

By freeing up federal spectrum for the market, consumers who are coming to depend on mobile communications will greatly benefit.

Wireless technology increases economic efficiency and productivity, increases convenience and connectivity for individuals and families, and is ready to be a major growth sector of the technology economy.

I would like to point out some key aspects of this bill that make it deserving of support by all in this House. Number 1 is filling national security needs.

This bill has a sustainable and predictable funding mechanism to ensure DOD does not have to cut corners with their communications.

Robust communications are especially critical to our modern military's ability to get its job done, and DOD, and all other federal agencies should be fully, 100 percent compensated for spectrum relocation costs.

Number two is the Congressional oversight of the spectrum auction and relocation process to be led by the Commerce Committee and the GAO.

While the Department of Defense may be the most essential federal agency and one with a great tradition of heroism and honor—waste, fraud, and abuse do occur there. That is no particular criticism of DOD, just the federal government in general.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass this consensus legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 1320, the "Commercial Spectrum Enhancement Act," to ensure that consumers benefit from the tremendous technological advances in commercial wireless services.

I had several concerns when this bill was first introduced, and I commend Chairmen TAUZIN and UPTON for working with me to address my concerns.

It is important that the Committee on Energy and Commerce, whenever it creates a direct funding mechanism to achieve a policy goal, ensure that both the Committee and the congress maintain full and effective oversight abilities. I am comfortable that the substitute before us achieves that goal.

First, it directs that both the Comptroller General and the Energy and Commerce and Appropriations Committees receive reports on the preliminary and final cost estimates for all relocations. The Committees and the General Accounting Office (GAO) will also receive reports on an annual basis regarding adherence to cost estimates and proposed timelines. These materials, taken together, will permit the Congress to closely monitor the spending inclinations of the Department of Defense and other agencies as they relocate to new spectrum.

Also—this is particularly important—if an agency ever exceeds its spending estimates by 10 percent, it has to justify that increase both to the relevant Committees and to the GAO. In addition, the government agency in question is prohibited from spending the additional request for 45 days while the Congress examines the reason for the cost overrun.

These provisions are not perfect, but they represent a good faith effort on the part of the Energy and Commerce leadership to exercise effective oversight over the relocation process. I am pleased that Chairman TAUZIN, Subcommittee Chairman UPTON, Subcommittee Ranking Member MARKEY and I will be working with the GAO throughout the process to

ensure that its work is thorough and its oversight is effective.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to passing this legislation and to bringing the next generation of wireless services to America's consumers.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1320.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MARKEY. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### WELFARE REFORM EXTENSION ACT OF 2003

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2350) to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2350

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Welfare Reform Extension Act of 2003".

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the amendment or repeal shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Social Security Act.

#### SEC. 3. CONTINUATION OF TANF BLOCK GRANT FUNDING.

(a) STATE FAMILY ASSISTANCE GRANT.—Section 403(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and 2002" and inserting "2002, and 2003"; and

(2) by striking subparagraphs (B) through (E) and inserting the following:

"(B) STATE FAMILY ASSISTANCE GRANT.—The State family assistance grant payable to a State for a fiscal year shall be the amount that bears the same ratio to the amount specified in subparagraph (C) of this paragraph as the amount required to be paid to the State under this paragraph for fiscal year 2002 (determined without regard to any reduction pursuant to section 409 or 412(a)(1)) bears to the total amount required to be paid under this paragraph for fiscal year 2002 (as so determined).

"(C) APPROPRIATION.—Out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated for fiscal year 2003 \$16,566,542,000 for grants under this paragraph."

(b) MATCHING GRANTS FOR THE TERRITORIES.—Section 1108(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1308(b)(2)) is amended by striking "2002" and inserting "2003".

(c) BONUS TO REWARD DECREASE IN ILLEGITIMACY RATIO.—Section 403(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking "and 2002" and inserting "2002, and 2003"; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking "2002" and inserting "2003".

(d) SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS FOR POPULATION INCREASES IN CERTAIN STATES.—Section 403(a)(3)(H) (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(3)(H)) is amended—

(1) in the subparagraph heading, by striking "of grants for fiscal year 2002";

(2) in clause (i), by striking "fiscal year 2002" and inserting "each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003";

(3) in clause (ii), by striking "2002" and inserting "2003"; and

(4) in clause (iii), by striking "fiscal year 2002" and inserting "each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003".

(e) CONTINGENCY FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 403(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 603(b)(2)) is amended by striking "and 2002" and inserting "2002, and 2003".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 403(b)(3)(C)(ii) (42 U.S.C. 603(b)(3)(C)(ii)) is amended by striking "2002" and inserting "2003".

(f) FEDERAL LOANS FOR STATE WELFARE PROGRAMS.—Section 406(d) (42 U.S.C. 606(d)) is amended by striking "2002" and inserting "2003".

(g) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—Section 409(a)(7) (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "or 2003" and inserting "2003, or 2004"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking "2002" and inserting "2003".

(h) GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—Paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of section 412(a) (42 U.S.C. 612(a)(1)(A) and (2)(A)) are each amended by striking "and 2002" and inserting "2002, and 2003".

(i) CENSUS BUREAU STUDY.—Section 414(b) (42 U.S.C. 614(b)) is amended by striking "and 2002" and inserting "2002, and 2003".

#### SEC. 4. CONTINUATION OF MANDATORY CHILD CARE FUNDING.

Section 418(a)(3)(F) (42 U.S.C. 618(a)(3)(F)) is amended by striking "fiscal year 2002" and inserting "each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003".

#### SEC. 5. CONTINUATION OF CHILD WELFARE DEMONSTRATION AUTHORITY.

Section 1130(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1320a-9(a)(2)) is amended by striking "2002" and inserting "2003".

#### SEC. 6. CONTINUATION OF ABSTINENCE EDUCATION FUNDING.

Section 510(d) (42 U.S.C. 710(d)) is amended by striking "2002" and inserting "2003".

#### SEC. 7. CONTINUATION OF TRANSITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1925(f) (42 U.S.C. 1396f-6(f)) is amended by striking "2002" and inserting "2003".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1902(e)(1)(B) (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)(1)(B)) is amended by striking "2002" and inserting "2003".

#### SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on July 1, 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2350, the Welfare Reform Extension Act of 2003. This legislation is a simple 3-month extension of key parts of the Nation's welfare system.

Since the historic 1996 welfare reform law, nearly 3 million children have been lifted from poverty, record shares of current and former welfare recipients are working, and welfare dependence has been cut in half. Despite the challenges facing our country, these welfare reforms continue to benefit families with children by promoting work by low-income parents.

Unless we act, the authorization for key welfare programs will expire on June 30, 2003. H.R. 2350 will continue current funding for these programs through September 30, 2003. That will provide the Senate more time to consider a broad welfare reauthorization bill along the lines proposed by the President and already passed by the House.

Members will recall that the House passed a broad 5-year welfare reauthorization bill last year. The Senate did not act on that bill before the 107th Congress adjourned. The 2002 House bill was the product of intensive research and evaluation, including more than 20 hearings in the House. Key provisions focused on achieving more work, less poverty, and stronger families.

In February 2003, the House again acted on a full 5-year welfare reform reauthorization bill and approved H.R. 4, an updated version of its 2002 bill. While we have been waiting for consensus on a long-term reauthorization of these programs, the House and Senate have agreed to three separate short-term extensions. Those extensions covered the first, second, and third quarters of the current fiscal year.

The legislation before us today would do more of the same, extending these programs for the fourth quarter of the current fiscal year, or through September 30, 2003. States and families would be on the receiving end if we reach agreement on a long-term reauthorization bill.

The House-passed 5-year reauthorization bill, H.R. 4, encourages even more low-income parents to work while providing more resources to support them. Unfortunately, the improvements included in H.R. 4 will continue to remain on hold while we pass short-term placeholder extensions. For example, H.R. 4 as passed by the House provides at least \$2 billion in added child care funds over 5 years, along with more flexibility in spending cash welfare funds on child care and other needs.

So long as we continue to extend our Nation's welfare system on a short-term basis, States cannot take advantage of these additional dollars or improve flexibility. That means low-income families will not see the benefits of the improvements we have proposed for the program. Ultimately, the success of the 1996 law reforms may begin to erode as well.

It is my hope H.R. 2350 will be the final short-term extension we approve, and in the next 3 months we get a comprehensive welfare reform bill to the President's desk for signature.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this 3-month extension of the funding for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, program. I also support the bill's continuation of funding for a series of programs designed to help people leave welfare for work, including child care assistance and transitional Medicaid coverage. Without this extension, funding for all these vitally important programs would expire at the end of this month.

While this bill is important, it is obviously only a stopgap measure, as the chairman has indicated. Unfortunately, this is the fourth short-term extension we have been forced to pass since last fall. Rather than continuously enacting these temporary measures, we should be sitting down to figure out how to craft a good 5-year reauthorization for the TANF program.

I appreciate my chairman's hope that this will be the last of our extensions. I can tell my chairman, the best way to make sure that this will be the last of these short-term extensions is for us to get together, Democrats and Republicans, with Members of the other body and the administration, and work out a true bipartisan compromise on a reauthorization that will help America's families.

But regrettably, the Republican leadership of this House has precluded such discussions by literally ramming through a TANF reauthorization without any hearings and without any opportunity this year for us to work our will, so once again we are stuck without a long-term commitment to many of our Nation's most important anti-poverty programs.

My friends on the other side of the aisle may be tempted to blame the other body, but let me tell the Members, I think it has been our actions, not theirs, that have stalled the opportunity to enact a comprehensive 5-year reauthorization bill. President Bush did send to Congress a rigid, Washington-knows-best welfare plan that was criticized by Governors, mayors, welfare administrators, poverty experts, and religious leaders. It focused on make-work instead of real jobs for welfare recipients, and it replaced State flexibility with unfunded mandates.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday three dozen religious leaders sent a letter to President Bush echoing these concerns. Let me quote a little from that letter. These were religious leaders, some of whom helped the administration in crafting its policy.

"Poor people are suffering; and our faith-based service providers see it every day in communities across the country . . . We believe that the budget your administration has put forward fails to protect and promote the well-being of our poorest and most vulnerable citizens. The tax cut passed by

Congress with your support provides virtually no help for those at the bottom of the economic ladder, while those at the top reap windfalls."

The letter goes on to say:

"Pro-family commitments to invest in adequate child care, education, and training for our poorest families have fallen short in your administration's proposals. The most effective and bipartisan public policies for reducing poverty have not been adequately supported by your administration."

This letter from religious leaders concludes by suggesting, "many are feeling betrayed" by the disconnect between the President's words and the actions on poverty-related issues.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of this letter.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CALL TO RENEWAL,

Washington, DC, June 9, 2003.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are all leaders in the faith community, whose churches and faith-based organizations are on the front lines of fighting poverty. Many of us have supported your faith-based initiative from the beginning of the administration. Several of us have met with you to discuss the churches' role in overcoming poverty and have offered solid support to our friends, John Dilulio and Jim Towey, who have led your Office of Faith Based and Community Initiatives. But while we have consistently backed faith-based approaches to poverty reduction, we have also insisted they must be accompanied by policies that really do assist low-income families and children as they seek self-sufficiency.

Mr. President, it is a critical time for poor people in America. Poor people are suffering; and our faith-based service providers see it every day in communities across the country. The poor are suffering because of a weakening economy. The poor are suffering because of resources being diverted to war and homeland security. And the poor are suffering because of lack of attention in national public policy.

We are writing because of our deep moral concern about consistency in your administration's support for effective policies that help alleviate poverty. We believe a lack of focus on the poor in the critical areas of budget priorities and tax policy is creating a crisis for low-income people. We believe the budget your administration has put forward fails to protect and promote the well being of our poorest and most vulnerable citizens. The tax cut just passed by the Congress with your support provides virtually no help for those at the bottom of the economic ladder, while those at the top reap windfalls. The resulting spending cuts, at both federal and state levels, in the critical areas of health care, education, and social services, will fall heaviest on the poor. Budgets are moral documents.

You have taken many positive steps with regard to international aid and development, such as the HIV/AIDS initiative, and we would like to see that compassion manifest here at home. In significant social programs, like welfare reform, we have supported the proposals of your administration to strengthen marriage and family as effective antipoverty measures; but the companion pro-family commitments to invest in adequate child care, education, and training for our poorest families have fallen short in your administration's proposals. The most effective and bipartisan public policies for reducing poverty have not been adequately supported by your administration.

Over the past several years, we have advocated several policy initiatives in addition to the "faith-based initiative" that would help low-income people in this country. These include TANF reauthorization that makes poverty reduction a priority, targeted tax relief for low-income families, and funding for proven programs that would effectively reduce poverty. We believe administration support for such policies would be consistent with your stated commitment of being compassionate toward the poor, especially since you have spoken more about issues of poverty than many of your predecessors.

We recall your Notre Dame address two years ago, where you pointed out: "Government has an important role. It will never be replaced by charities. . . . Yet, government must also do more to take the side of charities and community healers, and support their work. . . . Government must be active enough to fund services for the poor—and humble enough to let good people in local communities provide those services."

Mr. President, "the good people" who provide such services are feeling overwhelmed by increasing need and diminishing resources. And many are feeling betrayed. The lack of a consistent, coherent, and integrated domestic policy that benefits low-income people makes our continued support for your faith-based initiative increasingly untenable. Mr. President, the poor are suffering, and without serious changes in the policies of your administration, they will suffer even more.

When you announced the faith-based initiative, you pledged that: "I want to ensure that faith-based and community groups will always have a place at the table in our deliberations." Mr. President, it's time to bring faith-based organizations to the table where policy decisions are being made. We are concerned that the needs of poor people in America seem to have little influence in the critical policy decisions your administration is making. The faith-based initiative seems to be the only place in your administration where poverty is prioritized, yet we know that faith-based initiatives alone will never be sufficient to solve the problems of poverty. As we have discussed with you the faith-based initiative, we now want to engage your administration in a serious conversation about domestic social policy. Mr. President, it's time to talk.

Sincerely,

Rev. Jim Wallis, Convener and President, Call to Renewal.

David Beckmann, President, Bread for the World.

Rev. Peter Borgdorff, Executive Director of Ministries, Christian Reformed Church.

Lt. Col. Paul Bollwahn, National Social Services Secretary, The Salvation Army.

J. Daryl Byler, Director, Washington Office, Mennonite Central Committee.

Bart Campolo, President, Mission Year.

Tony Campolo, President, Evangelical Association for Promotion of Education.

Rt. Rev. John Bryson Chane, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Washington, DC.

Rt. Rev. Steven Charleston, President and Dean, Episcopal Divinity School.

Dave Donaldson, President, We Care America.

Rev. Dr. Robert Edgar, General Secretary, National Council of Churches in the USA.

Dr. Robert M. Franklin, Presidential Distinguished Professor, Candler School of Theology, Emory University.

Wayne Gordon, President, Christian Community Development Association.

Rev. Wes Granberg-Michaelson, General Secretary, Reformed Church in America.

Rev. Dr. Richard Hamm, General Minister & President, Christian Church—Disciples of Christ in the US and Canada.

Rev. Mark Hanson, Presiding Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Bishop Thomas L. Hoyt, Jr., Presiding Bishop, Fourth District, Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, President-elect, National Council of Churches in the USA.

David G. Hunt, President, American Baptist Churches USA.

Hyepin Im, President, Korean Churches for Community Development.

William "Bud" Ipema, Vice-President, Council of Leadership Foundations.

Rev. Alvin Jackson, National City Christian Church, Moderator, Christian Church—Disciples of Christ in the US and Canada.

Rev. Ted Keating, SM, Executive Director, Conference of Major Superiors of Men.

Rev. Clifton Kirkpatrick, Stated Clerk, Presbyterian Church USA.

Rt. Rev. Mark MacDonald, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Alaska.

Bishop Felton Edwin May, Presiding Bishop, Baltimore-Washington Conference, United Methodist Church.

Rev. Dr. A. Roy Medley, General Secretary, American Baptist Churches USA.

Gordon Murphy, Executive Director, Christian Community Development Association.

Rev. Glenn R. Palmberg, President, Evangelical Covenant Church.

Bishop Donald A. Ott, Coordinator, United Methodist Council of Bishops Initiative on Children and Poverty.

Carole Shinnick, SSND, Executive Director, Leadership Conference of Women Religious.

Ron J. Sider, President, Evangelicals for Social Action.

Rev. John H. Thomas, General Minister and President, United Church of Christ.

Joe Volk, Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation.

Jim Winkler, General Secretary, General Board of Church and Society, United Methodist Church.

Mr. Speaker, let me also point out to my colleagues a book that was recently released by Elizabeth Sawhill as the editor called "One Percent for Kids. I mention that because the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and I participated on a panel at Brookings on this particular subject.

I want to just emphasize one point that was pointed out in the beginning of this book. At the present time, our Nation is spending 2 percent of its gross domestic product on programs for children. We are spending 2½ percent of our gross domestic product on servicing the national debt.

My chairman mentioned the fact that the TANF reauthorization bill that passed this body would increase the potential for funding for the poverty programs in this country by \$2 billion. I might point out that only \$1 billion was assured. The second billion was authorization. We are increasing the national debt this year by \$400 billion in order to give tax cuts basically to wealthy people. To service that additional debt, it will cost somewhere between \$12 billion and \$14 billion in next year's budget alone.

□ 1100

So, yes, we are very generous on the tax cuts and on saddling taxpayers with interest on the national debt. But when it comes to America's future, when it comes to investing in our children for their future, we seem to have

a deaf ear. One percent for kids could really help stimulate our economy and grow our economy.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear, speaking for my colleagues on this side of the aisle, we are ready today to sit down with our colleagues on the Republican side to work out a TANF reauthorization 5-year bill that will provide predictability, flexibility, and resources to our States to continue the job that they started 6 years ago when we reformed the welfare system in a bipartisan way. Let us continue that effort. Let us make the tools available. Let us not just try to ram through a bill that the experts tell us will not be in the best interests of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means who is a very active member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the 1996 welfare reform bill expired about a year ago, and since then this Congress has passed a series of short-term extensions.

I will vote for this extension, but it is a sad reflection on this House and its majority, and on the majority in terms of the Senate, and surely on the administration that we have failed to renew and to really expand the basic principles of welfare reform that so many of us worked to enact.

The House Republican leaders rammed through a rewrite of welfare reform some months ago. It was not a continuation, but really a step backward. It was passed on a partisan vote. There was no effort in this House to create a bipartisan welfare bill. In 1996 we passed one on a bipartisan basis, but this time around there was no effort to continue that tradition. The bill that was pushed through this House also ran counter to the research that we helped to fund and the views of Governors.

In a survey that was conducted by the National Governors Association, over 40 State welfare directors said this, that the Bush administration plan would force "fundamental changes" in their successful welfare programs. And the researcher who did most of the research on welfare-to-work strategies said that the Bush administration plan would force "the most successful programs to change substantially."

So we lost, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has said, a chance some months ago to work on a bipartisan basis in this House. And there are key differences between the approach that was embodied in the bill that passed here and what Democrats have proposed.

The first basic difference is whether people should be, who are on welfare and remain there, should be working or whether we should help people move off

of welfare into work. And we Democrats say that should be the key objective of welfare reform, helping people move off of welfare into work; and that was in the proposal that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and others of us put together.

A second difference is whether the emphasis should be on people working in poverty or people working their way out of poverty, and the Democratic plan emphasized people working their way out of poverty.

A third difference related to the issue of work supports. In 1996, the first welfare reform bill was vetoed by President Clinton because there were inadequate day care money and inadequate health care provisions. And then the majority here came back and finally agreed to adequate health care and adequate day care. But in the bill that passed here some months ago, there were inadequacies in terms of health care provisions and also in terms of day care provisions.

So here we are again. We are suggesting a quarterly extension. We cannot allow this legislation that was passed almost 7 years ago now to simply die. We have to continue the process. We owe it to this country. We owe it to the families who are trying to work their way off of welfare into work. But we need to do better. As the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) said to the chairman of the subcommittee, and really to the chairman of the committee, and really to this whole House, let us go back and try to put together a bipartisan product. Welfare reform deserves more than a partisan approach.

So that is really the basic issue before us today. We will pass the extension. I urge everybody to vote for it. But I do not think that it should be an excuse for further inaction by the majority in this House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind everyone that what we are renewing is an updated legislation that we had some 20 hearings on in the last Congress. It is legislation that is updating probably the most successful social welfare reform in our Nation's history. More than 50 percent of those who have been on welfare are now out being productive. Child poverty levels are at the lowest in history. Again, what we need to do is extend this for the 3 months so that we can get agreement in the Senate so we can move forward with this updated legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a member of the committee and subcommittee.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly welcome the opportunity to come to the floor and invite my colleagues to support this extension on a bipartisan basis. I will talk more on this in a moment;

but too often we have seen partisanship, as the gentleman pointed out, but not with the examples that he had cited. We have seen partisanship creep into the debate on welfare reform, and I think it has detracted from the seriousness of the endeavor.

As the chairman of the subcommittee noted, this has been, if not one of the greatest social reforms of the 20th century, certainly the most successful social reform of the last 20 years of the last century. We were successful in overhauling a failed welfare system. And as a result, some 3 million children have risen out of poverty since the bill that we had passed and we developed in the subcommittee, and I was there in 1996, and was signed into law by the last administration.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the number of American children experiencing hunger has plummeted to half the number in 1995. Now, the economy was growing during this period; but we also have to recognize that at different times when the economy was growing in the past, the welfare rolls had also been growing. During this period, the welfare rolls were literally cut in half. In all, 3.5 million fewer Americans lived their lives in poverty than in 1995.

The results of welfare reform are hard to argue with, although some on the left are continuing to try to make that argument.

While this success is inspiring, we recognize that more work needs to be done and further changes need to be made, which were embodied in the bill that we passed last year. May I say we need to recognize that some of the things that were included in the bill that we passed earlier this year, which was a replication of what had passed in the earlier Congress to fully reauthorize this program, including initiatives like full-check sanction, a very important reform that makes very clear if you do not follow the rules, you do not get your welfare benefits.

Some 2 million recipients now remain dependent upon welfare assistance and many still do not participate in work or training programs. In response, we have passed in our reauthorization, a boost of tough work requirements and reinvigorated work incentives for State and welfare recipients. Stronger welfare reform means less dependence and more economic independence for poor people in America. Perhaps more importantly, strengthening welfare reform means fewer American children will be living in poverty.

However, some opponents of welfare reform, as we have seen, have sought to turn back the clock by running out the clock on this reauthorization. We saw that in the Senate in the last Congress; and, unfortunately, in this Congress the Senate has not taken up the bill in as timely a fashion as we would like. Hence, we are with this bill today.

I believe that there are opponents of this effective social policy that are trying to filibuster our attempts to fight

poverty. I urge the Senate to end this obstructionism and work with us to enact a strengthened TANF program.

I am hopeful that this bill will pass today; but having heard some of the remarks earlier on the floor, I also want to take a moment to clarify the record. Yes, the bill that passed in 1996 passed finally with bipartisan support. But in its earlier forms it had been consistently opposed by the minority. The record shows very clearly the broad outline of what we had proposed and was signed into law was present in the earlier versions of the bill, but it was opposed by the Clinton administration and opposed by many on the minority side. We had sought bipartisanship in that markup in 1996 just as we had sought bipartisanship last year and this year. But bipartisanship requires both parties to engage. We also have shown on our side, in the majority, a strong and consistent commitment to day care, whereas, we were faulted by some for not adequately funding day care. In fact, in 1996 we put twice as much funding, substantially more funding for day care than the Clinton administration had originally proposed. So that has always been a red herring.

What we have done is give the States adequate resources to meet the needs of poor people; and as they brought more and more off the rolls, they have been extraordinarily successful in meeting those needs.

We need to continue that work and continue this bill by passing this reauthorization.

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

Mr. Speaker, first, let me just comment briefly on my friend's, the gentleman from Pennsylvania's (Mr. ENGLISH), revisionist history.

The original welfare reform bill was signed by President Clinton. He held out his final support because it was moving through Congress without the child care provisions that my friend from Pennsylvania is now taking credit for or the health provisions.

Let me also point out, if I might, Mr. Speaker, that a lot has happened in the last year. We have had no hearings on this legislation in this Congress. Yet we have extended unemployment insurance. We have seen a deterioration in our economy. We have seen our States strapped with some of the highest budget deficits in their history. And yet on the most important anti-poverty program in our Nation, we have not had one hearing or one opportunity to deal with the bill on this reauthorization act. That is not bipartisanship, and that is not an open process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) for yielding me time. I thank him for his leadership on this issue in the Committee on Ways and Means.

Let me acknowledge to the chairman of this committee that I stand in support of the extension of the temporary assistance for needy families block grant reauthorization. But I think it is important to put a face on this question. And my good friend from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) made a very good point. We have a troubled economy, almost a crumbling economy. And, frankly, it is imperative, it is almost urgent, it is a crisis that we have hearings on this particular legislation, the idea of welfare reauthorization, because people are hurting.

The history of this legislation was aptly pointed out that, in fact, as more people moved from welfare to work in the mid-1990s, it was because the economy was percolating. Under President Clinton's administration and the 1997 Budget Act, jobs increased and opportunities increased for those welfare recipients moving off of welfare; as I heard the chairman mention, more work, stronger families and less poverty.

Today we have the complete opposite: a deficit that is blossoming, booming and imploding; unemployment at 6.1 percent; constituents in my district begging for work but without the opportunity for work. Just last weekend in visiting with my constituents, a single mother with three children, working every day, begged me for increased child care assistance.

□ 1115

The reason why that bill passed in the mid-1990s that President Clinton signed is because he held out for child care and health assistance. What do we have now? We have the complete opposite. We have poverty growing deeper, more people in poverty and needing welfare, and no response from this Congress.

Yet the Democratic approach, which we are prepared to sit down and negotiate, involves more welfare recipients getting real jobs coming out of poverty, not make-work jobs, State flexibility to help welfare recipients move into employment, even in the backdrop of these terrible economic conditions. We need more education training, which the Democratic bill has, which we have not been able to get to the table and discuss and negotiate in a bipartisan way, and then of course the whole issue of child care services.

Mr. Speaker, we have another crisis because in fact as we extend this legislation but yet not have the real hearings that we need to have, we are still fighting to get the child tax credit bill on the floor of the House. We ARE still fighting to get the Republican leadership of this House to understand that people are living in a crisis, and those making \$10,000 to \$26,000 a year are begging us to pass the Senate bill which gives an additional \$154 on average per child to hardworking low-income families, up to 12 million families.

The new tax law provides each of America's 190,000 families, meaning the

bill passed by the Republicans, a \$550 billion tax cut, an average of \$93,500. So here we are, extending a welfare bill without real hearings to be able to assist us in getting a real welfare reform bill, and yet we cannot get the child tax credit bill, the refund bill, the free-standing Senate bill which has been passed by the Senate to aid 12 million families, we cannot get it on the floor of the House.

What we are hearing are rumors about a kitchen sink full of unnecessary additions to the tax bill that will do nothing but throw it into conference and delay this refund to needy working families in America. I hope as we extend and vote to extend this particular bill, we do it on behalf of those families who made a change in their life and those attempting to make a change, but we cannot really help America's working families unless we sit down in a bipartisan way and work on the Democratic approach and come together on a bill that truly puts tools and skills in the hands of those who want to move from welfare to work.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are shamed if we continue to pay 190,000 rich families in America \$93,000, and we cannot afford to give working families on average \$154. Let us vote for the Senate bill on the tax question and reextend this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2350, a bill to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant program. TANF is an important program for millions of needy families and it is right that we support the extension in funding that this bill provides.

While I support this bill, I agree with my Democratic colleagues who have said that this three month extension is only the beginning of what we must do to provide for the needy. I also agree with my colleagues that we need to bring to the floor and pass a bill to extend the child credit to more than 6 million families that were excluded from the legislation that the President recently signed. Extending the child tax credit will do much to aid low-income families in this country. As such, passing the child tax credit bill should be the next order of business by this body.

Mr. Speaker, in 1996, the House passed "The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act." The act was a far-reaching welfare reform plan that dramatically changed the nation's welfare system. The primary change is that welfare recipients are now required to work in exchange for the time-limited assistance that they receive.

As part of that bill, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program replaces the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) programs. Under TANF, States and territories operate programs, and tribes have the option to run their own programs. States, territories, and tribes each receive a block grant allocation with a requirement on States to maintain historical levels of State spending known as maintenance of effort. Moreover, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act empowers States with the flexibility to design their TANF programs.

Under TANF, recipients must work after two years of receiving assistance. With the country's current economic standing being so poor, it is difficult to find employment not only for TANF recipients but also for most unemployed people who are looking for work. To count toward State work requirements, recipients are required to participate in unsubsidized or subsidized employment, on-the-job training, community service, 12 months of vocational training, or they must provide child care services to individuals who are participating in community service. In this House, we know that budgets for subsidized employment programs have been cut, funds for vocational training are being slashed, and education programs are being decreased on the State and Federal level. The diminution of those employment and education programs only hurts TANF recipients and other low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, there is a five-year time limit for families who receive TANF. In other words, after receiving five years of assistance over a lifetime, recipients are ineligible for cash aid. If we do not do what is needed to get this economy moving and to create jobs for the unemployed, there will be many families bumping up against the cutoff time for their TANF benefits.

In closing, I will support this bill for the good of my constituents. I call upon the other members of this body to support this bill and to support the child tax credit for low-income families immediately. Finally, I call upon my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop the attack against working families and to support positive initiatives to help improve the lives of American families.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind the other side how successful this legislation has been since 1996. Child poverty has fallen sharply. Nearly 3 million children have been lifted from poverty. The black child poverty rate is now at a record low. More parents are working. Employment by mothers most likely to go on welfare rose by 40 percent from 1995 to 2000. Dependence fell by unprecedented levels. Welfare caseloads fell by 9 million, from 14 million recipients in 1994 to just 5 million today.

Again, this is legislation that has been updated this year that we had some 20 hearings on in the last Congress and which passed earlier this year; and I might mention also that we provide an additional \$2 billion in added child care funds in our legislation which hopefully will be renewed here in 3 months. We provide the States with more State flexibility in spending cash welfare funds, we focus more on promoting healthy marriage and child well-being, and we encourage more work, higher incomes, and less welfare dependence.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just in response to our friend from California, point out if the gentleman has so much confidence in current law in the results that have just been spelled out, I am

curious as to why the bill that passed the House that is now being promoted, why over 40 of our welfare administrators in our various States have said it will cause a fundamental change in their welfare system, it would cause them to shift their local priorities to federally mandated priorities where our own scorekeepers have indicated that there are additional mandates to the States far beyond the dollars made available, far beyond the \$2 billion, if in fact \$2 billion is made available, our States would be required to conform to new mandates. If we believe that the current law has been so successful, why are we now taking away the ability of States to set their own priorities?

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to do two things. First, I ask my colleagues to support the 3-month extension. It is the responsible thing to do. We need to approve this legislation.

Second, I am going to ask, let us all step back for a moment and take a deep breath and take a look at the issues and the families that are affected, listen to our Governors who have the principal responsibility, analyze the GAO report which indicates that most of our States have had to cut back on child care money because of their fiscal problems.

In my own State of Maryland, they are taking no new enrollments in child care unless you are on welfare. Think of this message: If you want safe, affordable child care, go on welfare. That is the wrong message. Let us talk together, let us listen to each other and let us come up with a bipartisan bill that we can be proud of, that can pass both this body and the other body and be signed by the President; and, most importantly, will help our States in their efforts not only to get people out of welfare, but to get American families out of poverty.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me remind the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) that just in the last 2 weeks we passed legislation which was signed by the President which gives to the States an additional \$20 billion in State aid. The States also have some \$6 billion in Temporary Aid to Needy Families or TANF surplus that is available to them. We also transferred some \$3 billion of surplus that they have available. We also have \$6 billion of unemployment that they have in surplus available.

The gentleman asked if the legislation is so successful, why would we want to make changes; child poverty has fallen, more parents are working, dependence fell by unprecedented levels. But the fact is there is still more that needs to be done. There is still 58 percent of recipients who are not working or trained. There are too many families that are breaking up, who never formed, that this legislation will

address, and there are some 2 million families that remain dependent on welfare. And that is why even though this legislation has been so incredibly successful, we still have more to do.

With that, I would urge the body to support this legislation, this extending of 3 months. I urge an "aye" vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). 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. 2350.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. CARDIN. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

---

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2115, FLIGHT 100—CENTURY OF AVIATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 265 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 265

*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. 2115) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs for the Federal Aviation Administration, 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 one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. 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 Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the re-

port 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. 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 amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 265 is a structured rule providing for the consideration of 2115, the Flight 100 Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule provides ample opportunity to discuss this important reauthorization before us today.

H.R. 2115 is a bipartisan bill introduced by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) as well as the ranking members, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO). This reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration, appropriately titled for the 100th anniversary of powered flight, continues a tradition of funding the promotion of safety in our skies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight some of the important provisions in the underlying legislation.

First, this legislation reauthorizes the FAA at \$3.4 billion next year raising \$200 million in the year after that. The FAA, nearly 45 years after it was created, takes an ever-present role as we take important steps to ensure America's security. The FAA is primarily responsible for the safety of our Nation's skies through activities ranging from the continued monitoring by air traffic controllers to the development of new air space technologies.

Within my district is Miami International Airport, which I have the privilege to represent, and is consistently one of the Nation's busiest for