



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2003

No. 27

House of Representatives

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY
WORK, AND FAMILY PROMOTION
ACT OF 2003—Continued

□ 1515

Mr. WATERS. Unfortunately, the Republican bill does not do that. I would ask for an eye on the Democratic alternative.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH) for the sake of a colloquy.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and I rise to engage in a colloquy. Would the gentleman so engage?

Mr. HERGER. If the gentleman would yield, yes.

Mr. GERLACH. In 1996, I was the lead sponsor of legislation that overhauled Pennsylvania's welfare system. When this legislation was implemented, I worked with the Chester County Chamber of Business and Industry in my district to initiate what later became the Jobs and Advancement Through Mentoring program. This program provides welfare recipients who are entering the workforce with volunteer mentors recruited from the local business community. The intent of the program is to make sure that welfare recipients do not just start working, but that they have a volunteer partner in the community helping them over the rough spots during that first year of employment in helping to ensure lifetime self-sufficiency and productivity.

While I realize that the bill we are debating today expresses the sense of Congress that States should encourage mentoring programs, I believe we should do more. That is why I have drafted an amendment to require States to identify approaches to establishing voluntary community-based mentoring programs like the one I just described.

Let me emphasize that States would only be required to formally consider

mentoring programs. They would not be mandated to actually create them.

Mr. Chairman, I would be very appreciative if you would give every consideration to including this amendment in any conference agreement that may be forthcoming.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his interest and activity on the mentoring issue. The programs you have described are important to helping welfare recipients to succeed in the workforce.

The gentleman's proposal will be considered, and I look forward to working with him to support these types of mentoring programs so that we can help even more recipients achieve independence through work.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cardin substitute.

At a time of great need with our economy stagnant and unemployment high, the underlying bill is so misguided. It eliminates education as an activity that counts towards necessary work requirements. It abandons the 15 million children eligible for child care assistance who will not be covered because of woefully inadequate funding.

In my home State of Connecticut alone, 4,000 families have been waiting in line for child care assistance since August 2002. It leaves our States in the midst of the worst fiscal crises since World War II with a massive unfunded mandate by shifting the burden of welfare to the States without providing them with the estimated \$11 billion necessary to meet those needs.

The Cardin substitute has a strong work requirement. It give States the

flexibility to increase access to education and training. It increases mandatory funding for child care by \$11 billion over the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill does not encourage personal responsibility or promote families. If anything, it discourages hard-working families by offering them too little or no hope that their cycle of dependency can ever be broken.

I urge my colleagues to turn aside this misguided, inadequate bill and support the Cardin substitute.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), a key person on the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from California for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute offered by my friend from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN). It may be well intentioned, but it fails to embrace a couple of realities and perhaps this is the fundamental difference among friends.

Mr. Chairman, success in welfare reform means reducing the number of people who seek welfare, people who actually go to work. There is news to celebrate according to our own Department of Labor, Mr. Chairman. The job market in the United States, despite the challenges we face now, which we all admit we have, from July of 1996 when we first passed this to last month, January of 2003, according to our own Department of Labor, the workforce has added 11 million jobs.

Unemployment is a real concern. We all understand that. But actually, unemployment was reduced from when we passed this measure in the last Congress, in April of 2002.

Now, understand the welfare rolls are reducing. We have held constant the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H547

dollars that are going to the States. It is a net increase. No one doubts that there are fiscal challenges facing the States. But, Mr. Chairman, the fact is, the States as laboratories of democracy must fashion their own solutions, not flexibilities in the form of pseudo-mandates from the Hill, but reasonable, rational solutions based on the work that is fundamental and inherent in this act, that rewards work, that provides funding for child care, that instead of cursing the darkness, lights a candle of opportunity for so many families.

That is what makes this reform historic. That is why we should reject the Cardin substitute and support H.R. 4.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), a valuable member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the House needs to pass a reauthorization of the welfare reform bill. Welfare reform was designed to help people by getting them a job, not handing them a check.

CBO estimates that implementing the work requirements of the Republican bill will cost States \$11 billion. It makes absolutely no sense to impose an unfunded mandate on our States. This mandate will cost my State of Texas \$688 million at a time when we are facing a budget deficit of \$10 billion in the State. That is irresponsible and that is simply a tax increase on our citizens.

On a more personal level, American families want jobs and the quality education and training to get good jobs. The Republican bill eliminates vocational educational training as a work-related activity and increases work participation hours for mothers with children under 6 years from 20 hours to 40 hours. It is irresponsible.

Let us do the right thing. Let us forge a working partnership with America's families as envisioned by the Cardin amendment. We need to be an asset, not a stumbling block to helping our citizens obtain the jobs and the dignity they deserve.

Let us support State governments. Reject the Republican bill and support Cardin-Kind-Woolsey.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my good friend from Texas that in H.R. 4, his State of Texas will receive an additional \$370 million for child care over the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today reminded of the tribute that we have paid to a former President named Ronald Reagan just a few days ago on

what was his 92nd birthday. I think of what Ronald Reagan spoke about as a vision for welfare in America. He said, "It is not simply to provide for the needy, but more than that, to salvage these, our fellow citizens, to make them self-sustaining and, as quickly as possible, independent of welfare."

President Reagan would say on many occasions that we measure the success of welfare not by how many people arrive on it, but how many people leave it. And as we look at welfare reform this day, it is undeniable that the welfare reform of 1996, that we continue and expand through this legislation, is an unqualified success.

As this diagram demonstrates, Mr. Chairman, welfare caseloads in the millions: 1994, 14 million Americans on welfare; 2001, 5 million Americans. But that does not tell the story. We can look at the cold and hard statistics: 3.6 million fewer Americans living in poverty today than 1996, 2.7 million fewer children, a million fewer African American children in poverty today since welfare reform.

But as the father of three small children, Mr. Chairman, this is the most compelling statistic to me: Tanya was a single mother, went on public assistance when her twin girls were just a year old. But since completing her program with CalWORKS last year, Tanya has not only escaped welfare, but she has been able to earn enough money to buy her own home for those little girls. Welfare reform has worked, Mr. Chairman, and I oppose the substitute and will stand with the underlying bill in keeping that Reagan vision alive.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to go over some of the facts because there is so much rhetoric we are hearing from those who oppose this bill. But these are what the facts say: 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.

That is a positive story. The cycle of poverty is broken. There are 3.6 million fewer Americans living in poverty today than did in 1996.

Had we listened to those who were so against welfare reform, 2.7 million fewer children live in poverty today than in 1996, including 1 million African American children. This is from the U.S. Census Bureau. This is not

from the Republican Party. This is fact.

Child care, we hear how it is bad for children. The child care has gone from 3 billion to 9.7 billion in child care assistance. Again, very positive things, a significant change since the bill.

These are great reasons to vote for this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California has the right to close.

Does the gentleman from Maryland wish to proceed?

Mr. CARDIN. Am I correct that the gentleman from California has no further requests for time other than closing?

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

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

Mr. Chairman, 41 of our 46 States responded to a survey saying that if the Republican bill is enacted, they will have to fundamentally change their programs. The programs we have all been bragging will about will be no longer. They will need to change them radically and create what is known as makeshift work-fare-type jobs that lead nowhere.

We just got a letter today from many of our governors saying, please do not take a significant step backwards in reforming welfare. This is not the time to replace State flexibilities with unfunded mandates.

If you are going to give the dollar amounts of the extra monies the States receive under your bill, why do you not tell the whole story, the extra cost? Every State will end up in the negative under the Republican bill.

If you believe the 1996 bill was a success, why are you going back and destroying what we did in 1996 on flexibility to the States? If you believe that child care is important and we need to help our States, why are you not supporting the substitute that provides \$11 billion of extra money for child support?

If you believe the arguments that have been made on both sides of the aisle, you will support the substitute.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN). I appreciate his hard work on this issue. I do, however, have a difference of opinion with him regarding the amendment we are considering, and I oppose it for several reasons.

The gentleman's amendment weakens work requirements and would lead to less work, more welfare and more poverty. Like the failed AFDC program that preceded TANF, the substitute promotes more welfare dependence. It places new mandates on States by requiring them to assess every recipient

for child care needs, barriers to work and history of domestic violence, and by prohibiting States from applying sanctions to those who refuse to work.

□ 1530

The substitute, which we estimate to cost at least \$20 billion over the next 5 years, is just too expensive and would greatly increase deficits.

However, I would like to commend the gentleman for including certain provisions that mirror those in our H.R. 4. Those provisions include maintaining the basic TANF funding and block grant structure, requiring parents to engage in real work for 24 hours per week, raising total work requirements to 40 hours per week at State option, increasing State work rate requirements and adding reducing poverty as a TANF purpose.

I urge the Members to oppose this amendment and vote in support of H.R. 4.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative to the welfare reform bill.

Our alternative gives families the tools they need to lift themselves out of poverty—I'm talking about education and quality child care.

Individuals working to leave welfare must have access to higher education, GED courses, and English as a Second Language programs in order to make a successful transition to the world of work.

The facts are clear—women who obtain GED certification, participate in on-the-job training, or attend college have higher average annual earnings and a greater probability of employment.

Individuals with limited English speaking skills earn 24 percent less than their employed counterparts who are fluent in English. Language barriers limit non-English speaking workers to jobs that tend to be low-wage and seasonal, making it difficult to attain self-sufficiency.

It's time for us to enact a welfare law that recognizes that families want to work—they simply need the proper tools to succeed. I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of Puerto Rican and Hispanic families, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Democratic substitute proposed today by my colleague Mr. CARDIN. Since the 1996 changes, Puerto Rico according to the HHS report, has met the mandates of TANF, it has reduced its welfare rolls by 56 percent—Puerto Rico has followed the rules.

However, the Commonwealth's TANF families have not had access to all of the tools Congress established to support moving them from welfare to work. The Commonwealth is committed to our families' self-sufficiency. According to the recently release HHS report, of the TANF cases closed 23 percent of the recipients are working—this is more than 11 States and it is in an economy of 11 percent unemployment as opposed to 5 or 6 percent.

We want our families to move from welfare to work; but we need the tools to make that transition possible.

Our commitment to families is further demonstrated by the fact that in 2001 the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico collected twice the

amount in child support payments than it received from the Federal Government in TANF. Puerto Rico according to HHS collected more in child support than 24 States.

The Democratic substitute allows Puerto Rico and the territories to access all of the tools Congress established to help families move from welfare to work. Again, I urge my colleagues to vote for the democratic substitute to insure that no American family is left without the necessary tools to end the cycle of poverty.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate has expired. 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 Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 225, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

AYES—197

Abercrombie	Ford	McIntyre
Ackerman	Frank (MA)	McNulty
Alexander	Frost	Meehan
Andrews	Gonzalez	Meek (FL)
Baca	Gordon	Meeks (NY)
Baird	Green (TX)	Menendez
Baldwin	Grijalva	Michaud
Ballance	Gutierrez	Millender-
Becerra	Hall	McDonald
Bell	Harman	Miller (NC)
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Berman	Hill	Mollohan
Berry	Hinchey	Moore
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Bishop (NY)	Hoeffel	Murtha
Blumenauer	Holden	Nadler
Boswell	Holt	Napolitano
Boucher	Honda	Neal (MA)
Boyd	Hooley (OR)	Oberstar
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Obey
Brown (OH)	Inslee	Olver
Brown, Corrine	Israel	Ortiz
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Capuano	Jackson-Lee	Pastore
Cardin	(TX)	Pascrell
Cardoza	Jefferson	Pelosi
Carson (IN)	John	Peterson (MN)
Carson (OK)	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Case	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)
Clay	Kanjorski	Rahall
Clyburn	Kaptur	Rangel
Cooper	Kennedy (RI)	Reyes
Costello	Kildee	Rodriguez
Cramer	Kilpatrick	Ross
Crowley	Kind	Rothman
Cummings	Kleczka	Roybal-Allard
Davis (AL)	Kucinich	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Lampson	Rush
Davis (FL)	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Davis (IL)	Lantos	Sabo
Davis (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Linda
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	T.
DeGette	Lee	Sanders
Delahunt	Levin	Sandlin
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Deutsch	Lipinski	Schiff
Dicks	Lofgren	Scott (GA)
Dingell	Lowey	Scott (VA)
Doggett	Lynch	Serrano
Dooley (CA)	Majette	Sherman
Doyle	Maloney	Skelton
Edwards	Markey	Slaughter
Emanuel	Marshall	Smith (WA)
Engel	Matheson	Snyder
Eshoo	Matsui	Solis
Etheridge	McCarthy (MO)	Spratt
Evans	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Farr	McCollum	Stenholm
Fattah	McDermott	Strickland
Filner	McGovern	Stupak

Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)

Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt

Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—225

Aderholt	Gingrey	Owens
Akin	Goode	Oxley
Bachus	Goodlatte	Paul
Baker	Goss	Pearce
Ballenger	Granger	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Green (WI)	Petri
Barton (TX)	Greenwood	Pickering
Bass	Gutknecht	Pitts
Beauprez	Harris	Platts
Bereuter	Hart	Pombo
Biggert	Hastings (WA)	Porter
Bilirakis	Hayes	Portman
Bishop (UT)	Hayworth	Pryce (OH)
Blackburn	Hefley	Putnam
Blunt	Hensarling	Quinn
Boehler	Herger	Radanovich
Boehner	Hobson	Ramstad
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Regula
Bonner	Hostettler	Rehberg
Bono	Houghton	Renzi
Boozman	Hulshof	Reynolds
Bradley (NH)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hyde	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Isakson	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Rohrabacher
Ginny	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Janklow	Royce
Burns	Jenkins	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Johnson (CT)	Ryan (KS)
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Saxton
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Schrock
Camp	Jones (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Keller	Sessions
Cantor	Kelly	Shadegg
Capito	Kennedy (MN)	Shaw
Carter	King (IA)	Shays
Castle	King (NY)	Sherwood
Chabot	Kingston	Shimkus
Chocola	Kirk	Shuster
Coble	Kline	Simmons
Cole	Knollenberg	Simpson
Collins	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Crane	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Latham	Smith (TX)
Culberson	LaTourette	Souder
Cunningham	Leach	Stearns
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (CA)	Sullivan
Davis, Tom	Lewis (KY)	Sweeney
Deal (GA)	Linder	Tancredo
DeLay	LoBiondo	Tauzin
DeMint	Lucas (KY)	Taylor (MS)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas (OK)	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Terry
Doolittle	McCotter	Thomas
Dreier	McCreery	Thornberry
Duncan	McHugh	Tiahrt
Dunn	McInnis	Toomey
Ehlers	McKeon	Turner (OH)
Emerson	Mica	Upton
English	Miller (FL)	Vitter
Everett	Miller (MI)	Walden (OR)
Feeney	Miller, Gary	Walsh
Flake	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Fletcher	Murphy	Weldon (FL)
Foley	Musgrave	Weldon (PA)
Forbes	Myrick	Weller
Fossella	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Ney	Wicker
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Wilson (NM)
Gallely	Norwood	Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ)	Nunes	Wolf
Gerlach	Nussle	Young (AK)
Gibbons	Osborne	Young (FL)
Gilchrest	Ose	
Gillmor	Otter	

NOT VOTING—12

Allen	Cox	Payne
Burr	Cubin	Sanchez, Loretta
Combest	Ferguson	Tiberi
Conyers	Gephardt	Turner (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) (during the vote). Two minutes to vote. Two minutes.

□ 1550

Mrs. KELLY and Mr. GOODE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."
Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. LIPINSKI changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

Stated for:

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 28 (the Cardin substitute) I was unable to cast my vote because I was attending a briefing by Secretary Ridge and Secretary Thompson in the Roosevelt room at the White House on Project Bioshield and unable to return before the vote was closed. If I had been present I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 28.

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4) 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, pursuant to House Resolution 69, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CARDIN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CARDIN. I am in the present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CARDIN moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 87, after line 14, insert the following:

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that additional funding for child care is necessary given the additional financial burdens on the States resulting from the implementation of this Act, due to the worsening of economic conditions since the last consideration of welfare reform legislation by the House of Representatives, including—

(1) the severe deficits of more than \$80,000,000,000 affecting the States, the largest budget gaps in half a century, that will necessitate reductions in vital services, including the loss of Medicaid for nearly 1,000,000 Americans;

(2) the loss of 2,300,000 jobs since March 2001, including 42 percent more job cuts in January 2003 than in December, and an un-

employment rate of nearly 6 percent representing 9,000,000 Americans;

(3) the loss of unemployment benefits by 1,000,000 men and women whose benefits have expired and whom Congress has failed to assist;

(4) an increase in child poverty in 2001 for the first time in 8 years;

(5) the increase of homelessness by nearly 20 percent in the last year; and

(6) substantial waiting lists for child care in at least 18 States, many in the tens of thousands, and actions by other States to make fewer families eligible for child care services.

Page 87, line 15, strike "202" and insert "203".

Page 88, line 14, strike "203" and insert "204".

Page 89, line 1, strike "204" and insert "205".

Page 93, line 3, strike "205" and insert "206".

Page 94, line 8, strike "206" and insert "207".

Page 95, line 11, strike "207" and insert "208".

Page 95, strike line 17 and all that follows through line 2 on page 96 and insert the following:

SEC. 209. INCREASE IN ENTITLEMENT FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 418(a) (42 U.S.C. 618(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting "and paragraph (6)" after "paragraph (3)";

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (E);

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking "fiscal year 2002." and inserting "each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(G) \$3,217,000,000 for fiscal year 2007; and

"(H) \$3,717,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.";

(3) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

"(4) AMOUNTS RESERVED FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reserve 2 percent of the aggregate amount appropriated under paragraphs (3) and (5) for each fiscal year for payments to Indian tribes and tribal organizations for each such fiscal year for the purpose of providing child care assistance.

"(B) USE OF FUNDS; APPLICATION OF CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT OF 1990.—Subsections (b) and (c) shall apply to amounts received under this paragraph in the same manner as such subsections apply to amounts received by a State under this section.";

(4) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7); and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

"(5) ADDITIONAL GENERAL ENTITLEMENT GRANTS.—

"(A) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to amounts appropriated under paragraph (3) for any fiscal year, there are appropriated for additional grants under paragraph (1)—

"(i) \$1,250,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

"(ii) \$1,750,000,000 for fiscal year 2005; and

"(iii) \$2,250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2008.

"(B) ADDITIONAL GRANT.—In addition to the grant paid to a State under paragraph (1) for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, of the amount available for additional grants under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay the State an amount equal to the same proportion of such available amount as the proportion of the State's grant under paragraph (1) bears to the amount appropriated under paragraph (3) for the fiscal year.

"(6) REQUIREMENT FOR GRANT INCREASE.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1), (2), and (5), the aggregate of the amounts paid to a State under this section for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2008 may not exceed the aggregate of the amounts paid to the State under this section for fiscal year 2002, unless the State ensures that the level of State expenditures for child care for the fiscal year is not less than the level of State expenditures for child care that were matched under a grant made to the State under paragraph (2); and that the State expended to meet its maintenance of effort obligation under paragraph (2) for fiscal year 2002."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1108(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 1308(a)(2)) is amended by striking "or 413(f)" and inserting "413(f), or 418(a)(4)(B)".

In the table of contents, strike the item relating to section 208 and insert the following: Sec. 209. Increase in entitlement funding.

In the table of contents, redesignate the items relating to sections 202 through 207 as items relating to sections 203 through 208, respectively.

In the table of contents, insert after the item relating to section 201 the following: Sec. 202. Findings.

Mr. CARDIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, the motion is very straightforward. It increases child care by \$11 billion, which is the cost, the extra cost, to the States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL), a new member of the House.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard from the Republican side of the aisle the phrase "compassionate conservative," and while our Republican colleagues may have the conservative part down, there is absolutely nothing compassionate about gutting one of the most successful government reform programs in recent history.

Let us look at the facts. The bipartisan welfare reforms of 1996 have cut the welfare rolls by more than 50 percent. We have succeeded in breaking the welfare web, the so-called welfare web. But that apparently is not enough for our Republican colleagues.

If we look at H.R. 4, there is absolutely nothing that is fiscally responsible about H.R. 4. It would place a huge unfunded mandate upon States all across this country when they can least afford it, including my State of Texas, which is staring at a \$10 billion shortfall and has no way of getting out of it at the present time. And that is happening all across this country, yet now we are going to put this unfunded mandate on them.

This bill increases the number of work hours for mothers with young children from 20 to 40 hours, while at

the same time it decreases the amount of child care money which will be provided for these mothers.

Now, let us think about that. If the idea is to move people off of the welfare rolls, why would we set them up to fail from the very beginning? It makes no sense, and in no way, shape or form is it compassionate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, the majority will say that they have a letter from the Congressional Budget Office saying that this is not an unfunded mandate, but what the majority will not mention is that they have a letter from the Congressional Budget Office that says that this bill will significantly change the way the States have to spend their money on TANF; that it will cost them an additional \$11 billion in order to comply with the mandates that are included in this bill.

Now, my definition of an unfunded mandate is telling the States they have to do something and not giving them the extra money to do it with. That is exactly what the bill does. It mandates the States to develop workfare programs, it requires the States to spend more money on child care in order to deal with the new work requirements, and the States do not have the money and resources to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard my colleagues on both sides of the aisle say they are for child care, that children should not be penalized, that we have to have safe and affordable child care. Our States are telling us they need the money. This motion does one thing and one thing only: It increases the amount of child care by \$11 billion to equal what our Congressional Budget Office is telling us is the increased burden on the States. That is all it does.

I would urge my colleagues to listen to our governors. Listen to what we have said in the past about unfunded mandates. Listen to what we have said about protecting our children and support the motion to recommit.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote down this motion to recommit and pass the bill.

We are adding \$2 billion in money for child care for the States. But beyond that, remember that we are giving the States exactly the amount of money we gave them 5 years ago, but the welfare rolls are half that amount. So the States have all that additional money that they can devote to child care or meeting the other needs of people working to get off welfare and into the job market.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, there is money there both in welfare, lots of money, more

than there has ever been in the history of our country. Furthermore, we have added \$2 billion in the child care block grant. We have made sure it has grown every year.

There is \$170 billion available over the next 5 years from the State and Federal governments for TANF. We have a balanced, sound, strong bill that will support women and their families as they make the transition from welfare to work, and I urge rejection of the motion to recommit and passage of this landmark legislation.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit. I am especially supportive of provisions that would encourage funding of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program. This program has helped communities across the United States rebuild and repair blighted areas in an attempt to create open and green space opportunities for working families.

In my community, children are often forced to play in abandoned lots or next to super-highways. They literally share their playgrounds with drug dealers on grounds that are unsafe.

One project funded by UPARR near my district renovated a hazardous park electrical system, repairing damaged and dangerous wiring, and improving and installing walkway safety lighting.

Thanks to the UPARR program, children like those in my community have been able to experience more opportunities in a safer, cleaner environment. Despite UPARR's success and far-reaching impacts in our communities, this omnibus bill will essentially shut down the entire program by eliminating almost \$30 million dollars in funding for the program.

I support the motion to recommit and am hopeful that this body will remember the importance of our urban parks—not only for their recreational value but for the health and well being of our children.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 221, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—197

Abercrombie	Andrews	Baldwin
Ackerman	Baca	Ballance
Alexander	Baird	Becerra

Bell	Hoeffel	Oberstar
Berkley	Holden	Obey
Berman	Honda	Olver
Berry	Hoolley (OR)	Ortiz
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Insee	Pallone
Blumenauer	Israel	Pastor
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Boyd	(TX)	Pomeroy
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Brown (OH)	John	Rahall
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Capps	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Cardin	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Cardoza	Kaptur	Ross
Carson (IN)	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Carson (OK)	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Case	Kilpatrick	Ruppersberger
Clay	Kind	Rush
Clyburn	Klecza	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Kucinich	Sabo
Costello	Lampson	Sanchez, Linda
Cramer	Langevin	T.
Crowley	Lantos	Sanders
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Sandlin
Davis (AL)	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Davis (CA)	Lee	Schiff
Davis (FL)	Levin	Scott (GA)
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Davis (TN)	Lipinski	Serrano
DeFazio	Lofgren	Sherman
DeGette	Lowey	Skelton
Delahunt	Lucas (KY)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Deutsch	Majette	Snyder
Dicks	Maloney	Solis
Dingell	Markey	Spratt
Doggett	Marshall	Stark
Dooley (CA)	Matheson	Stenholm
Doyle	Matsui	Strickland
Edwards	McCarthy (MO)	Stupak
Emanuel	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Engel	McCollum	Tauscher
Eshoo	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Etheridge	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Evans	McIntyre	Tierney
Farr	McNulty	Towns
Fattah	Meehan	Turner (TX)
Filner	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Ford	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Frank (MA)	Menendez	Van Hollen
Frost	Michaud	Velazquez
Gonzalez	Millender	Visclosky
Gordon	McDonald	Waters
Green (TX)	Miller (NC)	Watson
Grijalva	Miller, George	Watt
Gutierrez	Mollohan	Waxman
Hall	Moore	Weiner
Harman	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Hastings (FL)	Murtha	Woolsey
Hill	Nadler	Wu
Hinchey	Napolitano	Wynn
Hinojosa	Neal (MA)	

NAYS—221

Aderholt	Camp	Forbes
Akin	Cannon	Fossella
Bachus	Cantor	Franks (AZ)
Baker	Capito	Frelinghuysen
Ballenger	Carter	Gallely
Barrett (SC)	Castle	Garrett (NJ)
Bartlett (MD)	Chabot	Gerlach
Barton (TX)	Chocola	Gibbons
Bass	Coble	Gilchrest
Beauprez	Cole	Gillmor
Bereuter	Cox	Gingrey
Biggert	Crane	Goode
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Goss
Blackburn	Cunningham	Granger
Blunt	Davis, Jo Ann	Graves
Boehlert	Davis, Tom	Green (WI)
Boehner	Deal (GA)	Greenwood
Bonilla	DeLay	Gutknecht
Bonner	DeMint	Harris
Bono	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hart
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hastings (WA)
Bradley (NH)	Doolittle	Hayes
Brady (TX)	Dreier	Hayworth
Brown (SC)	Duncan	Hefley
Brown-Waite,	Dunn	Hensarling
Ginny	Ehlers	Herger
Burgess	Emerson	Hobson
Burns	English	Hoekstra
Burr	Feeney	Hostettler
Burton (IN)	Fletcher	Houghton
Buyer	Foley	Hulshof
Calvert		Hunter

Hyde	Musgrave	Schrock	Castle	Hunter	Pombo	Lee	Napolitano	Serrano
Isakson	Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Chabot	Hyde	Pomeroy	Levin	Neal (MA)	Sherman
Issa	Nethercutt	Sessions	Chocola	Isakson	Porter	Lewis (GA)	Oberstar	Skelton
Istook	Ney	Shadegg	Coble	Issa	Portman	Lofgren	Obey	Slaughter
Janklow	Northup	Shaw	Cole	Istook	Pryce (OH)	Lowey	Olver	Smith (WA)
Jenkins	Norwood	Shays	Cox	Janklow	Putnam	Lynch	Ortiz	Snyder
Johnson (CT)	Nunes	Sherwood	Cramer	Jenkins	Quinn	Majette	Owens	Solis
Johnson (IL)	Nussle	Shimkus	Crane	Johnson (CT)	Radanovich	Maloney	Pallone	Spratt
Johnson, Sam	Osborne	Shuster	Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Ramstad	Markey	Pastor	Stark
Jones (NC)	Ose	Simmons	Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Regula	Matheson	Paul	Stenholm
Keller	Otter	Simpson	Cunningham	Jones (NC)	Rehberg	Matsui	Pelosi	Strickland
Kelly	Oxley	Smith (MI)	Davis, Jo Ann	Keller	Renzi	McCarthy (MO)	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Kennedy (MN)	Paul	Smith (NJ)	Davis, Tom	Kelly	Reynolds	McCarthy (NY)	Price (NC)	Tanner
King (IA)	Pearce	Smith (TX)	Deal (GA)	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (AL)	McCollum	Rahall	Tauscher
King (NY)	Pence	Souder	DeLay	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)	McDermott	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
Kingston	Peterson (PA)	Stearns	DeMint	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)	McGovern	Reyes	Thompson (MS)
Kirk	Petri	Sullivan	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Rohrabacher	McIntyre	Rodriguez	Tierney
Kline	Pickering	Sweeney	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Ros-Lehtinen	McNulty	Ross	Towns
Knollenberg	Pitts	Tancredo	Doolittle	Kline	Royce	Meehan	Rothman	Turner (TX)
Kolbe	Platts	Tauzin	Dreier	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)	Meek (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Udall (CO)
LaHood	Pombo	Taylor (MS)	Duncan	Kolbe	Ryun (KS)	Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Udall (NM)
Latham	Porter	Taylor (NC)	Dunn	LaHood	Saxton	Menendez	Rush	Van Hollen
LaTourette	Portman	Terry	Edwards	Latham	Schrock	Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Velazquez
Leach	Pryce (OH)	Thomas	Ehlers	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner	Millender-	Sabo	Vislosky
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Thornberry	Emerson	Leach	Sessions	McDonald	Sanchez, Linda	Waters
Lewis (KY)	Quinn	Tiahrt	English	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg	Miller (NC)	T.	Watson
Linder	Radanovich	Toomey	Feeney	Lewis (KY)	Shaw	Miller, George	Sanders	Watt
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Turner (OH)	Flake	Linder	Shays	Mollohan	Sandlin	Waxman
Lucas (OK)	Regula	Upton	Fletcher	Lipinski	Sherwood	Moore	Schakowsky	Weiner
Manzullo	Rehberg	Vitter	Foley	LoBiondo	Shimkus	Moran (VA)	Schiff	Wexler
McCotter	Renzi	Walden (OR)	Forbes	Lucas (KY)	Shuster	Murtha	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
McCrary	Reynolds	Walsh	Fossella	Lucas (OK)	Simmons	Nadler	Scott (VA)	Wynn
McHugh	Rogers (AL)	Wamp	Franks (AZ)	Manzullo	Simpson			
McInnis	Rogers (KY)	Weldon (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Marshall	Smith (MI)			
McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Weller	Galleghy	McCotter	Smith (NJ)			
Mica	Rohrabacher	Whitfield	Garrett (NJ)	McCrary	Smith (TX)			
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wicker	Gerlach	McHugh	Souder			
Miller (MI)	Royce	Wilson (NM)	Gibbons	McInnis	Stearns			
Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)	Wolf	Gilchrist	McKeon	Sullivan			
Moran (KS)	Ryun (KS)	Young (AK)	Gillmor	Mica	Sweeney			
Murphy	Saxton	Young (FL)	Gingrey	Miller (FL)	Tancredo			
			Goode	Miller (MI)	Tauzin			
			Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Taylor (MS)			
			Goss	Moran (KS)	Taylor (NC)			
			Granger	Murphy	Terry			
			Graves	Musgrave	Thomas			
			Green (WI)	Myrick	Thornberry			
			Greenwood	Nethercutt	Tiahrt			
			Gutknecht	Ney	Toomey			
			Hall	Northup	Turner (OH)			
			Harris	Norwood	Upton			
			Hart	Nunes	Vitter			
			Hastert	Nussle	Walden (OR)			
			Hastings (WA)	Osborne	Walsh			
			Hayes	Ose	Wamp			
			Hayworth	Otter	Weldon (FL)			
			Hefley	Oxley	Weller			
			Hensarling	Pearce	Whitfield			
			Herger	Pence	Wicker			
			Hobson	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (NM)			
			Hoekstra	Petri	Wolf			
			Holden	Pickering	Wu			
			Houghton	Pitts	Young (AK)			
			Hulshof	Platts	Young (FL)			

NOT VOTING—16

Allen	Everett	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Ferguson	Tiberi
Collins	Gephardt	Weldon (PA)
Combest	Holt	Wilson (SC)
Conyers	Pascrell	
Cubin	Payne	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1616

Mr. GORDON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 192, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—230

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Brown-Waite,
Akin	Blackburn	Ginny
Bachus	Blunt	Burgess
Baker	Boehlert	Burns
Ballenger	Boehner	Burr
Barrett (SC)	Bonilla	Burton (IN)
Bartlett (MD)	Bonner	Buyer
Barton (TX)	Bono	Calvert
Bass	Boozman	Camp
Beauprez	Boyd	Cannon
Bereuter	Bradley (NH)	Cantor
Biggert	Brady (TX)	Capito
Bilirakis	Brown (SC)	Carter

NAYS—192

Abercrombie	Cummings	Harman
Ackerman	Davis (AL)	Hastings (FL)
Alexander	Davis (CA)	Hill
Andrews	Davis (FL)	Hinchey
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Baird	Davis (TN)	Hoeffel
Baldwin	DeFazio	Holt
Ballance	DeGette	Honda
Becerra	Delahunt	Hooley (OR)
Bell	DeLauro	Hostettler
Berkley	Deutsch	Hoyer
Berman	Dicks	Inslee
Berry	Dingell	Israel
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Dooley (CA)	Jackson-Lee
Blumenauer	Doyle	(TX)
Boswell	Emanuel	Jefferson
Boucher	Engel	John
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	Jones (OH)
Brown, Corrine	Evans	Kanjorski
Capps	Farr	Kaptur
Cardin	Fattah	Kennedy (RI)
Cardoza	Filner	Kildee
Carson (IN)	Ford	Kilpatrick
Carson (OK)	Frank (MA)	Kind
Case	Frost	Klecicka
Clay	Gephardt	Kucinich
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Lampson
Conyers	Gordon	Langevin
Cooper	Green (TX)	Lantos
Costello	Grijalva	Larsen (WA)
Crowley	Gutierrez	Larson (CT)

NOT VOTING—13

Allen	Everett	Tiberi
Capuano	Ferguson	Weldon (PA)
Collins	Pascrell	Wilson (SC)
Combest	Payne	
Cubin	Sanchez, Loretta	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1623

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 2003, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall votes, due to the death of a family member.

Had I been present I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 27 (Kucinich Substitute to H.R. 4), 28 (Cardin Substitute to H.R. 4), and 29 (motion to recommit H.R. 4).

I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote 30 (passage of H.R. 4, welfare bill).

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 79) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 79

Resolved, That the following named Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Case (to rank immediately after Mr. Acevedo-Vilá), Mr. Pomeroy, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Udall of Colorado, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

(2) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Davis of Illinois (to rank immediately after Ms. McCollum), Mr. Van