We have a next step to take; and if the other body will work on reauthorization, we can move forward. But please vote ''yes'' on this extension today.

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

We have heard a great deal from the other side indicating that evidently when this bill originally came through, the historic 1996 legislation, that it was bipartisan. Yet we have heard the chairman that was chairman of the committee during that time indicate just the opposite, and I believe that the record certainly indicates that. The other side, the other party, opposed this legislation in committee and opposed it on the floor when it was voted on. It did that three times. It overwhelmingly opposed it. It was not until President Clinton finally said he was going to support it that there was finally, for basically the first time, any support from the other side. I think the record should show that to be the case.

Another point is when all we do is extend this legislation and do not go with H.R. 4, what we are doing is denying an additional $4 billion for child care over the next 5 years. There is no assurance of full TANF funding for the next 5 years. In the area of marriage and families, there will be no additional $1.5 billion targeted to promoting healthy marriages, no added State flexibility to count spending on strengthening families. It goes on and on on what we will be denying ourselves. It also denies the added flexibility to spend an additional $4 billion in unspent prior TANF funds.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the comparison to how we proceeded in 1996 versus how we have proceeded in the year 2002, 2003, and 2004 is very instructive. In 1996, we had a President who ran for the Presidency saying that he would end welfare as we know it. He established three parameters for a new welfare bill, which were flexibility to our States, accountability, and resources. In 1996 in a bipartisan manner, we passed welfare reform with the support of our national Governors. In 2002 and 2003 and 2004, this body has passed legislation in a very partisan manner, without the support of our national Governors, for good reason.

The three pillars on which welfare reform was built in 1996 which has gotten such praise from both sides of the aisle are severely compromised by the legislation that passed this body.

□ 1230

First, on flexibility to the States, we take it away in the bill that we passed. We cannot use vocational education as the States would like to do, and I can name example after example.

On accountability, we have make shiftwork rather than real jobs, people moving up the economic ladder in the legislation that passed this body. And in resources we provide $1 billion only in new child care that is mandatory, even though the estimates are that the mandates in this bill will cost our States an additional $11 billion, an unfunded mandate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this extension because it is clean. It has none of those extraneous issues in it. It extends the 1996 law for 3 additional months. And then I hope we will get back to working together as Democrats and Republicans for a long-term extension that builds on the success of 1996.

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

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

I wish the legislation before us today were not needed. But we do need to pass this bill. That is the only way we can have any hope of reaching agreement this year on ways to better assist low-income Americans in going to work and supporting their families.

I am pleased that the House has taken action on that important goal and look forward to defending our broader welfare reauthorization bill, H.R. 4, in conference. It is a good bill which promotes stronger families, healthy marriage, and more involvement by fathers in their children's lives, which all would improve child well-being. H.R. 4 also expects and supports more work in exchange for welfare benefits. That is what made the 1996 welfare reform so successful at lifting families off of welfare and out of poverty and dependence.

It is past time for additional commonsense measures to help the 2 million parents that remain on welfare today go to work and better support their families.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, during the June 22, 2004 House debate on extending welfare programs, Democrats suggested the process behind the historic 1996 welfare reform law was far more bipartisan than today.

They need to recheck the facts.

The Republic reauthorization bills passed by the House in 2002 and 2003 were more "bipartisan" than two out of three welfare bills considered in the mid-1990s.

During the 1990s, the vast majority of House Democrats OPPOSED welfare reform at every stage in the legislative process. The single exception was on the conference report that became the 1996 welfare reform law, when 50 percent of Democrats voted for welfare reform—but only after then-President Clinton announced he would sign the Republican bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4589.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of H.R. 4589 and H.R. 4372.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP MONTH

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 658) recognizing National Homeownership Month and the importance of homeownership in the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 658

Whereas the President of the United States has designated the month of June as National Homeownership Month each of the last two years and will do the same in 2004;

Whereas the national homeownership rate in the United States has reached a record high of 68.6 percent and, for the first time, more than half of all minority families are homeowners;

Whereas the people of the United States are one of the best-housed populations in the world;

Whereas owning a home is a fundamental part of the American dream and is the largest personal investment many families will ever make;

Whereas homeownership provides economic security for homeowners by aiding them in building wealth over time and strengthens communities through a greater stake among homeowners in local schools, civic organizations, and churches;

Whereas improving homeownership opportunities requires the commitment and cooperation of the private, public, and nonprofit sectors, including the Federal Government and State and local governments; and

Whereas the current laws of the United States encourage homeownership and should continue to do so in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) fully supports the goals and ideals of National Homeownership Month; and

(2) recognizes the importance of homeownership in building strong communities and families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on this resolution.

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