experience programs at the end of last year compared to 15 percent 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, there is a better way, one that maintains State flexibility, one that focuses on real work, and one that seeks to help families escape poverty. My colleagues and I support strong work requirements that seek to move people into real jobs. We believe States should have the flexibility to determine the best mix of services and activities to move welfare recipients towards self-sufficiency.

We want to end discrimination against legal immigrants and provide welfare recipients with access to vocational training so they can find good jobs. And we support providing the necessary resources, especially for quality child care, to help families leave welfare for work. I am afraid this measure fails to do just that.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, assistance to those in need is not only important, it is vital. However, that assistance must be enabling, not disabling. To me, welfare reform success must be measured by how many people no longer need temporary assistance, food stamps, or Medicaid, and how many are moved to a life of self-sufficiency, dignity, opportunity and hope.

Before moving forward, it is useful to review and look back on the welfare reform legislation from 1996. It had three goals. First, reducing welfare dependence and increasing employment. Today 4 million fewer people are living in poverty than when welfare reform was enacted.

Second, reducing child poverty. Since welfare reform, welfare dependence has been cut nearly in half.

Third, reducing illegitimacy and strengthening marriage. For nearly three decades, out-of-wedlock births as a share of all births rose steadily at a rate of almost 1 percentage point per year. Welfare reform has stopped this trend in its tracks.

H.R. 4737 is based on the principles of this past reform. It increases minimum work requirements, but it builds in cushions for sick days and holidays, simulating a typical American work schedule.

It makes special accommodation for parents with infants, and for individuals who need a substance abuse treatment, rehabilitation or special work-related training.

It provides financial incentives to the States to give as much money as possible to mothers and children, and it directs up to $300 million for programs that encourage healthy, stable marriages, including communications and conflict resolution training.

It provides grants to support community efforts to improve parenting skills and promote responsible fatherhood.

It encourages State innovation that will help States design revolutionary programs to help bring welfare reform to the next level.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this rule and to support H.R. 4737.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, this process of the rule shows contempt for poor people and poor children, just as legislation also shows contempt. Welfare legislation should not demonize poor children. Yes, first we must remember that the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Act is a safety net program for children, for poor children. Helping mothers to find jobs is only a means to accomplish the end of providing necessities for children.

These children are a vital part of the fabric of America. History clearly exposes the fact that poor children of America have grown up to supply the majority of the foot soldiers who have been maimed and killed by the wars of

this Nation. The overwhelming majority of the heroes whose names are engraved on the Vietnam War Wall Memorial are soldiers who came from families who would qualify for free school lunches, food stamps and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

If we are so unfortunate that we are entrapped into a prolonged war against terrorism and it becomes necessary to institute a draft again, the first and greatest number to be drafted will be the children from the poorest families in America.

Helping children out of poverty and not harassing the so-called welfare mothers should be the goal and mission of the reauthorization of TANF legislation. After 5 years of this program, which has been labeled a great success, why are there more children living in poverty than before? Have the infant mortality rates decreased? Are children who have been pushed off Medicaid receiving adequate health care? Are there more children in juvenile delinquent detention facilities? What proportion of the prison population were teenagers on welfare 5 years ago?

To bring legitimacy and humanity into this lawmaking process, these are a few of the questions that we should answer. We have rushed to declare a success without applying any basic scientific research principles. Instead, we are passing a rule tonight which facilitates a cold-blooded grab for another pound of flesh from the demonized welfare mothers.

Today it is approximately 2 weeks since we passed the largest safety net under congressional jurisdiction, the farm subsidy program. Although it has a few other features, it is primarily to convey $20 billion per year to so-called poor farmers who constitute less than 2 percent of the population.

This is not the only tax dollar give away orgy that we have seen recently. In the nearly $400 billion defense bill, we threw billions of dollars at several unnecessary weapon systems, such as the dangerous Osprey helicopter gadget, a missile defense system that will not protect us from terrorists, and other high-tech overweight gun monsters that the Secretary of Defense has declared obsolete.

□ 2045

There have been other tax giveaway orgies, but the farm bill is the most relevant comparison because the farm subsidy is a safety net program. Most people do not understand; it is a safety net program. The means test for the agriculture safety net benefit is $2.5 million. If you make more than this, you are not eligible for the safety net benefits of the farm program. In any one year, you can only receive $390,000. Do farmers have to work for these taxpayer dollars? Or are they paid not to work to grow food? Farmers are important, but no more important than the families that supply the majority of the foot soldiers who fight and die in the wars of America. Poor children in America are as important as anybody else. We should not continue to demonize them. We should understand what Osama bin Laden and a number of people in the Islamic world understand. They are precious, they take them and they train them to hate; and they have become a resource to be used against America. Our children deserve the same kind of attention, not to be demonized but to be nurtured.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and the underlying bill. It seems to me that we often devote most of our time in this body attempting to fix that which is broken and very little time preventing damage before it occurs. The greatest cause of poverty in this Nation is fatherlessness. Children without fathers are five times more likely to live in poverty. They are five times more likely to depend on welfare. The greatest cause of dysfunction among young people is fatherlessness. Fatherless children are three times more likely to have behavioral problems, two times more likely to commit a crime, and much more likely to be involved in teen pregnancy, drugs, suicide and dropout from school. We have 18 million fatherless children in our country today.

The President's welfare reform plan addresses these problems. It eliminates the higher work requirements for two-parent families. It removes a disincentive to marriage. It provides $300 million to allow States to provide marital preparation programs, to provide counseling to strengthen marriages, and to promote fatherhood programs which encourage fathers to take responsibility. This bill strengthens families and attempts to eliminate the root cause of poverty. It is proactive rather than reactive.

I urge support for this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask Members to vote against this rule. The American taxpayers who pay our salaries deserve a full and open debate on the most significant piece of legislation concerning the lives of families and children across this country. If this were an open rule, of course, I would try to offer an amendment that does in fact enhance the position of fatherhood and fatherhood programs in a State. But, Mr. Speaker, States around the country are financially strapped. Indiana alone would be affected $211 million with the passage of this incredible legislation. Because it is as significant as it is, it deserves full and open debate. We have pushed unfunded mandates for education of our children from the Federal Government to the States; and the last time I looked at this bill, by whichever number it may be at this particular point, it would even deny persons an opportunity to get vocational education which would push them into the economic mainstream, into the job opportunities that would be afforded them from vocational education.

I think that it is grossly unfair to punish American families and to punish children by this bill. That will be why, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the Members to vote against the rule and recall the words of Abraham Lincoln, I believe, that a House divided cannot stand. Certainly this particular legislation is very divisive, and we should not support the rule.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to express my great dismay, consternation and disillusionment with the decision of the Committee on Rules to deny every single amendment that had been proffered for debate in this House on this very, very important bill. I cannot fathom the reason why there would be a total rejection of all of these important measures. They could select out some. The four that I proposed could easily have been eliminated. I would have been angry, but at least the process would have been preserved. This House has a world reputation to maintain as a great deliberative body. What are we afraid of in terms of a full debate? There is no way in which you can take a general debate and a debate on a substitute, to have that constitute an amendment on specific provisions of the bill.

An amendment would allow us to single out an issue, to target it, to talk specifically about one particular provision, such as education, why that is so important. It seems to me that the leadership of this House, the Committee on Rules, has completely abdicated its responsibility to preserve the very heart of this Chamber and, that is, to allow the diverse opinions, the discussion and debate to formulate the final outcome of this bill. As it turns out, none of the amendments are going to be considered. We will have just the debate on the main bill and a debate on the substitute. All the other things of importance will be relegated to the trash heap. I think that that is really a disgrace.

I hope that the Members of this House will understand that this is a degrading operation on the integrity of this House, and I hope they will vote down this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, we need to block this block grant proposal. This welfare reauthorization bill

that the House leadership has finally brought to the floor still contains a proposal to allow five States to elect a food stamp block grant in lieu of the regular program. And in addition, it allows the food stamp program the opportunity or the provision of a super waiver. This is a bad idea on procedure; it is flawed policy and should be defeated.

I offered an amendment to remove from the bill these two provisions, the five-state block grant provision and the super waiver provision. The Committee on Rules denied that amendment. This rule, therefore, needs to be defeated on process.

This block grant proposal ought to be blocked for a number of valid policy reasons: first of all, this proposal undermines the ability of the food stamp program to respond to human needs during economic downturns. The States will face pressure to transfer food assistance spending to employment and training.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that between 2002 and 2007, expenditures for food stamp benefits, administrative costs and employment and training programs will increase by 13 percent, from $21 billion to $24 billion. Indeed, if this should occur, where would this money come from? Fixed block granting of food stamps would not allow for those expenditures.

Finally, the restoration of legal immigrants, unlikely under food stamp block grants. Just Monday, I stood beside the President when he bragged about the fact that he was restoring legal immigrants to have the provision of food stamps. Well, they will not have it if five States can block grant, because the immigrant cost is not in the base of it; and that cost, therefore, would be impossible for States to assume, and that provision would not happen.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to act responsibly by indeed responding to the increasing need of food assistance during economic times and not to block-grant food stamps. The States cannot afford it. Therefore, I implore my colleagues not only to defeat this rule but also to defeat this bad proposal.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in strong opposition to this unfair rule. I am strongly disappointed that my friends on the other side of the aisle decided that a debate about the future of working families, working poor families in this country does not deserve more than a few hours of discussion. And I am disappointed that they decided that amendments on important issues like child care and restoration of benefits for legal immigrants, legal immigrants, does not deserve to be heard on the floor of this House. These are vital issues to my community.

In Los Angeles County alone, there is a child care crisis. Only 16 percent of the children in my community there receive child care. And for a family earning the minimum wage in my community, it takes about 61 percent of their income just to place one infant in child care. So I attempted to offer an amendment to allow mothers who are receiving welfare benefits and have infant children or a child or a disabled child to stay at home and care for that child because it is so costly to place these children in child care. It is hard to get, and it costs a lot of money. This request was denied.

Mr. Speaker, I also represent a community with a large number of immigrants, many from Mexico, Central America, and Asia. I attempted to offer an amendment with the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) to restore welfare benefits to legal immigrants. But this request was also denied. I cannot support a rule which does not even allow me to debate the issues that matter most to men and women from my district who are struggling to get out of poverty. They want to have dignity. They want to have a job. But they also need assistance from this government.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this unfair rule and oppose the previous question so we can make our voices heard and allow for a free and fair debate.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this welfare reform rule should be defeated in that there is really no reformation of welfare here. There are just some glib statements of people who would not know a poor person if they saw them walk by them tonight. They need to get into the shoes of poor people. Then they can realize that this bill does nothing to increase self-sufficiency of poor people.

We use a lot of buzz words here in the Congress. We keep talking about self-sufficiency. You do not find it here. None of your welfare reform bills or your welfare programs have brought self-sufficiency, because the people you say will be out of poverty are still in poverty. You are not meeting the child care needs. The children are getting poorer and poorer. Poverty resides just away from here, not two blocks from here. Yet you cannot realize that this bill does nothing to address self-sufficiency.

In 1999 in the middle of the economic boom, ex-welfare recipients who worked earned an average of nearly $7,200 a year, approximately $6,000 below the poverty line for a family of three. Think of that. Nearly one out of five children in the United States are still living in poverty. And we are here in this great land, we are able to give away money to everyone; but we cannot look down to the least of those, our small children who need help in this country. Poverty is not so that we cannot overcome it. Other governments have tried it. Why is it that our government is so bitterly opposed to helping poor people? You are helping the rich. Why not put the same measurement on the poor? You are not helping them.

Are we providing recipients with the education and training? I see these women who come in and out like they are on an escalator with all of these training programs. There are people who are getting rich off your poverty program under the guise of bringing about welfare reform. That is why we sit here and make these obsolete kinds of measures, not letting people talk about them. You have got to have some real jobs, not dead-end jobs, so that these people can become self-sufficient and educate and train them. It can be done if we really want to do it.

Defeat this rule.

□ 2100

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend His remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this rule.

A fair rule should give us a chance to build a consensus; this rule does not. Women on public assistance with children under 6 years of age have three full-time jobs. They are expected to work, as they should, in exchange for their welfare benefits; they are expected to get an education so that they can leave welfare and get a better job, and they are expected to be full-time moms 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. Only a magician can pull off that triple-threat problem, unless she has adequate child care.

There are Members in this Chamber who believe strongly that the work requirement should be increased to 40 hours, and there are those of us who believe that that increase is punitive and counterproductive. There is an opportunity and a possibility for compromise, and that compromise would be to guarantee, not to promise, but to guarantee first-rate child care when needed for these moms that we are telling to get out and get an education and go to work. Amendments that would have given us a chance to strike that compromise have been stricken from this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule fails the test of serious compromise and it should fail the vote of this House. I would urge my colleagues to defeat the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is two words to describe what is wrong with this welfare bill: Rile-ya Wilson, this beautiful baby. Right now, this 5-year-old child from my State is missing somewhere in this country, and this Congress wants to give full responsibility to under-funded State agencies without any Federal oversight.

It is truly an outrage that we are tonight debating how much money to dedicate to the weakest, when the President and the Republicans want to make permanent extending tax credits to the richest in our country to the tune of over $500 billion. And worse, the children of Florida have double jeopardy because we have a governor, Jeb Bush, that gives all of the money to the wealthy businesses instead of making sure that the State can account for all of its children.

Our priorities are all wrong. It is time that we start thinking of the children first. What happened to ''Leave No Child Behind?'' Well, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are really good with coming up with catchy statements, but I have one for you: Where is the beef? I say, where is the beef?

The Republicans do nothing to improve the state of children in this country. The Republicans want welfare recipients to work 40 hours a week, but where is the money for child care? This bill does nothing to allow parents to receive an education and training to get good jobs to get off the welfare rolls.

The proof is in the pudding. Do not just talk the talk, walk the walk. Instead of sending money to the States to try to get people to get married, we need to focus all of our energy on what is really important: making sure that the States are equipped to take care of all of the children. We cannot afford another tragedy like this precious, precious baby.

Mr. Speaker, to whom God has given much, much is expected, and they are expecting much from this Congress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. It is an unfair rule, and it does not give the minority party a chance to engage in a meaningful, substantive debate about the base bill by offering amendments.

Now, during the course of this debate as it resumes tomorrow, we are going to hear a lot of fluff and a lot of bluster about empowering individuals with work and jobs, but if we are truly interested in lifting people out of poverty, we must be interested in giving them an opportunity for work. Yet, an amendment that myself and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) wanted to offer which would have established a work credit, an incentive for States to move people off of welfare into meaningful, respectable paying jobs, is denied an opportunity to be fully heard.

We are also going to be hearing a lot of talk about the importance of two-parent families and the role of fathers with welfare reform. Yet an amendment I wanted to offer with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) that would create an incentive for States to make sure that noncustodial parents get work and also pay child support payments, which is important for the upbringing of these kids, is denied a meaningful debate during consideration of this legislation.

Also, another important area that needs to be addressed with the base bill, and that is victims of domestic abuse and sexual assault are in a unique situation. They sometimes have deep psychological scars and it is not easy for them to turn their life around. Yet, consideration of those issues, which are very important for a lot of people currently on welfare rolls throughout the country, is not given meaningful attention under the base bill.

These issues, however, have been addressed in the Democratic substitute, one that we will be hearing more about and the differences, the basic differences between the two bills, and that is why I would encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule so that we can open up the base bill for more discussion. But if that fails, support the Democratic substitute and vote ''no'' on the Republican underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for following the time-honored tradition of allowing the Democrats to have a substitute under the rule, but let me urge my colleagues to vote against the rule, because in a bill of this importance amendments should have been made in order and no amendments were made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to many people who were saying they are going to support the underlying bill talk with pride of what we have accomplished during the past 5 years, but then they are supporting legislation that moves backwards and takes away a lot of tools that States currently have that have been responsible for the success during the past 5 years. Our States have said that if these new requirements become law, it is going to require them to have workfare programs rather than getting people real jobs.

But let me talk about the amendment that I took to the Committee on Rules that deals with education, because I think education is key. The current law allows vocational education training to count towards a State's work participation rate for up to 12 months. That is the current law. The Republican bill takes that out of the law. It says basically that education is important for everyone in this country, except the most vulnerable, the people that are on welfare. Is that the message we really want to give to the American people?

The amendment that I submitted to the Committee on Rules would have continued education as a core requirement under the work participation. It would have expanded it to 2 years. It would have included English as a second language and GED, and expanded the opportunities of using education so people cannot only be lifted out of cash assistance, but can have a good job and lifted out of poverty. That is the type of debate that we should be having tomorrow. But the rule that we have before us denies us that opportunity to debate that issue.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue, TANF reauthorization and welfare. It deserves debate in this Chamber so that we can talk about education and we can talk about the other issues as to whether there is adequate resources for our States but, unfortunately, the rule before us will not let us do it. I urge my colleagues to reject the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I understand my colleague has no further requests for time, nor do I, so I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow us to consider two important amendments denied in the Committee on Rules.

The first amendment, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), would remove the ban on welfare benefits to legal immigrants. Legal immigrants contribute greatly to our society and they paid an estimated $50 billion in surplus taxes just last year, and 20,000 legal immigrants serve in our Nation's Armed Forces but they are banned from receiving funds in this bill. We would have an opportunity to vote to change this, and the amendment would give us that chance.

The second amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) would strike the food stamp program from the super waiver in the five-state block grant. Food stamps are often the only source of Federal assistance for many low-income working Americans. This program should not be tampered with by the House.

Please vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can have an opportunity to debate and vote on these two very important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House resolution 422.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time. In closing, I ask my colleagues to look back at the welfare reforms of 1996 and to remind them that we have come a long, long way.

Today we will find children and families in each of our districts better off than they were 6 years ago. We have reduced the welfare rolls and helped those who were once down and out to lift themselves up. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4737 builds on these efforts to further protect the children, to further strengthen families, to further increase State flexibility, and to further continue the decline in poverty.

It is often said that the best social program is a job. This legislation provides the needed tools for people to move from welfare to work and opens up for them the door of opportunity, pride, and a better future. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and bill before us today.

I want to make it clear that I strongly advocate giving the states the flexibility that they need to effectively serve those citizens who strive to break the cycle of welfare dependence. That is why I am troubled by the provisions in the bill before us today that severely restrict the flexibility of states such as Texas to continue the activities that have been successful in their welfare to work programs and place a tremendous unfunded mandate on states.

For my own state of Texas, this bill would create an unfunded mandate of $166 million a year, in addition to the $78 million shortfall they will face under current law by 2007. Under the bill, Texas would be forced to implement policies which Texas has already rejected as unworkable and change parts of its welfare reform effort that have been a success in moving welfare recipients into real jobs because of the mandates in the bill. The welfare reform effort in Texas has been a success. It would be the height of arrogance for me to stand here in Washington and vote to require Texas to implement policies on welfare reform that the Texas legislature has already considered and rejected.

The so-called ''super-waivers'' advocated in this legislation has the potential to undermine current food stamp policy that has a sound track record of providing nutrition assistance to all eligible citizens if they face economic hardships. The question is not whether states should or should not receive the flexibility under waiver authority to tailor the food stamp program rules. States already have that flexibility. The question is whether states should be allowed even greater flexibility to change the very nature of the food stamp program.

If there are innovative reforms that states would like to implement that are prohibited under current law, we should examine how to address those specific problems. That is what the Committee process is intended to do. Let state administrators testify before the Agriculture Committee about the changes they believe would allow them to run the program better, let the Committee examine the consequences of those changes, and then come up with legislation to address those concerns.

The delay in bringing this bill to the floor today highlights the problems of ignoring the committee process and writing bills in the leadership offices. Welfare reform is too important to consider under a process that has more to do with scoring political points than building on what has been successful.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4737 is a top priority for President Bush and one of the most important bills we'll consider this year.

The 1996 welfare reform law—one the most successful social policy initiatives in recent memory—is set to expire later this year. In February, President Bush unveiled his principles for reauthorizing this important law; H.R. 4737, the Personal Responsibility, Work and Family Promotion Act, is based on those principles.

Its goal is simple: to put even more Americans on the path to self-sufficiency and independence. While the '96 law has been an unqualified success, there is more work to be done. A majority of TANF recipients—58 percent—still aren't working for their benefits.

That's why H.R. 4737 strengthens current work requirements. It asks welfare recipients to engage in work-related activities for 40 hours a week—16 of which could be in education, job training, or other constructive activities as defined by states.

The measure also gradually increases the work participation rate required of states—by 2007, 70 percent of a state's TANF recipients must be in work-related activities, up from 50 percent in current law.

Moreover, the bill makes significant improvements to the Child Care and Development Block Grant. It adds $1 billion in discretionary funding to the program over five years and requires states to devote more money to improving child care quality. The bill also incorporates key elements of President Bush's Good Start, Grow Smart early childhood education plan, encouraging states to make sure children are developmentally prepared to enter school.

H.R. 4737 also significantly enhances flexibility for states and localities to integrate a variety of federal programs, including TANF, food stamps, housing assistance, the child care block grant, and workforce investment programs.

This innovative plan will give states and localities the opportunity to respond creatively to recipients' needs and improve the efficiency of federal welfare and workforce programs. As a recent Wall Street Journal editorial noted, the State Flex proposal ''has the potential to spur the next wave of reform.''

With this bill, we have the chance to build on the success of the last five years. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue as we move forward.

This proposal has been approved by three different House Committees; many Members have had the opportunity to consider and amend this bill. The rule today before us is a fair rule, and I urge members to support it.

The amendment previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. ___) to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to State for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours, with 50 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution or the amendments specified in section 2. Each amendment specified in section 2 may be offered only in the order specified. The amendment printed in the report of the Rules Committee may be considered only after the amendments specified in section 2. Each amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report or in section 2, as the case may be, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report or in section 2, as the case may be, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendment are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Sec. 2. The amendments referred to the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(1) Amendment to be offered by Representative Becerra of California or Representative Solis of California or Representative Wu of Oregon or Representative Crowley of New York or a designee, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE ___—TREATMENT OF ALIENS

SEC. ___. TREATMENT OF ALIENS UNDER THE TANF PROGRAM.

(a) EXCEPTION TO 5-YEAR BAN FOR QUALIFIED ALIENS.—Section 403(c)(2) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity

Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1613(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(L) Benefits under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program described in section 402(b)(3)(A).''.

(b) BENEFITS NOT SUBJECT TO REIMBURSEMENT.—Section 423(d) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1138a note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) Benefits under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act except for cash assistance provided to a sponsored alien who is subject to deeming pursuant to section 408(h) of the Social Security Act.''.

(c) TREATMENT OF ALIENS.—Section 408 (42 U.S.C. 608) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO THE TREATMENT OF 213A ALIENS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In determining whether a 213A alien is eligible for cash assistance under a State program funded under this part, and in determining the amount or types of such assistance to be provided to the alien, the State shall apply the rules of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), and (6) of subsection (f) of this section by substituting '213A' for 'non-213A' each place it appears, subject to section 421(e) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconcilation Act of 1996, and subject to section 421(f) of such Act (which shall be applied by substituting 'section 408(h) of the Social Security Act' for 'subsection (a)').

''(2) 213A ALIEN DEFINED.—An alien is a 213A alien for purposes of this subsection if the affidavit of support or similar agreement with respect to the alien that was executed by the sponsor of the alien's entry into the United States was executed pursuant to section 213A of the Immigration and Nationality Act.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect October 1, 2002.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by the provisions of this section apply to benefits provided on or after the effective date of this section.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

(2) Amendment to be offered by Representative Clayton of North Carolina or a designee, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes.

Page 113, line 10, insert ''or'' after the semicolon.

Page 113, line 13, strike ''; or'' and insert a period.

Page 113, strike lines 14 through 16.

Page 118, line 6, insert ''or'' after the semicolon.

Page 118, strike lines 7 through 18.

Page 118, line 19, strike ''(F)'' and insert ''(E)''.

Page 124, strike line 5 and all that follows through line 7 on page 137.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 204, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—213

Aderholt
Akin
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—204

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Bachus
Burton
Cunningham
Gibbons
Gordon
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Kolbe
Mascara
Miller, George
Murtha
Reyes
Stump
Stupak
Tauzin
Thornberry
Traficant

□ 2136

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, HILL and MARKEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 205, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—214

Aderholt
Akin
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—205

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Ryan (WI)

NOT VOTING—14

Bachus
Burton
Gordon
Hall (OH)
Harman
Kolbe
Mascara
Murtha
Reyes
Stearns
Stump
Stupak
Thornberry
Traficant

□ 2150

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.

Stated against:

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that on the immediate past vote, rollcall 166, I voted; but somehow my vote was not recorded. Had I been recorded, I would have voted ''no.''

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3686

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from cosponsorship of H.R. 3686.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3215

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3215.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CHAIR TO POSTPONE FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4737 TO A TIME DESIGNATED BY THE SPEAKER ON THE LEGISLATIVE DAY OF THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2002

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 4737, pursuant to House Resolution 422, the Chair, notwithstanding the order of the previous question, may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker on the legislative day of Thursday May 16, 2002.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, 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 Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RAILROAD SAFETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, we have had in this Nation in recent weeks several high-profile train accidents, one in Southern California and one in Florida. In light of these accidents and in light of ongoing problems with railroad safety, I have asked the chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroad on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN), and his ranking member, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT), to hold a hearing and consider new legislation on railroad safety.

As my colleagues know, an Amtrak auto train crashed and derailed near Crescent City, Florida, last month. While the National Transportation Safety Board is still investigating, we have to wonder if the four deaths and over 100 injuries could have been prevented by the previous enactment by this body of real railroad safety legislation.

In the Southern California crash, a Burlington Northern engineer and conductor missed a yellow light that

should have signaled them to slow their freight train down. Instead, they barreled head on into a Metrolink commuter train, killing two people and injuring almost 200 more. We simply cannot tolerate any more of these preventable accidents.

Various investigators in the media have looked at these accidents. In Los Angeles, the KCBS station said in a report: ''Apparently there was no warning, no audible alarms, no automatic breaking system on the Burlington Northern train in Southern California. It all came down to one yellow traffic light and only two pairs of eyes. If they had seen that yellow signal, they would have had time to stop and prevented the accident.''

According to the Federal Railroad Administration, the number one cause of train accidents today, and there is one every 90 minutes in this country, Mr. Speaker, is human error. And most of that human error comes from fatigue. We know that. And yet this body has not acted.

The leading expert in this Congress on railroad safety is my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR). He has introduced in the past, and he will introduce again tomorrow, a bill which should have been enacted many, many years ago. This year it is called the Railroad Safety Reform Act of 2002. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and I will introduce this tomorrow in this body.

The bill goes into fatigue of employees of railroads; it goes into how employees and witnesses ought to be protected against any intimidation by railroad owners. It talks about grade crossing safety and passenger service safety standards, rulemaking and enforcement, and talks about technology. Unfortunately, my colleagues, the technology on railroads in this Nation today, the freight railroad system specifically, goes back to the 1930s.

We have to do a better job of protecting both the employees and our constituents from railroad accidents in the future. We can regulate, as we do with the airline industry, hours of work, amount of rest that is needed, amount of warning before people have to go on in shifts. Today, there are no such schedules. People can be required to go to work with just 2 hours' notice. If they work less than 12, they only have 8 hours off the next day. If they work more than 12, they are only guaranteed 10 hours off. These rules do not even take into account travel time from the worker's home. So the folks who are driving these trains, who are working as conductors, can be dead tired, literally dead tired, with the rules that we have today.

If I may quote one more time, Mr. Speaker, from the KCBS–TV report. They interviewed several employees from trains that have had accidents, and they acknowledge that they are tired. Their eyes are open, but they are just not there. There was one time a guy had fallen asleep and looked over and found his fellow conductor had also fallen asleep. Both of those in the locomotive were asleep at one time. One of the engineers says he averages 330 workdays a year.

My colleagues, we have to take these accidents seriously. Let us have this hearing. Let us mark up the bill of the gentleman from Minnesota and let us pass the Railroad Safety Reform Act of 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SULLIVAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINOJOSA 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 California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2200

CHILDREN SHOULD NOT BE TREATED WITH CONTEMPT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SULLIVAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we have initiated the debate on the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Act reauthorization. I want to pick up on a point that I made during the discussion of the rule, and that is that poor people are treated with great contempt in this Congress. During the discussions that preceded the preparation for the bill, there has been language that indicated that the poor are held in contempt. Children are treated with contempt. They make the mistake of assuming, speaking as if we are dealing with welfare mothers and women who are unworthy of being helped by the government. Actually most of the aid to families with dependent children is exactly what it says, it is aid to families with children. We are helping children, and to treat children with contempt is a great mistake in humanitarian terms, in national terms and even military terms.

It happens at this point in history there has been a lot of highlighting of the fact that poor children in certain countries like Pakistan and Afghanistan and a few of the Islamic nations are being nurtured and brought into schools called madrassahs, and being given three meals a day, taught to read and write, and they are taught to hate, and then shipped out to military camps which become part of the armies which are supposed to wage jihad against the West.

Recently in the New York City Times there was an article which shows that the right-wing Hindus in India are doing the same thing. They are taking poor children with nowhere else to go, and raising these children up as soldiers. Observing these manifestations in the world of Islam, I began to think about what happens in this country. It dawned on me if we examine the names that are on the Vietnam War Memorial Wall in Washington, and I challenge the Heritage Foundation or anyone else who has the staff to do it to challenge me, the majority who died for the country are poor people.

We know from the Civil War if you got drafted, you could pay for someone to take your place. In Korea and Vietnam, the majority also were poor people. Those were the foot soldiers. If we ever have a situation where we start drafting people again, those are going to be the foot soldiers again. Let us not treat our poor children with contempt. They are as vital to America as anyone else.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) makes an eloquent point, and I just want to follow up, and I heard the gentleman's comment earlier, it seems they are bragging that this promotes work. My understanding is that we should be promoting children, to have health care and good nutrition. I believe this bill is misdirected because it takes parents away from nurturing children. The gentleman is absolutely correct in saying that this bill does not emphasize the values of helping poor people who just want an opportunity.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, this is a program for children. The only able-bodied adults who get safety net benefits are farmers in America. I must mention that because of the fact that we have suddenly decided to become fiscally responsible in this bill. We do not have the money for the kind of day-care we need. Part of the money was spent on our farm bill where in order to be a participant, you can make as much as $2.5 million a year. And we put a cap on the amount of taxpayer dollars that the farmers can receive of $390,000. That is where the obscenity is in terms of the misapplication and misappropriation of taxpayers' dollars. To nurture children makes more sense. The costs are far lower.

If there is anybody in America that ought to be crowned as royalty, and we do not have royalty in America, but it would be the people who have been maimed and killed in all of our wars. They would be designated as the royal class, and we would find that the overwhelming would be poor people, the sons and daughters of poor families.

CHILDREN ARE BEING NEGLECTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) to speak about the provision of the welfare bill which takes away the rights for education and training so people can move up and out of the welfare rolls. Other than that, it sounds like some form of regressive slavery.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. That is very much a part of the pattern of contempt I have observed in this bill. We say we want to put Americans to work and off welfare, meaning the mothers of the children. Yet there is a prohibition against higher education in the present law. You cannot go into a junior college or community college to get an associate degree. That is where the jobs are, the technician jobs that pay a decent salary, offer steady and continuous work with fringe benefits, and a health care plan. But no, we will not allow a welfare mother to use, to go into a higher education program.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have been elected for 20 years, 10 years in this House, and in that time period I have seen all kinds of welfare. The bill we passed last year, $94 billion to the farmers, the percentage of the farmers is 2 percent of the population. I have got to ask the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) because I do not know exactly what percentage will the wealthiest farmers get out the farmers' welfare bill.

Mr. OWENS. If the gentlewoman would continue to yield, it is a safety net program. It was started the same time that Franklin Roosevelt started the Aid to Families with Dependent Children. They were poor farmers at that time, but now a farmer may get as much as $390,000 per year, and you may participate in the program even if your income is $2.5 million.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I think the gentlewoman is right, the farm bill was far too generous to too few wealthy big farmers. Actually 2 percent of the people farm, that is correct. And of those who get resources, 20 percent of the farmers get 80 percent of the resources, so the vast majority of the farmers do not get what my colleague thinks.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, that means that the poor farmers are not getting this safety net benefit for the poor. I think this is relevant because now that we are on Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Act, suddenly our colleagues have become frugal. Suddenly they want to become responsible and prove to the public that they are here to protect the treasury. We have already given it away to people who need it the least, and now we are neglecting needy children in our society.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I held up this picture earlier, and this is Rile-ya Wilson has been missing in the State of Florida for 15 months. Now we are talking about super block granting the money to the State where we have no accountability. In Florida, we have close to 800,000 children living below the poverty line. That is 22 percent of all of the children in Florida. The kids in Florida have double jeopardy.

First of all, we have a President that has given away $500 billion and wants to make it permanent as tax breaks to the richest people in this country, and then we have a governor in the State of Florida that gives the rest of the money away to the businesses. And yet the State of Florida, the average worker that takes care of these kids does not make $20,000 a year, and they have a roll of between 40 and 100 kids that they have to look after.

The Republicans are very, very good with gimmicks. They have Leave No Child Behind, a slogan they stole from the Children's Defense Fund. What does that mean? This is the time we need to look at leaving no child behind; but are we doing that? No, no. We are talking about we cannot afford to take care of our children, but we can afford to take care of everybody else but the children. They talk a great talk, but they do not walk the walk.

Mr. Speaker, there are two words to describe what's wrong with this welfare bill—Rile-ya Wilson. Right now, there is a 5-year-old child from my State missing somewhere in this country because Congress wants to give full responsibility to underfunded State agencies without any Federal oversight. These super blocks grants allow the States to neglect our children.

Let's look at my State of Florida for an example of what happens when States don't take care of our children. There are over 775,000 children living below the poverty line in Florida—a staggering 22 percent of all children in the State. The welfare rolls have gone down, but, not surprisingly, this number has not improved; 77 percent of our fourth graders' reading skills are not up to speed. And although almost 20 percent of our children do not have any health insurance, Florida had to return over $30 million in Federal funds for the Children's Health Insurance Program in 1998 because the State did not want to match the money.

It is truly an outrage that we today have to debate how much money to dedicate to helping our weakest and most vulnerable as the President and the Republican leadership wants to permanently extend tax cuts to the richest in our country to the tune of $500 billion just in this decade and $4 trillion in the next!

And worse, the children in Florida are doubly penalized because our Governor decided to spend the State's money on wealthy businesses instead of making sure the state can account for all of its children.

Our priorities are all wrong when the average worker at the Department of Children and Families in my State makes less than $20,000 a year and handles over 70 cases at a time.

It is time that we start to think of the children first. What happened to "Leave no Child Behind"? The Republicans can come up with lots of catchy slogans, but I've got one for you: Where's the beef? The Republican bill does nothing to improve the state of children in this country. The Republicans want welfare recipients to work 40 hours a week, but where is the money for childcare? This bill does not allow parents to receive education in order to end the cycle of poverty that they find themselves in. They need an education to get a good job to stay off the welfare rolls.

The proof is in the pudding. Don't just talk the talk—walk the walk! Instead of trying to make people all around the country go running to the altar to get married, we need to be making sure that the States are equipped to take care of our children. We cannot have any more tragic cases occur like the one of Rile-ya Wilson.

MUSHARRAF'S FAILURE TO ROOT OUT TERRORISM IN KASHMIR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor this evening to reiterate once again that President Musharraf of Pakistan is failing to root out terrorism in Kashmir.

This past Tuesday, more than 30 Indian soldiers and members of their families fell victim to a deadly attack in Kashmir at the hands of three Pakistani-based militants.

Mr. Speaker, this type of terrorism is tragic and is exactly the type of terrorist activity that President Musharraf so valiantly claimed he would eliminate. It seems clear that President Musharraf has paid no regard whatsoever to preventing infiltration of Islamic militants into Kashmir.

As a result of the October 1 attack on the Jammu and Kashmir State Assembly and the December 13 attack on the Indian parliament last year, Musharraf stated that action would be taken against Islamic militants. He proceeded to outlaw two organizations responsible for terrorism in Kashmir, Jaish e-Muhammad and Lashkar-e-Taiba. He also arrested nearly 2,000 men supposedly linked to terrorists and ordered madrassahs to be closed. This supposed crack down on terrorists and closing of extremist religious schools was a sham. Most of the militants that were arrested are now free and madrassahs continue to recruit and train young boys in Islamic fundamentalism and terrorist activities.

Although Musharraf made claims that he is cracking down on terrorists throughout Pakistan, he has always referred to the Pakistani-based militants in Kashmir as freedom fighters. At the times he has referred to these terrorists, with deep, close connections to groups like al Qaeda and the Taliban, I have tried to highlight that Musharraf is operating under a double standard of siding with the U.S. against terrorism, while allowing terrorism to continue in Kashmir.

More and more, the world is able to see that President Musharraf has dedicated himself to continuing military rule in Pakistan and allowing terrorism to occur in Kashmir.

President Bush stressed in his address to Congress after September 11 that there would be no shades of gray. A country either supports us in our war against terrorism, or it does not. The Bush administration praises President Musharraf for joining the U.S. effort again the Taliban, but this support does not extend to countering terrorism in Kashmir.

There are more indications daily that the terrorist elements are regaining ground in Pakistan, and the Musharraf government is doing very little to condition constrain it. I believe the U.S. should rethink its support for Musharraf in light of these events.

□ 2215

TWO HARMFUL FOOD STAMP PROVISIONS IN HOUSE WELFARE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SULLIVAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier and just want to expound again on the procedure that was engaged in, or the procedure that should have been engaged in, as we brought forth a major piece of legislation that involves several committees. To my surprise, in the welfare reauthorization bill, there were provisions in there that would have given the States, at least five States, the election of having a block grant and also in that bill were provisions that would allow for the super waiver. Giving the super waiver means that you are almost giving States an unlimited amount of flexibility and authority almost that they do not have to follow any rules and regulations. This super waiver really gives sweeping authority to the Governors of the States and the possibility of programs being diverted or the real incentive really as we look at this proposal, in requiring more work, requiring more day care, more transportation.

When you begin to understand that States are in fiscal constraint, you begin to know how that temptation becomes a real possibility if indeed you are giving pots of moneys in the block grant and say, You can do with it as you please, that gives some of us very much concern, particularly when we are concerned about the poor, concerned about those who need food; and it is food stamps which is indeed our Nation's greatest safety net, primarily to families, families who are working.

We have seen in the last 7 months the increase of a large number of people who are unemployed who are now eligible for food stamps and indeed receiving food stamps. More than 1.7 million individuals have now increased the benefit for food stamps because they need it. If we block-grant food stamps, you do not have the ability to respond to this unanticipated need because you have essentially received a certain amount of money. Therefore, you do not have the ability to fluctuate and respond to uncertain needs.

The reason that, I guess, I am really upset or offended by this is the process. When you consider that the farm bill, which my colleagues have been trying to beat up on me for the farm bill, but the farm bill was a 2-year-and-several-months' process; and not one time did we hear this provision being mentioned. I serve on the Subcommittee on Nutrition of the Committee on Agriculture. We did not have any debate. We did not hear any proposal. We did not hear any public announcement at all about this. We went to the Committee on Rules and asked them that they should have had due process. In fact, because they did not have due process, the Committee on Rules should have made this amendment we offered to strike that provision so that we could go back to the appropriate committees and have a full deliberation which this bill so rightly needs.

Why is this important? Not only the procedure, it is important to understand the implication of this proposal. This proposal would be devastating for unemployment. It would be devastating indeed for its meeting the increased participation that we are trying to have for working families. It would be devastating for meeting our obligations that we have just passed in the farm bill, where we said we are restoring legal immigrants. If you are restoring them and they are not in your base budget and you are block-granting it, you cannot respond to that. You either respond to your legal immigrants or you have to cut funds.

This is really, Mr. Speaker, tantamount to taking food out of our babies' mouths and food out of our elderly. I think our Nation can do better than that. I think we are unworthy of that kind of action where we on Monday morning are signing into law, giving new benefits and new opportunities for people to be fed and responded to as they need. Yet here we are on Wednesday evening and tomorrow, indeed, taking this away.

Mr. Speaker, both of these provisions should be sufficient for us to have great pause and indeed to vote against that when it comes up again tomorrow.

EDUCATION TAX CREDITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, this evening's discussion is on the topic of education. It is a topic which has occupied a lot of time here on the House floor during these Special Orders of the last few weeks. For those who believe, as I do, that America's children warrant a profound amount of attention and resources from the country, I would invite those colleagues who might be monitoring tonight's proceedings to come join us here on the floor this evening.

I specifically want to discuss school choice, trying to create a market-driven education system in America, one where government-owned institutions, or public schools, have the opportunity to compete on an even playing field with other providers of academic services and America's schoolchildren become the beneficiaries through the market forces that ought to exist where education is concerned. We do not have that to a large degree in America today.

We have what is effectively a government-owned, unionized monopoly when it comes to the most important industry in America, that being education. There are pockets around the country where you have a competitive framework for delivery of education services. Those pockets exist in some States. They exist in some community schools and in some cities. They exist for the wealthy, certainly, because only the wealthy in America on any given day can afford to forgo the taxes they pay to the government schools and then pay tuition on top of that to send their child to a school where services are delivered by private professional institutions.

But what we really need to do today is try to eliminate this discrimination that exists in American education today between the extraordinarily wealthy and the extraordinarily poor. Because speaker after speaker after speaker who comes to these microphones or maybe testifies before any of our education committees, committees that deal with education, seem to have a unanimous agreement that we need to have a concerted effort in America involving the Federal Government and the States to elevate the achievement of underserved children, the poor, minority children, those who happen to live in school districts that are just not achieving that much on behalf of children, and they need our focus.

Too often in Washington, the conclusion from those kinds of concerns results in an agreement that we should just spend more money, that we should just take more cash from the American taxpayers and send it to the Department of Education, maybe wave a little magic wand and hope that the speech about poor children preceding the expenditure of cash will somehow help underserved kids in America. We have been doing that for years. Sometimes we get lucky. Sometimes we just manage to have the right combination of devoted teachers, committed school board members, a community that rallies around the poorest children in their neighborhoods and a Federal program or two that provides some of the resources. We see those examples of

success from time to time and we celebrate them when they are known to occur, but those are the exception rather than the rule.

In inner city after inner city after inner city, the children who are trapped in failing schools, without the opportunity to choose other options, are the children who are the victims. It is unfortunate because there are several States around the country that have really showed us how to reach down to the neighborhoods and empower families and empower children in a way that makes a meaningful difference in their academic futures.

There are six States that have really gone far above and beyond the rest of their peers among the 50 States in moving forward on a change in the State tax code to benefit children. That solution involves education tax credits. There are some great examples around the country. Some of the best examples include the State of Arizona, the State of Pennsylvania, the State of Illinois, the State of Florida, and a handful of others. It is important to understand that education tax credits allow for a revolutionary approach to public schooling and private schooling, American schooling, on a nondiscriminatory basis that results in a massive cash infusion into America's public education system. And it does so in a way that reaches the children who need it most, the very children that we all profess to care about more than all the rest. This tax credit proposal is really something to be excited about.

I am grateful tonight, Mr. Speaker, for the promise made by our Speaker of our House to move an education tax credit bill through this House, by the commitments from our President to support the education tax credit legislation that we are currently in the process of finalizing here in the House, and to make this concept of education tax credits a high national priority. It is significant from the President's standpoint because this really was the core of his education proposal last year. Not so much education tax credits, to be specific, but the concept of advancing the cause of academic choice, school choice.

When he sent up his proposal, Leave No Child Behind, the core element of that plan was school choice, the bill also entailed a component that dealt with flexibility for States, and a third component that dealt with accountability through a national testing strategy. But the core element of school choice, the most important provision that the President proposed and, in fact, campaigned on, was quickly abandoned by the Congress. I regret to say that, because everybody rallied around the President's proposal. When he took the ribbons off of it and announced he was going to send it up here to Capitol Hill, there was lots of fanfare and celebration, big press conferences, lots of pictures. We even brought all the kids that sat in front of the podium at that press conference and tried to convey the message that school choice, flexibility for States, public accountability, were going to help those kids sitting in front of us.

But as I mentioned, even before that bill had its first full hearing in the education committee here in the House, that core element of the President's proposal, the school choice provisions, were jerked right out of the bill. The people did not want to vote on it. I want to explain why. I want to explain the politics of it for those who are unfamiliar with the rough and tumble nature of education politics. I also want to explain in doing so how dollars get to children in American schools today and why it seems that taxpayers pay and pay and pay and are promised over and over again that money they send to Washington for education is going to help children and yet it never does. It rarely does. And I want to contrast that bureaucratic model, that is, really the framework of American education today, with the new model of freedom and academic liberty that is represented through education tax credits, a model that has now been tried in six different States, has been proposed in almost 40 States, and continues to be debated this very day in the halls of State legislatures across the country.

First, let me start with the status of education funding today. This chart explains how a dollar gets to a child. At the top, we have the hard-working taxpayer that is emblematic of every wage-earning, tax-paying American today. They work hard to raise the money that is confiscated by the Federal Government, taken out of their paychecks and given to the U.S. Treasury and goes through this process till it gets to the child way down here at the bottom. The Treasury Department collects the cash, Members of Congress, politicians, me, others, all of our colleagues, redistribute the wealth that has been collected by the Nation's Treasury Department through the Internal Revenue Service. We distribute that wealth through programs that we have selected, the charities of our choice, in the Department of Education.

□ 2230

The Department and its several office buildings just a few blocks from here distribute those dollars to the States and tie strings to those dollars as well under the pretense of accountability. At the State level these dollars are considered in State legislatures and governors' offices by more politicians, and they redistribute those dollars at the State level, dispensing them through State Departments of Education. The State Departments distribute those dollars to school districts. School districts, of course, are political entities; they are managed by elected officials, school board members, more politicians, who distribute those dollars according to their values to the various schools within a school district. Once we get those dollars in a school, we have a handful of managers, principals, business managers and program chairs who finally manage to get those dollars to teachers, and then to a child. By the time we go through this whole vortex of bureaucracy, the dollar that we work hard for every day to send to Washington to help children gets whittled down as each one of these bureaucracies, these agencies take their cut in order to run their various programs, and by the time these dollars actually reach a child, we only have maybe 60, 70 percent on a good day.

We want to bypass all of this. We are not going to get rid of this. The bureaucracy has lobbyists. All of these agencies hire lobbyists that come to Washington to preserve this system, and we will try to change it as time goes on, and we have for years, but the politics are tough to beat. So we are content to say that you have won. This bureaucracy has won. This empire continues to grow. It does not matter whether Republicans are in charge or Democrats are in charge, this system gets bigger and bigger every year. So we can confront reality. That is going to continue until there is a wave of change around the country that calls for mass reform of this system. It just is not going to happen, and there is not enough of us here. So we are going to leave this in place in exchange for a tax credit proposal that the gentleman from Michigan will describe, which is much more simple, and a proposal to which the gentleman from Michigan has been supremely devoted, and I yield the floor to him.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to point out the contrast between the chart that he outlined, which is the money that flows through the Federal Government, where it comes to Washington, goes through this funnel, the dollar gets whittled down to 60 to 70 cents on the dollar, and then that 60 to 70 cents that is left that actually makes it to a child's classroom, not only is that dollar whittled down to 60 to 70 cents, but it also comes with strings attached, meaning that it comes for a reading program, it comes for a math program, it comes for a science program, it comes with a very specific set of requirements attached to it, and then the school has to report back to the Federal Government that they actually spent the money exactly the way that the Federal Government mandated that they use that dollar to help our kids.

The gentleman from Colorado is absolutely correct. That system is going to stay in place. We may reach the same point that we reached finally a few years ago in welfare reform where we found out that it was a failed system and that what we needed to do was to give States flexibility in how they dealt with the individuals who are on welfare to give them hope and to actually structure programs that would move them off of welfare, and that may

happen with that system. But what we want to do is we want to put in a system, that number one, takes the dollar from the taxpayer and moves the dollar directly into a classroom, so we do not see that whittling down, and what we also want to do is we want that dollar to get into the classroom, we want that dollar to get into the school and give local officials a great degree of discretion as to exactly how they will spend that money, whether they will use it for a math program, whether they need to use it for English as a second language program, whether they want to use it for a science program, whether they want to use it for class size reduction, or whether they want to use it for technology, but the local school district will have a tremendous amount of flexibility in terms of how they will spend that money.

Here is how it works. We have the one system that says, on April 15 your taxes are due, send in a check to Washington and eventually some of that money will get back to your local school districts. This is much simpler. Here is our taxpayer, a local parent, someone in the community who is passionate about education in their community, they are passionate about the kids in their community, a local business that is passionate about the kids in their community. They are approached by the local school and they say, hey, we have this need in our school district. We want to keep this school open. We want to develop this technology program. We have done an analysis of our kids and we are really weak in this area. We have a program that we want to design for this. Will you help us?

Joe Taxpayer, ABC Business, decides, man, I love this community. This community is built on values; this community is built on each of our kids getting a solid education. They have laid out, the school has laid out a great case for what they want to do for the kids in our community. I am going to write them a check for $1,000 and they get a $500 tax credit.

So instead of whittling that dollar down from a dollar to 60 to 70 cents, what an education tax credit does is it takes the taxpayers' dollar and it grows it. This person says, I am going to invest $2 in education, but I am only going to get a reduction in my taxes of a dollar. That money then goes directly to that school and that school can spend that money on a program as they have identified it to the taxpayer.

If they do a great job, guess what? They can go back to Joe Taxpayer, they can go back to ABC Corporation the next year and say, wow, look at the kind of results and the kind of performance that we are getting. The accountability is directly back to the people in the community. They say, we really want to build on that program, or we have identified another need, and here we get the greatest accountability. Joe Taxpayer of ABC Corporation, they can make the decision as to whether they are going to invest in that school district again.

We have structured this program in such a way that individuals and businesses can contribute to their local public school, a traditional public school, to a local public charter school; they could also contribute to an education scholarship fund, and this scholarship fund would enable parents to apply for scholarships for sending their kids to a nontraditional school, perhaps a private or parochial school.

But what the gentleman from Colorado and I and many others in our conference are trying to do is we are trying to get a significant new investment in education that grows the investment, that grows every dollar of investment into $2 of education investment, make sure that it is under local control, and is available for all of our kids, is available for those kids that go to public schools, private, and parochial, so that these new dollars going into education are driven at the local level, the decisions are made at the local level as to how they will help our kids out, and it is going to be for all of our kids.

There are a lot of advantages to this system, and it has been, as my colleague may want to explain, this has been implemented in a number of States. What we have seen is that there is a significant inflow of new money into education, so that it is not a reallocation of the money that is already being paid into a State government. This is new money coming into education, and it is benefiting all of our kids and putting some local control back into our schools as they have seen local control being eroded by States taking more responsibility and now the Federal Government reaching back into a local school district, reaching back into the States, telling States and local schools exactly how they are supposed to run their local school districts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Arizona, between 1998 and the year 2000, in the first 3 years since Arizona passed their tax credit language for education, that State raised over $30 million for schoolchildren in Arizona. These are new dollars. These were not dollars taken away from the existing public schools; these were new dollars that were infused into the education system, the overall system, the nondiscriminatory system of Arizona. Because today, when we talk about academic freedom and choice, these qualities of liberty are dispensed on a discriminatory basis. The wealthy get freedom, the children of the wealthy do. Those who happen to live in one of these unique States or neighborhoods where school choice is allowed to occur, they get freedom. But the vast majority of children, especially those who need it the most, are denied the freedom to go to the kinds of schools that they want. Not only that, but the administrators of the public schools have their hands tied behind their back because their ability to access these new funds are limited, and the tax credit proposal puts more money into the education system for private and public schools. It does not discriminate against children. That is the beauty of it and the difference between the bureaucratic model that we have today that I described, and the tax credit liberty model of education that my colleague described.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the other thing that is different between what we are proposing here in Washington versus what is happening in Arizona is Arizona is a 100 percent tax credit, so it is $30 million of new money flowing into education, and it is a reduction in these individual's taxes of $30 million.

What we are proposing here in Washington is if we get $30 million of new money invested in education that is actually, or if we get $30 million in tax credit, it is actually $60 million of new money that is flowed into education and flowed into our schools at the local level. It is a significant difference in that it shows the power, the multiplier effect of this that says, I am going to put 2 bucks in, but it is only going to reduce the tax bite by $1.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, we have done the research, we have done the analysis. Sure, it would be great to have a bigger tax credit and maybe some day we will, but initially we have to start out small. There is a cost to government, there is no doubt about that.

Again, referring to the chart on how money is spent today, this city, Washington, D.C., frankly lacks imagination when it comes to finding new ways to fund schools. The answer for years has always been the same, and that is to just spend more on this system whenever we find a problem. When test scores take a dip, we do not really go fix the problem in Washington; maybe some day we will. I think our new President is committed to changing the management style of schools. But over the last 10 years, we have gone to this model $125 billion worth of times, and that is how much we spent over 10 years. We just keep spending more.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we talk about the accountability. In fact, through the tax credit models, as we outlined, if the school district goes back to Joe Taxpayer or goes back to ABC Corporation a second year and asks for a tax credit, or asks for a donation, and they have mismanaged the funds, Joe Taxpayer at ABC Corporation says, are you kidding me? No. I gave last year, and you mismanaged it. Until you can demonstrate to me that you are going to use my money wisely, I am not going to give you any more. That is a great accountability measure.

On my colleague's chart here, the third line down we see the Department of Education. Now, I applaud what

President Bush is doing in the Department of Education. But as the gentleman and I know that from 1996 on, as he and I are on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, year after year after year we would call in the officials from the Department of Education and ask them where the money went, and that third layer where that $120 billion or $40 billion a year flows through could not even get a clean audit, and the price for not getting a clean audit was what? How much did we cut their spending? We did not cut their spending.

Mr. SCHAFFER. We did not cut it at all.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The least we could have done is we probably froze it.

Mr. SCHAFFER. We increased their spending.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We increased their spending each and every year, even though they could not get a clean audit, and that is the bureaucratic model that says, well, being able to go back to the American people and getting a clean audit, that is not an essential requirement and, as a matter of fact, even if we do not get a clean audit, they are going to give us more money. There is a whole list of scandals and fraud within the Department of Education, so it is not only that they could not get a clean audit, the systems that they had in place were actually an open invitation to theft and corruption between the Department of Education. Now, that is rapidly changing under this President and Under Secretary Paige. But it was accepted in the Clinton administration for 4 years, and it was a major disappointment, and the biggest disappointment was when they did not perform. Rather than having their spending frozen or their spending cut, the bureaucratic, the Washington model said, that is okay, we are going to give you more money.

□ 2245

That would never happen with the tax credit.

Mr. SCHAFFER. They might have thought to fix it too, but what they chose to do is ignore the problems, and that really gets back to the beauty of tax credits. So from our perspective, the politicians here, the Members of Congress who deal with these dollars that come to the Treasury, every dollar spent on education really does come out of our budget. Every dollar spent results in a dollar reduced from the Nation's budget and, therefore, the ability to spend those dollars somewhere else. But by the time those dollars get down to the child, there is just a fraction of those dollars left. So the dollars spent does not have as much buying power as a taxpayer would hope and certainly as taxpayers deserve, certainly as much as children deserve.

The education tax credit, it costs us money as well. We do have the budget for those dollars. The difference is we do not get a negative like you get here. In fact, you double it through the proposal that we are proposing because for every dollar that we have to budget for an education tax credit, because it is a 50 percent tax credit, what that means is that the taxpayer is donating $2 to the education charity of his or her choice. And, again, we have run the surveys. We have done the models, and we know Americans are eager to invest in schools when they know the money is really going to get there, and that is the beauty of tax credits because that is the promise that taxpayers get.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If my colleague will hold the chart up for a minute, the contrast between the two charts is absolutely phenomenal. My colleague's chart is exactly the way the system here in Washington works. The total emphasis here is on the stuff in red: the Treasury Department, the Department of Education, the State, the politicians, the State Department of Education, the school district and politicians. That is where the whole focus is on the bureaucratic model. What is the process that the dollar is going to make it from Washington down through Lancing to Holland to Lincoln School? What is the process? What are the rules and the regulations that are going to follow it? What are the mandates that are going to follow it? And the child is kind of the footnote, the asterisk at the bottom, saying, oh, yeah, this is about kids; but most importantly this is first and foremost about process.

And what happens with the tax credit, it becomes very, very clear, the focus is on two people. The focus is on the person who has the ability and the desire to contribute to the schools and the focus is on the child. The middle people are cut out. And as soon as the school can demonstrate to the taxpayer that the child is going to benefit, the dollars will flow in because that is exactly what we have seen at the State, that States that have this, the school districts convince Joe Taxpayer that if you give money to this school for that purpose, that child is going to benefit, and this person sees the value, they write the check and that is exactly what we want to have. We want to build that connection between Joe Taxpayer, the local parents and people who are passionate about education in their community and they want to give more money, but they do not want to send it through that process. They want it sent directly to their school, directly for the purpose that that has outlined; and if that school blows it, they will not get a check the second year, but they will have the opportunity to come back in future years and say we have addressed those concerns and these issues. We will fix and improve the system.

Mr. SCHAFFER. I was at the mall this weekend with my family and someone stopped me and said they had seen us a couple of weeks ago having the same discussion on education tax credits. She remembered this chart because I was talking about the politics, the nature of the tough politics that exists within these levels of bureaucracy and how it is played out here in Congress. She said, Oh, Congressman, is it really that bad? And it really is. There is no exaggeration.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If my colleague will yield, it is not only that bad. It is probably worse than what people actually think.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Right. If we think of this from the administrator's perspective, the guy that runs this school, the principal, this principal, in order to get money for the child because the principals care about the kids. There is no doubt about that in my mind. But the principal who is trying to get money to help the child has to beg to these politicians at the school board to get the cash. In order for the school members to get the cash, they have to beg to the State Department of Education here to get the money. They have to apply for grants. They have to go down to the State capitals. And they have to learn the language of education finance.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If my colleague will yield, at the bottom level here, if you do not believe the system as my colleague and I are describing it, all you need to do is go to your local school and go to the administration building and ask them if they have got a couple of people. Do you have a grants writer? I mean, the gentleman and I, when we went to I think 20, 21 States and we had the hearings around the country on what is wrong with this process, they all said we have to get grant writers. What is a grant writer? A grant writer works at the local school district level. They take a look at this whole arrangement, an assortment of Federal education programs, and they go through there and they figure out which one their school may qualify for, and they start filling out the grant applications.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The grant writer cares about the children too. All of these people who work in the school, they really do care about the kids. But unfortunately, the system we have created for them over the years, the system is a bunch of nonsense, and we have created it for them, because in order for them to get the money to help the child, they have to first learn almost a foreign language in school finance, and they have to become proficient beggars to all of these different levels of bureaucracy. And if they do not figure that out, if they do not hire the expert who speaks in the bureaucratic language and understands which forms to fill out, the timing of these forms, what to say in the forms, even if it is not true, what to put on the forms in order to get somebody's attention up here, if they do not learn all of these things, then the child suffers. So their motivation is very pure.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The real question is where does accountability flow in that model? In that model the accountability flows from the school, to the politicians, to the school district, to

the State Department of Education. It flows away from the local community. And it flows away from the people who care most about the kids. It starts flowing to the Department of Education. We have always said, I am from Michigan, I wonder if we start with Secretary Paige and you start going down through the hierarchy when we will find the first person from Michigan and then when we will find the first person from the Second Congressional District who really knows my communities, who knows the difference between the needs in Muskegon and Muskegon Heights and Holland and Baldwin and Ludington and Cadillac, and says they are all a little bit different. But where is that person versus a tax credit? The accountability flows immediately from the child through the school to the taxpayer. So the accountability flows into the community, not away from the communities. It flows to the people who care most about the kids and they care most because they know the kids' names.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Just as the gentleman says in the chart, the taxpayer usually knows the children. They know the children in the school. They know the teachers, the administrators; they know the programs that seem to work and which ones fail. I wish I could map this out like a map of the country so we could see where their dollar goes. Let us use my State, for example. This dollar might go from Fort Collins, Colorado, my hometown, to Washington, D.C. From Washington, D.C. we will send it just a few blocks down here to the Department of Education buildings. They are massive. They are just a few blocks away. Those dollars would be shipped to Denver, Colorado. From Denver, Colorado, to another building in Denver, Colorado. From Denver, Colorado to Fort Collins, Colorado, to the office building on La Porte Avenue, and from there to my kid's school and ultimately to my child.

If these dollars got frequent flyer miles, it would be a great thing. But what the tax credit proposal allows to occur is it allows this taxpayer to give directly to the child, and it turns the leaders of the school from beggars of the government and bureaucracy into beggars of the community, people who can relate to taxpayers and speak the language that parents understand, that taxpayers understand, that communities understand, and ultimately the language the Nation needs to maintain its sovereignty as a free Republic.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I think the language, they do not become beggars. This is a beggar system because it is a bureaucratic system. You have to fill the forms out right. You have to check the exact number of boxes. You have to dot the I's and cross the T's. If you do all that, that really is a beggar system.

Mr. SCHAFFER. This really changes the dynamic entirely to a partnership.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. This becomes a visionary system. That system does not understand vision. It says, no, I can only write them a check if they have filled out this form correctly. And if they after they have spent the money, if they have sent the forms back in correctly telling me that they spent it exactly the way I have told them to, then they have done a good job. They do not ask whether children's performance has actually improved. This is a visionary system where the school board or a superintendent or a local principal or teacher can lay out a vision for their schools and for their kids, and if the community buys into that vision, they will embrace it and they will donate into this system because we have seen it happen at the State level. So they have become visionaries and cheerleaders for their kids and their local school district, and they know if they are successful it will continue.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Here is what it means for students and for States. In Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Inquirer just a few days ago published a story, the headline is ''Nonprofit Foundations Ease Schools' Budget Pains,'' and it talks about the Cherry Hill Education Foundation. According to the Inquirer, this is an article by Kristen Graham, she says, ''Across the nation a growing number of districts are relying on grassroots, independent, nonprofit foundations to fund programs and foster business relationships.'' Here is a quote from somebody named Howie Schaffer, who is the spokesman of the Public Education Network which is a national association of education funds. He says, ''The growth is exponential around the country. There are quite a few in Pennsylvania and New Jersey.'' The article goes on: ''An estimated 3,000 to 4,500 school foundations operate in the United States.''

These foundation are the ones that benefit from a tax credit that we are proposing. Pennsylvania has really led the way. I am delighted the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART) is here to tell us about her experiences in Pennsylvania and tell us a little bit about some of these kids, perhaps, that are benefiting from tax credits in her hometown.

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman is doing this, bringing people's attention to the realities of how much we can do to help children learn more just by opening up some opportunities, different ideas, opportunities like Pennsylvania is now providing. I was a State senator there for 10 years. We did work long and hard to get somebody to get something to happen, and shortly after I came to Congress actually they passed a wonderful tax credit plan that allows for these foundations to collect money from corporations, money, every dollar of which will go to educational scholarships, every dollar. There is not money wasted in this plan.

So many different organizations have started foundations. They are not all for religious education. They are not all for nonreligious. It is just very different. It gives everybody an opportunity to have all kinds of different options for their children, and it is something we have worked on long and hard in Pennsylvania. We have tried the voucher system. The Senate passed the plan. The House did not. That happens over and over again. But the general theme of it has always been to bring a more dynamic atmosphere to education, to make sure that our students all have the opportunity to get the best education they can.

In Pennsylvania now, as was mentioned, there are, I do not know how many foundations, but there are a lot of folks taking advantage of this tax credit.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Just to name a few that were mentioned in this Philadelphia Inquirer article just a few days ago, in fiscal year 2000 the Chester Education Foundation listed revenue of $1.2 million. The Philadelphia Education Fund had $7.8 million in revenue in fiscal year 2000, collecting more than $50 million since its founding in 1984.

There are more. There is the Pew Charitable Trusts, the William Penn Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation. In Bucks County you have the Centennial Foundation, which has raised about $50,000 since 1997. These are funds that raised money even before the tax credit. When the tax credit in Pennsylvania took place making it easier for Pennsylvanians to contribute to education projects managed by these nonprofits, the revenue shot through the roof. These are dollars that were not taken from the Pennsylvania school budgets. These were new dollars that were added into the education system in a nondiscriminatory fashion.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, the beauty of this and the amazing part of this is in the States that have established this, these are voluntary contributions to your local public schools, to these education scholarship funds. And it is amazing to watch Americans willing to invest that kind of money in education. As long as they are willing to, as long as the opportunity is there for your local public schools and for all of our kids, different school districts and different schools have different constituencies, but to watch a potentially new massive infusion of dollars into the educational system that builds the linkage between that local school and their community again that they have just seen erode over the last few years.

□ 2300

So what is happening in Pennsylvania, what is happening in Minnesota, what is happening in Arizona, Illinois, Florida, this is one of those areas where Washington really ought to take heed. We are going to keep continuing to feed that beast, the bureaucratic beast, but let us complement it with this tax credit proposal that is working so well and has passed in a number of places on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. SCHAFFER. And how many times do we hear when we as political

figures are out campaigning or just in our communities from parents who say I care about the schools, I care about the kids? Even people who have no children in the schools, they are willing to invest and contribute and be part of an education community, but they are sick and tired of the wasted dollars in the programs that do not work. They are sick and tired of seeing the government shovel mountains of cash into schools that do not work and will not improve and the legacy of which is children who have a profound disadvantage in entering the workforce and becoming part of our economy.

These parents tell us all the time if we would just build them a system that works, they will be a part of it. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART), this is her first term, and she ran a pretty vigorous campaign and were in touch with thousands of people in her District. What do they say?

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, in general, people are not happy with one system, and I think the reality of the tax credit, the voucher, whatever we are talking about, changing the system as it is, we improve each sector of it, and I think that is one of the arguments that has always been made for either a tax credit or school choice.

What people tell me, and unfortunately too many people have told me, is that they cannot afford to send their kid to the school they want to. The individual tax credit that we consider here on the Federal level for parents who send their children to schools that require tuition is a wonderful thing, and it only makes sense for us to do that. Ultimately, a parent that chooses to send his or her child to a public school will end up getting a better education there as well.

I think this is one of the things for many, many years that has been sort of talked about by a lot of people involved in public education. I am not really sure why a lot of them oppose this, because it does give them a number of different things. One, it gives them more opportunity to ease overcrowding which has become a huge burden and, of course, comes to us here in the Congress in the form of requests for dollars for new school construction. We could avoid a lot of that if we would spend much fewer dollars on a tax credit. We would find that we would not need those new school buildings. We probably would not need a lot of things that we are convinced that we need because we are so wedded to a certain system.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, if I can interject, if the District really did need a new building and that was the education enrichment project that a school District chose to undertake, the way we have got the tax credit proposal written right now, that is a real priority in a community and the community buys into it, the tax credit can be used as a revenue stream to construct that facility or to buy the new computers or to establish the new curriculum for underserved children.

Ms. HART. If the gentleman would yield, in a community that is truly growing and that is a necessity, I think that is wonderful. However, there are a lot of communities that have convinced themselves that they do need new buildings when they actually do not.

One of the examples we always look at is the city of Philadelphia where they have had a spike in young children, which is going to drop again, and the question is do we need to build a whole bunch of new elementary schools or should we allow more options in education, and if we would allow more options in education and now we do, we will find that they do not have that pressure, and they can spend the money directly on the classroom, having the best quality teachers in that classroom and then ultimately having those children be served better.

The thing is, like the gentleman asked me, what parents say in my District, I am out in the District all the time as are my colleagues, and I think we probably hear a lot of the same things. All parents really want is to make sure that their child is going to be able to succeed down the road. That means he or she needs tools. How do they get those tools? The parents teach them as well as they can at home right from wrong and all the other kinds of things, but they need quality education.

How do they get that? We are part of the cog in the wheel providing it, but we need to provide more freedoms for them, especially on the State, to do what they want, and that has been I think our mantra for a long time in Pennsylvania. It took a long time to get to that point. I know Arizona has been doing a lot of creative things for a long time. What we will see in Pennsylvania, I think we will see results in other places, not just tax credits where it helps families to afford it, but the tax credits for businesses like we have in Pennsylvania where it helps more families to make a decision they were not even considering before because they just did not have the wherewithal to do it.

Then ultimately that competition in the system, where there are options, there is always a more dynamic system. That helps if we expect our kids to do better in a dynamic future and a dynamic economy in the United States and in the world. We certainly better get them adjusted to it all their lives, that way I think they will be comfortable with it. They will be more likely to succeed, and these kinds of programs certainly present to them more of a real world opportunity for them early, to get used to it, to like the competition, to strive harder, which is exactly what we want them to do.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is pointing out, in Pennsylvania they have the tax credit and they have seen this kind of explosion of new funds moving into education. Even in the State of Michigan, where we do not have a tax credit, what we have seen is that some people will say that the tax credit, that money is only going to stay in the wealthier suburbs and those types of things but in education.

I think, again, one of the great things about America, we recognize the importance of education, that a child get a good education. The other thing that I think is happening in a State like Michigan where there is a potential of leaving too many kids behind, the community and really the State is stepping up and businesses are stepping up and saying it is not just okay for kids from this side of the State, to make sure that no child is left behind in this side of the State. We need to make sure that every child in Michigan has the opportunity for a good education.

So even without a tax credit, proposal or model in place in Michigan, there are dollars flowing into education in Michigan because people want to step up, and those dollars are going into Detroit. They are going into all different parts of the State, and what we want to do is we want to accelerate that, and we want to grow that number through a Federal tax credit, and I wish we could do it through a State tax credit so that we could get the same dynamics kind of going on as in Pennsylvania.

We know that when a State does it, we get an infusion of new dollars, and what we want to do is we want to accelerate that process and accelerate the number of dollars and new dollars, and I think that is also the difference between what we are talking about with a tax credit versus a voucher. Too often vouchers are viewed as being, rather than what they do is they say okay, here is the education pie, now if the State does vouchers, it means some people are going to win because they are now going to get a croucher and they did not get one before, and there are going to be certain people that lose because that education pie is going to be split more ways than what it was before.

What a tax credit does it takes this education pie and grows it so that there will be more dollars invested in it, and basically our public schools will win, our kids that go to public schools will win. Our private and parochial schoolers, home schoolers, just they will all now have an opportunity, and we have a much better probability that we will not leave a child behind than what we have under the current system.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, every system has these education scholarship foundations that exist but the requests for scholarships, the applications, are far exceeded by dollars available, and usually these foundations are started

by some philanthropist who wants to help them and make a difference in one neighborhood or another, but we just need more of them because the record is very clear. These foundations, these scholarship funds work.

I brought with me today some testimony from a little boy in Colorado who testified in the Colorado legislature, before the Colorado legislature as it considered an education tax credit in my State, and here I will just read a couple paragraphs. His name was Joe Ray Sierra, and this testimony was delivered just last February.

He says, ''I am really glad that I do not have to go to my old school anymore. There are always people selling drugs there. I was afraid to go to school because I did not want to get beat up anymore at my old school. They gave me answers to the CSAP test,'' which is the State standardized test in my State. ''They gave the kids the answers,'' and I will go on.

''They were not very helpful to me with math, reading and writing. I did not like my old school at all. I like my new school because they help me better. They teach me in a way that is right for me. The teacher is nice to me and so are the other school kids. I also like that I do not have to switch classes. I like Dove Christian Academy so much that I want to come back again. The new school I go to does help me a lot more. Dove Christian Academy does different things to help me learn. I read a lot better now and I think my math and writing are better, too. I am really thankful to ACE,'' and ACE is the name of the scholarship foundation, one of them, in Colorado.

''I am really thankful to ACE for the money they have given me. I am so glad I was able to come to the school and learn.''

□ 2310

''Now I have that chance to get a good education and maybe even go to college. I never would have ever thought that before, if it weren't for ACE.'' And Joe's teacher also testified that ''Joe Ray was designated learning disabled in the local public school. At the end of his fifth grade year he was reading between a second and third grade level. He hated writing anything. His distraction level was extremely high. And to complicate things more, he had some fine motor problems.''

So he was basically doomed in the school that the government told him to attend. Some schools are great for kids. Most public schools are great for kids and kids who are just like Joe Ray. But in this case the school was not what he needed. He got the scholarship, and he is at the school that makes more sense for him now, an academy that better meets this child's needs, and the kid is back up to grade level and now he is even talking about going before the State legislature and talking about going to college.

It is kids like this that stand to gain from this tax credit debate. We are going to have some opposition from people who think choice is a bad idea or that liberty tends to threaten the power of the bureaucracy. And that is true to a degree. And if we only care about the bureaucracy, then we are going to keep voting to give it exclusive monopoly status in running schools. But if we decide that kids like Joe Ray Sierra matter more than the government, matter more than the bureaucracy, matter more than programs and the internal language of education generally, then we will make the country better for lots of kids just like him.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think this really points out a couple of things. Number one, whatever we do in education, the focus has to be on the kids. It has to be focused on Joe Ray. It cannot be focused on the bureaucracy or the system. So we have to keep the focus on the kids.

The second thing is we have to keep the focus on every child. We cannot afford to leave a single child behind.

The third thing is we really have to drive for parental involvement, or adult involvement with every kid to enable them to learn. Somebody has to ask them at the end of the day how their day was at school, what they have to get done, and what they have to get ready for for tomorrow.

And the other thing we need to do is what Joe Ray pointed out here, is that every child has the right to go to a school where the only thing that they have to worry about and be afraid of is the test, the next test, the next exam, not about the drugs or the violence that is going on. Every child deserves and has a right to go to a safe and drug-free school, where the only thing they fear is the exam they are going to get in the afternoon and not walking from class to class or from their locker to their next classroom.

Mr. SCHAFFER. We hear all the time from the defenders of the bureaucracy that if we move forward with these simple choice mechanisms, and we found a way to move forward with a choice mechanism that does not even affect a single penny of the money appropriated to the bureaucratic model, they still tell us this is going to somehow harm education.

The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has seen that choice makes a difference in the lives of Pennsylvania children.

Ms. HART. The whole situation of labeling a child has become, I think, a big problem in a lot of our government schools. If a child is told at a young age there is something wrong with him or her, then that child is going to believe it. I think the ultimate solution is, as the gentleman suggests and as Joe Ray pointed out, every child who is given an opportunity to excel and encouraged to excel will. They will to the degree that they are able, instead of to the degree someone told them they can.

One of the opportunities tax credits would also gives us is the opportunity for children who would not be able to afford some of the institutions that might believe specialize and be able to help them through a difficulty, whether it is a speech difficulty or some other kind of behavioral problem, that they will have access. I think it is important for their parents to be the ones who can make the choice of which type of educational institution is going to be best for the child.

Unfortunately, right now, cost prohibits them from doing that in a lot of cases and they only have one option. And sometimes that works for the student, but a lot of times it does not. We find some wonderful institutions closing their doors because the parents who would love to send their children there just cannot find the resources to do it. So this is another way to help those unique and diverse institutions that can help a lot of kids to continue to provide those services.

Mr. SCHAFFER. I want to point out again, Mr. Speaker, that the existing bureaucratic structure of education funding in America that is represented by this chart will not be affected by an education tax credit proposal. Now, that is a disappointment to some. I think this needs to be reformed. No doubt about that.

And I want to point out again for those who believe we are giving up, we are not giving up. We are going to continue to work on this at other committees and at other points in time. But the politics of this system is pretty brutal. All of these agencies that relate to one another fight very hard to make sure we here in Congress do not tamper with their line of work and their business. So fairness in the American education system of today is measured by the relationship between all of these agencies, the relationship between different programs within the Department, the relationship between all 50 States and districts.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield for just a second. We had a great example today. The House was in recess for, what, 7 hours today, as we debated welfare reform, or certain people debated welfare reform. And the focus on the debate was not about what is good for the individual recipient at the end of the welfare stream, to give them a helping hand up, the whole debate was between the politicians as to who was going to control the spending and who was going to put the accountability measures in.

We spent a whole day waiting as politicians fought not about what was best, but who was going to be in control, whether it was going to be politicians in Washington or bureaucrats and politicians at the State level. The debate was in the red parts here, without any consideration to the people at the bottom and without any consideration to the people at the top, the taxpayers.

Mr. SCHAFFER. And it is not just about the bills being proposed in Congress. These groups, they have organizations, sometimes they unionize, they

raise money, and they spend money on campaigns. Talk about campaign finance reform. These organizations that represent employees of this bureaucratic structure of education are the most powerful political forces in American politics today, especially when you get down to the school level.

These schools are organized, and the employees of them constitute the largest union in America and spend more money on the political process than anyone else. So that is why we get the system we have. It is not by accident. This system was deliberately designed, if you can believe that, and it was because these people have such powerful political influence.

I would ask my colleague from Pennsylvania to tell us about the politics of education. Do people in this vortex of education bureaucracy get involved in your campaign?

Ms. HART. Unfortunately, yes. And I think a lot of us have sort of two different opinions of people involved in the education system. We all know that there are some fantastic educators out there. Some of them we would count probably as our best friends, spouses, family. But there is also this behemoth structure of sort of protecting the bureaucracy folks, and that is a big problem.

Obviously, they have gotten involved in a lot of races, and I am sure they have been involved in the gentleman's as well as they have been involved in mine. The concern I hear from parents has nothing to do with preservation of the education bureaucracy. I never hear them saying, oh, please, can you make sure we still have this very strong bureaucracy in my school district so that we spend more money on the administration than in the classroom. No one ever asks me that. They always say how can we get more dollars to go to directly help the kids.

Well, let us get that bureaucracy to work with us on that goal, and then we will all be on the same page.

Mr. SCHAFFER. And while everybody on this chart has lobbyists, the two people that do not have lobbyists are the taxpayer and the child. That is our job.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. When we went to the 20 States with the Education at a Crossroads, every time we brought in a parent or a local school principal or a teacher, they always focused on the child. And the parents would come in and say, please, do this because we have to help Johnny, we have to help Mary. They would come in with the names, or they would come in with their kids and say this is what it is all about.

When we have the hearings with the bureaucracy, it is all about forms, rules, regulations, mandates, and there is not a name or a face or a child attached to it. And that was the power of going around the country and spending the time. Because when you bring the parents in, our colleague from Pennsylvania is exactly right, parents and teachers and local principals talk about that bureaucratic structure not very fondly. But they get passionate when they start talking about the kids in the classroom, because these principals and these teachers, that is why they went into education. They have got a passion for these kids. What they do not have a passion for is the paperwork, the rules, the mandates and the bureaucracy.

□ 2320

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, fairness in education should not be measured by the relationship between all government agencies. It should be measured by the relationship of children.

What we have today is a system where some children win, and some children lose. For one reason or another, the children from the poorest households, who come from inner city areas, who come from communities that do not have a lot in terms of public resources, those are the children that suffer the most. What we have seen through education tax credits that have existed in States through scholarship foundations is that the vast majority of these dollars are distributed on the basis of need, and I know that is true in Pennsylvania as well.

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I actually represent a school district that has been termed academically bankrupt. Any student who goes to that school district is sentenced to not learning anything, and it is not right. A lot of money is spent, and we are getting no results. We do need to change the sytem.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the commitments from our President, who has given his promise to help us get this bill passed, the promise of the Speaker and our leadership here in the House to get this bill to the floor. It is because of their commitment to children and an education tax credit that we are having this debate now. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART) for participating in this Special Order. We will do it again next week to speak about solutions for our children.

COMMUNICATION FROM FIELD COORDINATOR OF THE HON. CHRIS CANNON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN) laid before the House the following communication from Russell Hillman, Field Coordinator of the Honorable CHRIS CANNON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a deposition subpoena issued by the Third District Court, Salt Lake Department, State of Utah, in a civil case pending there.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL HILLMAN,
Field Coordinator.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HALL of Ohio (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of attending ambassador school.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 2002, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6829. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Limited Ports of Entry for Pet Birds, Performing or Theatrical Birds, and Poultry and Poultry Products [Docket No. 01-121-2] received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6830. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nuclear Explosives Safety Study Process—received April 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6831. A letter from the Director (FinCEN), Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Anti-Money Laundering Programs for Money Services Businesses (RIN: 1506-AA28) received April 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6832. A letter from the Director (FinCEN), Department of the Treasury, transmitting

the Department's final rule—Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Anti-Money Laundering Programs for Financial Institutions (RIN: 1506-AA28) received April 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6833. A letter from the Director, FDIC Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Capital; Leverage and Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance: Nonfinancial Equity Investments (RIN: 3064-AC47) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6834. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6835. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations—received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6836. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-D-7519] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6837. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-B-7426] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6838. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7777] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6839. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6840. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations—received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6841. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Electric Motor-Driven Mine Equipment and Accessories and High Voltage Longwall Equipment Standards for Underground Coal Mines (RIN: 1219-AA75) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6842. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the Definitions and the Continuous Emission Monitoring Provisions of the Acid Rain Program and the NOx Budget Trading Program [FRL-7207-4] (RIN: 2060-AJ43) received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6843. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Great Falls Carbon Monoxide Redesignation to Attainment and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes [MT-001-0037a; FRL-7208-8] received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6844. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Approval of Operating Permits Program; State of Connecticut [CT-021-1224a; A-1-FRL-7210-9] received May 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6845. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia: 1-Hour Ozone Attainment Demonstration, Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets, Reasonably Available Control Measures, Contingency Measures and Attainment Date Extension [GA-57-200224; FRL-7206-2] received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6846. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation—received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6847. A letter from the Assistant Administrator For Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Revisions to Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements [Docket No. 010313063-1297-02; I.D. 121200A] (RIN: 0648-AO20) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6848. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 011218304-1304-01; I.D. 020802A] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6849. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Effluent Limitations Guidelines, Pretreatment Standards, and New Source Performance Standards for the Iron and Steel Manufacturing Point Source Category [FRL-7206-7] (RIN: 2040-AC90) received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6850. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Award of Grants and Cooperative Agreements for the Special Projects and Programs Authorized by the Agency's FY 2002 Appropriations Act—received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6851. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Revisions to the Clean Water Act Regulatory Definitions of ''Fill Material'' and''Discharge of Fill Material'' [FRL-7209-2] (RIN: 2040-AD51) received May 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6852. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2002-5) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6853. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Guidance under Section 355(e); Recognition of Gain on Certain Distributions of Stock or Securities in Connection with an Acquisition [TD 8988] (RIN: 1545-BA55) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6854. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Taxation of Tax-Exempt Organizations' Income From Corporate Sponsorship (RIN: 1545-BA68) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6855. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting (Announcement 2002-37) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6856. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2002-21) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6857. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting (Rev. Proc. 2002-39) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6858. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Changes in accounting periods and methods of accounting (Rev. Proc. 2002-28) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6859. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Required Distributions from Retirement Plans (RIN: 1545-AY69, 1545-AY70) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6860. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2002-6) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6861. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Notice and Opportunity for Hearing upon Filing of Notice of Lien [TD 8979] (RIN: 1545-AW91) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6862. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Announcement and Report Concerning Advance Pricing Agreements—received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 422. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4737) to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–466). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 4736. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of Coltsville in the State of Connecticut for potential inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 4737. A bill to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Agriculture, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 4738. A bill to facilitate the ability of certain spectrum auction winners to pursue alternative measures required in the public interest to meet the needs of wireless telecommunications consumers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 4739. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of a project to reclaim and reuse wastewater within and outside of the service area of the City of Austin Water and Wastewater Utility, Texas; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. OBEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 4740. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a national research program to address the animal disease known as chronic wasting disease, which is afflicting wild deer and elk herds in many States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 4741. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide affordable prescription drugs to low-income Medicare beneficiaries and stop-loss prescription drug coverage for all Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMPSON (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FROST, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4742. A bill to restore a vision for the United States human space flight program by instituting a series of incremental goals that will facilitate the scientific exploration of the solar system and aid in the search for life elsewhere in the universe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 4743. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to credit prospectively individuals serving as caregivers of dependent relatives with deemed wages for up to five years of such service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. HEFLEY):

H.R. 4744. A bill to make it more likely that the cleanup and closure of the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site will be completed on or before December 15, 2006; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 4745. A bill to provide for the geographic reclassification of a county for purposes of equitable hospital payment rates under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 4746. A bill to assess the extent of the backlog in DNA analysis of rape kit samples, and to improve investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases with DNA evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. SPRATT):

H.R. 4747. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study certain sites in the historic district of Beaufort, South Carolina, relating to the Reconstruction Era to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SHOWS (for himself, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. CANNON):

H.J. Res. 93. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

242. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of West Virginia, relative to Senate Resolution No. 603 memorializing the United States Congress to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; to the Committee on International Relations.

243. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 411 memorializing the United States Congress to designate February 6, 2002, as ''Ronald Reagan Day'' in this Commonwealth; to the Committee on Government Reform.

244. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 490 memorializing the United States Congress to urge the National Park Service to facilitate the placement of a permanent commemorative plaque recognizing the site of the slave quarters and to work for continuing recognition of this historic site; to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 31: Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 122: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 218: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 239: Mr. CARDIN and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 595: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 665: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 778: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 792: Mr. HORN and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 914: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 959: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 1017: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1184: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. DUNCAN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1256: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1262: Mr. GILMAN and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1296: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1341: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 1494: Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 1556: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1581: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1723: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1811: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 1822: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1859: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 1877: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1904: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2009: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 2117: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2125: Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 2638: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 2641: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 2727: Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 2874: Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 3025: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3130: Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 3215: Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 3238: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 3259: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 3278: Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3321: Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 3335: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 3399: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 3430: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 3469: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 3544: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 3569: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 3661: Mr. BACA, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 3673: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 3710: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 3717: Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3773: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 3777: Mr. PETRI, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. EHRLICH.
H.R. 3794: Mr. MENENDEZ and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3808: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3838: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 3857: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 3884: Mr. KLECZKA.
H.R. 3895: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3915: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 3916: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 3989: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 4037: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4043: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 4066: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 4078: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4103: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 4210: Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 4446: Mr. COMBEST and Mr. OSE.
H.R. 4479: Ms. HART.
H.R. 4483: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4582: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4614: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 4620: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 4635: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 4642: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 4646: Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. STARK, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 4658: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 4660: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 4664: Mr. FORBES, Ms. HART, and Mr. GRUCCI.
H.R. 4667: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. FROST, and Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 4676: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 4698: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4704: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4710: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 4715: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 4716: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 4728: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. BONOIR.
H.J. Res. 86: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.J. Res. 92: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H. Con. Res. 213: Mr. HYDE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WU, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Con. Res. 320: Mr. TIERNEY.
H. Con. Res. 333: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H. Con. Res. 385: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. FILNER.
H. Res. 346: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H. Res. 418: Ms. HART, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 397: Mr. TANCREDO.
H.R. 3215: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3686: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 3799: Mr. TANCREDO.
H. Res. 346: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3994

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 14, line 2, strike ''and''.

Page 14, after line 2, insert the following:

(K) programs for housing, rebuilding urban infrastructure, and supporting basic urban services; and

Page 14, line 3, strike ''(K)'' and insert ''(L)''.