

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF  
CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH  
RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF  
CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS RE-  
PORTED 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 recommitment, 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 wel-

fare 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 done 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 pol-

icy. 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-minute, 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	Graves	Pitts	Holt	McCarthy (NY)	Sabo
Barr	Green (WI)	Platts	Honda	McCollum	Sanchez
Bartlett	Greenwood	Pombo	Hooley	McDermott	Sanders
Barton	Grucci	Portman	Hoyer	McGovern	Sandlin
Bass	Gutknecht	Pryce (OH)	Inslee	McIntyre	Sawyer
Bereuter	Hansen	Putnam	Israel	McKinney	Schakowsky
Biggert	Hart	Quinn	Jackson (IL)	McNulty	Schiff
Billirakis	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich	Jackson-Lee	Meehan	Scott
Blunt	Hayes	Ramstad	(TX)	Meek (FL)	Serrano
Boehrlert	Hayworth	Regula	Jefferson	Meeks (NY)	Sherman
Boehner	Hefley	Rehberg	John	Menendez	Shows
Bonilla	Herger	Reynolds	Johnson, E. B.	Millender-	Skelton
Bono	Hilleary	Riley	Jones (OH)	McDonald	Slaughter
Boozman	Hobson	Rogers (KY)	Kanjorski	Mink	Smith (WA)
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Rogers (MI)	Kaptur	Mollohan	Snyder
Brown (SC)	Horn	Rohrabacher	Kennedy (RI)	Moore	Solis
Bryant	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen	Kildee	Moran (VA)	Spratt
Burr	Houghton	Roukema	Kilpatrick	Nadler	Stenholm
Buyer	Hulshof	Royce	Kind (WI)	Neal	Strickland
Callahan	Hunter	Ryan (WI)	Klecza	Oberstar	Tanner
Calvert	Hyde	Ryun (KS)	Kucinich	Obey	Tauscher
Camp	Isakson	Saxton	LaFalce	Oliver	Taylor (MS)
Cannon	Issa	Schaffer	Lampson	Ortiz	Thompson (CA)
Cantor	Istook	Schrock	Langevin	Owens	Thompson (MS)
Capito	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner	Lantos	Pallone	Thurman
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Sessions	Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Tierney
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Shadegg	Larson (CT)	Pastor	Towns
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Shaw	Lee	Payne	Udall (CO)
Coble	Jones (NC)	Shays	Levin	Pelosi	Udall (NM)
Collins	Keller	Sherwood	Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Velazquez
Combest	Kelly	Shinkus	Lipinski	Phelps	Visclosky
Cooksey	Kennedy (MN)	Shuster	Lofgren	Pomeroy	Waters
Cox	Kerns	Simmons	Lowey	Price (NC)	Watson (CA)
Crane	King (NY)	Simpson	Lucas (KY)	Rahall	Watt (NC)
Crenshaw	Kingston	Skeen	Luther	Rangel	Waxman
Cubin	Kirk	Smith (MI)	Lynch	Rivers	Weiner
Culberson	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)	Maloney (CT)	Rodriguez	Wexler
Cunningham	LaHood	Smith (TX)	Maloney (NY)	Roemer	Woolsey
Davis, Jo Ann	Latham	Souder	Markey	Ross	Wu
Davis, Tom	LaTourette	Stearns	Matheson	Rothman	Wynn
Deal	Leach	Stump	Matsui	Roybal-Allard	
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Sullivan	McCarthy (MO)	Rush	
DeMint	Lewis (KY)	Sununu			
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Sweeney			
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Tancredo			
Dreier	Lucas (OK)	Tauzin			
Duncan	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)			
Dunn	McCrery	Terry			
Ehlers	McHugh	Thomas			
Ehrlich	McInnis	Thune			
Emerson	McKeon	Tiahrt			
English	Mica	Tiberi			
Everett	Miller, Dan	Toomey			
Ferguson	Miller, Gary	Turner			
Flake	Miller, Jeff	Upton			
Fletcher	Moran (KS)	Vitter			
Foley	Morella	Walden			
Forbes	Myrick	Walsh			
Fossella	Nethercutt	Wamp			
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Watkins (OK)			
Gallegly	Northup	Watts (OK)			
Ganske	Norwood	Weldon (FL)			
Gekas	Nussle	Weldon (PA)			
Gilchrest	Osborne	Weller			
Gillmor	Ose	Whitfield			
Gilman	Otter	Wicker			
Goode	Oxley	Wilson (NM)			
Goodlatte	Paul	Wilson (SC)			
Goss	Pence	Wolf			
Graham	Petri	Young (AK)			
Granger	Pickering	Young (FL)			

## NAYS—200

Ackerman	Cardin	Doyle
Allen	Carson (IN)	Edwards
Andrews	Carson (OK)	Engel
Baca	Clay	Eshoo
Baird	Clayton	Etheridge
Baldacci	Clement	Evans
Baldwin	Clyburn	Farr
Barcia	Condit	Fattah
Barrett	Conyers	Filner
Becerra	Costello	Ford
Bentsen	Coyne	Frank
Berkley	Cramer	Frost
Berman	Crowley	Gephardt
Berry	Cummings	Gonzalez
Bishop	Davis (CA)	Gordon
Blagojevich	Davis (FL)	Green (TX)
Blumenauer	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Bonior	DeFazio	Hall (TX)
Borski	DeGette	Harman
Boswell	Delahunt	Hastings (FL)
Boyd	DeLauro	Hill
Brady (PA)	Deutsch	Hilliard
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Hinchey
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Hinojosa
Capps	Doggett	Hoeffel
Capuano	Dooley	Holden

McCarthy (NY)	Sabo
McCollum	Sanchez
McDermott	Sanders
McGovern	Sandlin
McIntyre	Sawyer
McKinney	Schakowsky
McNulty	Schiff
Meehan	Scott
Meek (FL)	Serrano
Meeks (NY)	Sherman
Menendez	Shows
Millender-	Skelton
McDonald	Slaughter
Mink	Smith (WA)
Mollohan	Snyder
Moore	Solis
Moran (VA)	Spratt
Nadler	Stenholm
Neal	Strickland
Oberstar	Tanner
Obey	Tauscher
Oliver	Taylor (MS)
Ortiz	Thompson (CA)
Owens	Thompson (MS)
Pallone	Thurman
Pascrell	Tierney
Pastor	Towns
Payne	Udall (CO)
Pelosi	Udall (NM)
Peterson (MN)	Velazquez
Phelps	Visclosky
Pomeroy	Waters
Price (NC)	Watson (CA)
Rahall	Watt (NC)
Rangel	Waxman
Rivers	Weiner
Rodriguez	Wexler
Roemer	Woolsey
Ross	Wu
Rothman	Wynn
Roybal-Allard	
Rush	

## NOT VOTING—15

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

## □ 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