

and poverty reduction, all of which H.R. 4737 fails to adequately address. I believe the true measure of the success of welfare reform is in our ability to reduce poverty and to move recipients off of welfare and into long-term employment. The Cardin Substitute, which I strongly support, builds on the success of the 1996 welfare law by requiring welfare recipients to move toward employment, while providing the resources necessary to escape poverty, to move up the economic ladder.

H.R. 4737 places a huge unfunded mandate burden on the states, while at the same time significantly limiting the flexibility of states to develop their own approaches to moving people off welfare. If enacted over 80 percent of the states will have to implement fundamental changes to their current welfare program. The provisions in this bill will cost states an estimated \$8.3–11 billion dollars by 2007, almost four times what the Republican bill provides, at the same time states are facing large budget cuts and enormous budget deficits. Under H.R. 4737, the State of Texas alone, would have to provide over \$688 million to support such mandates, ultimately forcing the state to either raise taxes or cut benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I also oppose H.R. 4737 because it jeopardizes our ability to protect America's children, by merely providing an additional \$2 billion dollars for mandatory child care. H.R. 4737 also imposes major new work requirements on recipients, but made no progress toward reducing the severe child care shortage. The so-called "increase" that its proponents are touting provides only enough money to cover inflation, costing the states an additional \$3.8 billion in child care cost. This bill also unfairly continues the existing ban on providing assistance to legal immigrants.

Since the enactment of the 1996 welfare law's, millions of previously dependent families joined the labor force in unprecedented numbers as caseloads fell by more than half and the percentage of working recipients rose to historic heights. However, as one who supported the 1996 reforms, I believe there is a point where we need to accept that those remaining on welfare are likely to be the hardest to place in jobs due to a lack of education, training, or available child care. Mr. Speaker, there is a better way. My colleague from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN has put forth an alternative that focuses on providing opportunity, demanding responsibility and reflect the approach that work itself is the fastest and most effective means of preparing recipients for self-sufficiency. Yet the H.R. 4737 fails to recognize this reality. The Cardin Substitute, provides states with the flexibility and freedom to develop programs which allow recipients to count education and training, including post-secondary training toward participation rates for up to 24 months. this bill raises the bar on the work requirement and provides the states with the resources to meet these challenges by providing an additional \$11 billion for mandatory child care funding over five years to meet the work requirement. By requiring those who can work to do so, we recognize the dignity of all labor and the moral imperative of self-reliance. We should insist on work for it's instructional value—it is the only certain route out of dependence and poverty. Additionally, this bill removes the ban on states serving legal immigrants with Federal TANF funds, eliminates the ban on providing Medicaid to

pregnant women and children, and it restores Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits for disabled legal immigrant children.

The Cardin substitute rewards self-sufficiency and gives families the help they need to successfully move from welfare to work. It is the responsibility of Congress to build on the successes of the 1996 welfare law's and to ensure that low-income families are given a legitimate opportunity to move out of poverty. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support the Cardin Substitute.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Republican bill.

My home state of Massachusetts has operated a successful welfare program, utilizing a waiver in order to focus mandatory work activities on families without major barriers to work. Through this, we have succeeded in moving most of these families into employment. The current caseload is barely half of what it was before state welfare reform began.

Despite this success, three-quarters of those remaining are families with serious barriers to employment, including a disability or the need to care for a disabled child.

Massachusetts and other states need the ability to decide what is the approximate mix of services and activities in order to move welfare families from poverty to self-sufficiency. Unfortunately, this bill reduces state discretion.

Further, I believe this bill falls short in helping teen mothers break the cycle of welfare and poverty. While only 6 percent of the caseload in my home state of Massachusetts consists of teen parents, historically about 50 percent of welfare mothers started parenting as teenagers. While the 1996 law set strong goals for teen parents, this bill fails to make some modest improvements which would help these families break out of welfare dependency.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill and support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4737 and in support of the Democratic substitute. It is imperative that we provide families with the necessary ingredients to produce self-sufficiency and job stability. The Democratic substitute accomplishes this important goal.

I supported welfare reform under the Clinton Administration and these reforms have been effective in cutting our welfare rolls in half. In my home state of Illinois, the number of welfare recipients has been reduced by 74 percent over the past five years. However, H.R. 4737 will undo the successful strategies states now employ to move Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) recipients to jobs. While H.R. 4737 is well intended, I am concerned that we will undermine the law's stated goal of ending dependence on government assistance if we do not have adequate resources available for safe and affordable childcare, transportation, and healthcare. The legislation provides no help to states in implementing the new work requirements, which I support, and does nothing to extend childcare to the estimated 15 million children who are currently eligible for such assistance, but lack coverage because states do not have the necessary resources.

The Democratic substitute maintains state flexibility, focuses on real work, and helps families escape poverty and achieve permanent employment. It increases childcare funding by \$11 billion over 5 years so that the

tough work requirements can be met without harming the children of those receiving benefits. This substitute does not impose massive new mandates on states and work requirements on impoverished mothers without the assistance necessary to make welfare reform work.

Mr. Speaker, although I support responsible welfare reform, the Republican proposal is not sufficient. I do not want to see the federal government take a step backward in our effort to reduce the welfare rolls. For these reasons, I oppose H.R. 4737 and support the Democratic substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of yesterday, further proceedings on H.R. 4737 will be postponed until later this afternoon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY L. JOHNSON, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2002

Hon. DENNIS J. 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, that I have determined that the subpoena for documents and testimony issued to me by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia is not material and relevant, nor is it consistent with the privileges and rights of the House. Accordingly, I have instructed the Office of General Counsel to object to and to move to quash the subpoena.

Sincerely,

NANCY L. JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. DAVID L. HOBSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable DAVID L. HOBSON, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2002.

Hon. DENNIS J. 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, that I have determined that the subpoena for documents and testimony issued to me by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia is not material and relevant, nor is it consistent with the privileges and rights of the House. Accordingly, I have instructed the Office of

General Counsel to object to and to move to quash the subpoena.

Sincerely,

DAVID L. HOBSON,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON.
PORTER J. GOSS, MEMBER OF
CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable PORTER J. GOSS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2002.

Hon. DENNIS J. 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, that I have determined that the subpoena for documents and testimony issued to me by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia is not material and relevant, nor is it consistent with the privileges and rights of the House. Accordingly, I have instructed the Office of General Counsel to object to and to move to quash the subpoena.

Sincerely,

PORTER J. GOSS,
Member of Congress.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
UNITED STATES DELEGATION OF
CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-
PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. HOUGHTON, New York, Chairman
Mr. GILMAN, New York
Mr. LAFALCE, New York
Mr. SHAW, Florida
Mr. LIPINSKI, Illinois
Ms. SLAUGHTER, New York
Mr. STEARNS, Florida
Mr. MANZULLO, Illinois
Mr. DAN MILLER, Florida
Mr. SOUDER, Indiana
Mr. ENGLISH, Pennsylvania
There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-
PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, notwithstanding the provisions of that section regarding the chairmanship, and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. KOLBE, Arizona, Chairman
Mr. DREIER, California
Mr. STENHOLM, Texas
Mr. BARTON, Texas
Mr. DOOLEY, California
Mr. PASTOR, Arizona

Mr. FILNER, California
Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, California
Mr. CANNON, Utah
Mr. REYES, Texas
Mr. TANCREDI, Colorado
Mr. UDALL, New Mexico
There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-211)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Burma emergency is to continue beyond May 20, 2002, to the *Federal Register* for publication. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on May 17, 2001.

The crisis between the United States and Burma, constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Burma, including its policies of committing large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma, that led to the declaration of a national emergency on May 20, 1997, has not been resolved. These policies are hostile to U.S. interests and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to Burma and maintain in force the sanctions against Burma to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 16, 2002.

PERIODIC REPORT ON THE NA-
TIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RE-
SPECT TO BURMA—MESSAGE
FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-
212)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C.

1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report prepared by my Administration on the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 16, 2002.

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 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1516

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY,
WORK, AND FAMILY PROMOTION
ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, May 15, 2002, proceedings will now resume on 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 Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. CARDIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pending is the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 422, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

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

Mr. CARDIN. 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 198, nays 222, not voting 14, as follows: