

with bulletproof vests. Bulletproof vests and body armor have saved thousands of lives since the introduction of the modern bulletproof material, however, they cannot protect the lives of those who do not have access to them. Unfortunately, between 1992 and 2001, 594 police officers were gunned down in the line of duty. Of those slain, roughly half were not wearing bulletproof vests because sadly, their departments could not afford to provide them with these lifesaving pieces of equipment. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has estimated that the risk of fatality from a firearm for officers not wearing body armor is 14 times higher than for officers wearing body armor. The Fraternal Order of Police have stated that, "body armor is one of the most important pieces of equipment an officer can have and often mean the difference between life and death." According to the IACP/Dupont Kevlar Survivors Club, there are over 2,750 law enforcement officers in the United States who are alive today thanks to the bulletproof vests they were wearing.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program has directly benefited every State and territory of the United States. This critical program provides State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers with needed protection by aiding the purchase of protective equipment. More than 700,000 bulletproof vests are worn today as a direct result of this program.

The Act also recognizes that the lack of protective body armor is even more evident in small, rural police departments. Statistics show that officers in smaller departments are much less likely to have vests than their counterparts in large metropolitan departments. H.R. 1708, the text of which is included in Section 207 of this legislation, would meet the goal of saving officers' lives by reauthorizing the current grant program within the Justice Department for an additional 3 years, providing 50–50 matching grants to State and local law enforcement agencies. These grants are targeted to jurisdictions where most officers do not currently have access to vests, and they are designed to be free of the red tape that often characterizes other grant programs. That is why, in order to make sure that no community is left out of the program, half of the funds are reserved for jurisdictions with fewer than 100,000 residents.

In closing, the police officers who risk their lives are mothers and fathers, and they are sons and daughters. It is our obligation, to the officers and their families, to give them access to the equipment that will safeguard their lives. This legislation is intended to create a partnership with State and local law enforcement agencies in order to make sure that every police officer who needs a bulletproof vest gets one.

I thank Madam Speaker and urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I first would like to commend Chairman SENSENBRENNER for reasserting the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction over the Department of Justice with this bill. In the past few years, the Justice Department has become increasingly resistant to congressional oversight, either refusing to answer questions or answering them vaguely at best. Fortunately, we worked together at the Committee level to address our concerns with the Department and arrived at the bill before us today.

While the bill has numerous provisions that are worth notice, I would like to concentrate on a few. First, the bill reauthorizes the COPS office. We all know that this Clinton administration program has been increasingly vital in day-to-day crime prevention and crime solving. That is why COPS has received the praise of the Fraternal Order of Police, the largest law enforcement organization in the country. Local policing also is the backbone in our war on terrorism, as community officers are more likely to know the witnesses and more likely to be trusted by community residents who have information about potential attacks. This bill provides over \$1 billion per year for three fiscal years for this important program.

The bill also includes language offered by my colleague Rep. ADAM SCHIFF to require the Attorney General to submit reports to Congress on the number of persons detained on suspicion of terrorism. This is important because the Department has thwarted congressional and judicial efforts to obtain justification for terrorism detainees. In the past few years, the Department's Office of the Inspector General has found that the Department and its components had abused terrorism suspects, pushing them into walls, leaving them in legal limbo, and depriving them of access to family or counsel. With these reports, elected representatives can better determine whether the Department is overstepping its bounds again.

Third, the bill gives the Office of the Inspector General over \$70 million for its responsibilities. In the past few years, the OIG has been diligent in overseeing the Department's war on terrorism, issuing reports on 9/11 detainees and pushing the Department to change how its procedures for handling terrorism suspects. The bill provides that the increased funding should be used largely for continuing their PATRIOT Act-related functions.

Finally, the bill recognizes the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. It was President Kennedy's vision that brought members of the bar together to fight for the civil rights of all Americans. The Lawyers' Committee continues that fight and deserves our recognition and thanks.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation.

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Department of Justice Reauthorization Act. I commend Judiciary Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Ranking Member CONYERS, and other members of the Judiciary Committee for their diligent work on this bill. This bill makes important changes and adjustments to current law, which I believe will bring greater safety to our communities and ensure better and more efficient administration of crime-fighting programs.

There are two specific provisions of this Act that I would like to highlight.

The Reauthorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act is an important step in assuring the safety of law enforcement officers throughout the Nation. It has been through this program that thousands of police officers, including many in Puerto Rico, have received the critical personal safety protection of bulletproof vests. While the threat of gun violence will continue to endanger our police, the reauthorization of this grant program will continue the reduction of firearms injuries and deaths to our Nation's law enforcement officers.

Additionally, there is language in H.R. 3036 that is of great importance to Puerto Rico. Un-

like in the States, the Commonwealth government centrally carries out the vast majority of law enforcement functions. The Commonwealth's budget for 2005 calls for \$752 million to support the 22,500 Commonwealth police officers who have the primary responsibility for law enforcement on the island, and they are joined by approximately 4,000 officers at the municipal level. For this reason, the disbursement of funds under law enforcement grant programs, such as the local law enforcement block grant and the Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant, should be to the Commonwealth government. Under this scenario, the Commonwealth government then disburses funds to the municipal police forces as appropriate. This bill recognizes this unique structure, and includes language that appropriately directs the local law enforcement grants to the Commonwealth government.

Again, I greatly appreciate the leadership of Chairman SENSENBRENNER and his colleagues on the Judiciary Committee in bringing this important bill to the floor. I strongly support this legislation, and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3036, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WELFARE REFORM EXTENSION ACT OF 2004

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2231) to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through June 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2231

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 2004".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM THROUGH JUNE 30, 2004.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Activities authorized by part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, and by sections 510, 1108(b), and 1925 of such Act, shall continue through June 30, 2004, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2002, notwithstanding section 1902(e)(1)(A) of such Act, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose. Grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority through the third quarter of fiscal year 2004 at the level provided for such activities through the third quarter of fiscal year 2002.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 403(a)(3)(H)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42

U.S.C. 603(a)(3)(H)(ii)) is amended by striking "March 31" and inserting "June 30".

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL RANDOM SAMPLE STUDY OF CHILD WELFARE AND CHILD WELFARE WAIVER AUTHORITY THROUGH JUNE 30, 2004.

Activities authorized by sections 429A and 1130(a) of the Social Security Act shall continue through June 30, 2004, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2002, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose. Grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority through the third quarter of fiscal year 2004 at the level provided for such activities through the third quarter of fiscal year 2002.

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. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2231, the Welfare Reform Extension Act of 2004. This legislation is a straight 3-month extension of key parts of the Nation's welfare system.

Madam Speaker, the historic welfare reform law we passed in 1996 is working. Since 1996, more than 2 million children have been lifted from poverty, millions of families have left or remain off welfare, cutting welfare dependence in half, child well-being has dramatically improved, and record numbers of low-income parents are working.

But, Madam Speaker, that is not enough. Despite our progress, 2 million American families still remain dependent on welfare today. More than half of welfare recipients do not participate in any work or job training to prepare them for the future. Every year, millions of families break up or never form, risking welfare dependence for years to come. We must do more to assist these families.

Madam Speaker, that is why it is unfortunate that we are here today to approve yet another straight extension instead of an agreement on more long-term improvements. The House passed such comprehensive reform bills in 2002 and a year later in 2003, but the Senate still has not passed a companion bill, although one is being debated now.

Madam Speaker, in an effort to promote at least some reforms in recent weeks I have introduced two alternatives to a straight extension. Both of these alternatives would continue welfare funding at current levels, just like the bill before us today, but these alternatives would also provide more to help low-income families.

My first alternative would expect more welfare recipients to engage in work, a proven path out of poverty, or help more families avoid welfare dependence altogether.

My second alternative also would continue current programs while redirecting a small portion of welfare bonus funds to promote more healthy

married families. Both policies are drawn straight from the reforms that passed the House last year as part of our welfare reform bill, H.R. 4.

I introduced these alternatives because, after 18 months of simply maintaining the status quo, we must do more to help low-income families. I wish we were debating either of these extension bills today. The simple fact is that every day that passes without comprehensive agreement means more low-income families depending on welfare. It means less work and job preparation by parents. It means fewer child care and child support resources available to help families. It means more poverty, and it means more families breaking up or never forming.

Madam Speaker, there is real danger in continued delay as well. The House-passed welfare bill proposes \$1 billion more in mandatory child care funding during the next 5 years. It proposes billions more in discretionary child care funding. It proposes full funding for TANF programs.

□ 1330

Will those dollars be available in future years? Perhaps. But as time continues to pass and funding becomes tighter, the assurance that increased or even current Federal funding for these programs will remain available becomes more tenuous. For the past several years, Members on this side of the aisle have resisted proposals to reduce welfare funding knowing that these programs are working and recognizing the need for sufficient funds to make further reforms successful. But that case becomes harder to make, for example, if there is no real work requirement for welfare benefits for yet another year as further reforms fall by the wayside.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all Members to support the bill before us today. The bill will continue current funding for key welfare programs through June 30, 2004. It has already passed the other body, and I know the President will sign it immediately. As I have said during prior extension debates, it is my sincere hope that this will be the final extension needed and that the next 3 months will result in a final agreement that will help millions more families achieve independence and a brighter future. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise also in support of this legislation, which would extend the TANF and related programs for 3 additional months. It is important that these programs continue uninterrupted. They provide the wherewithal that our States can deal with some very vulnerable populations and help people restore their lives and help people be able to work. The bill is important, the program is important, and we need to pass it. It also provides for the

extension of transitional Medicaid which provides health care benefits to people who are coming off welfare. These are important programs that need to continue uninterrupted.

Madam Speaker, I share the disappointment of the gentleman from California that we are not considering a long-term extension of TANF and related programs. I think we need to do that. However, I disagree with my chairman as to the reason why we have been unable to do that. In the other body, they are now working on a bill, and I hope they are successful in bringing forward legislation. They are working, Democrats and Republicans, to try to produce a good bill. I am very happy that an amendment was adopted today that increases the amount of money in child care by \$6 billion. We are starting to get towards a true bipartisan bill that will provide the resources that the States desperately need in order to move welfare reform to the next plateau, and that is getting families out of poverty, because we have not been very successful in achieving that plateau of getting families out of poverty.

The reason I disagree with the gentleman from California as to why we are at this point where we are asking for another short-term extension, I do not believe it is the other body's fault. I think it is this body's fault, because the legislation that we passed, and I might say without any deliberation in this body, we just rubber-stamped the bill that was passed in the last Congress. The bill was not a bipartisan bill, it was a bill that was not favored by our States, it was a bill that goes backwards on welfare rather than continuing reform by being so prescriptive to our States, telling our States what they have to do. Unfunded mandates on our States. It is estimated that to implement the requirements that we placed in this bill would cost our States at least another \$11 billion in child care alone, let alone some of the other expenses. The worst part about the bill was that it provides for make-work activities, not real jobs. It does not take America's families out of poverty who are leaving welfare.

The reason we were unable to accomplish that, there was no effort to reach out, to bring out a bill that was truly bipartisan like they are trying to do in the other body. As a result of the action of this body, we made it very difficult to get a long-term extension enacted. I regret that.

I wish Members would listen to some of the experts in this field. We just got a letter from David Hage from the Star Tribune, who has written a book titled, "Reforming Welfare By Rewarding Work." That is exactly what we want to do. He talks about the Minnesota example. Let me just quote from Mr. Hage, if I might:

"In a recent conference call with journalists, Assistant Health and Human Services Secretary, Wade Horn, said the next steps in welfare reform

should be reducing poverty and improving the well-being of families and children.

"Yet the White House and House proposals for TANF reauthorization would do little to accomplish these goals and might in fact subvert them."

Then he goes on to tell why the prescriptive nature of the bill that was passed by the House makes it difficult for States to adopt the type of programs necessary so that families can get the skills they need, the education they need, the training they need, so they can not only get a job but they can move up the economic ladder of success. That is what TANF reauthorization should be about. It should not be moving backwards to penalize people and to make it difficult for them to be able to succeed and, worse than that, making it very difficult for our States to comply with our laws without spending a lot more money, and not the way they think it is best to spend that money.

Madam Speaker, I support this bill because we need to continue this program; but as I have said, I think this is my sixth time on the floor on a temporary extension during the last year and a half. Once again speaking for the Members on this side of the aisle, we are ready to sit down today to work out a true bipartisan multi-year TANF reauthorization bill and to consider the issues so that we can really improve our welfare system, help our States and deal with those families that need our help today. If the leadership on the other side is willing to do that, we would not have to be doing these short-term extensions. We could, in fact, be voting on not only in this body but we could be sending to the President a good multi-year reauthorization of the TANF programs to help American families get out of poverty and find real employment.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a senior member of the committee who was very instrumental in the 1996 TANF legislation.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland as usual has put his finger on what the issue is here, that is, whether we want to move forward with welfare reform or we want to move backwards.

The problem with the approach taken by the Republican majority here has been, instead of trying to reach out and move welfare reform to another stage, they have instead decided, on a very partisan basis essentially, to craft their own bill that really moves this backwards.

Let me just indicate why. The gentleman from Maryland has pointed out a number of ways. We need to accentuate this. The gentleman from California says we have to help families who are still on welfare, but the child care provision in their bill is very, very

inadequate. The literature is not complete, we do not have all the data, but it is very clear that one of the reasons welfare reform has worked is because there has been considerable money set aside for child care. Indeed, President Clinton, who brought this issue to the fore many years ago, vetoed bills originally passed in this House because there was inadequate money for child care. Eventually this House, on a bipartisan basis, stood up and was counted on this issue; and we passed many, many more moneys for child care and eventually President Clinton signed the bill.

The contrast between the House and the Senate on child care moneys is very striking. The gentleman from Maryland mentioned that the Senate has now passed a \$6 billion proposal, and I think it was a vote overwhelmingly in favor, while the gentleman from California and others get up here and defend a child care provision in the bill that was passed here on a partisan basis that is minor compared to what is needed.

Health care is another problem. If we want to help families move off welfare, we should provide adequate health care coverage during the transition period. The Republican majority here has absolutely refused to step up to the plate on transitional Medicaid. Absolutely refused.

And then as to the families on welfare, the gentleman from California mentioned they are moving out of poverty. An essential ingredient of that is some training so people are trained to be able to move up the economic ladder. But, instead, what they did in their bill was essentially to take out the training element as one of the ingredients of a successful effort by people on welfare.

Those are just three of the reasons. By the way, this training aspect is so vital, and I think the Republican majority in the House and the President of the United States have failed to understand, to face up to this fact: poverty is increasing in the United States of America under their domain. It is increasing. We do not have all the figures; but it is clear, I think, that many of those still in poverty are people who have moved off of welfare, who have not had the adequate training to be able to move up the ladder and still remain in minimum wage jobs. By the way, they refuse to raise the minimum wage, too.

We need to extend the present system, but we also need to move on to the second phase of welfare reform. I am hopeful if there is a bill that passes the Senate that there can then be a conference and you will not on the Republican House majority side be so recalcitrant and insist on taking good elements out of welfare reform, one, and also refuse to put some added ingredients into welfare reform, two.

You have stonewalled. It is not the Senate. They are now moving ahead. The question is whether you are going

to be willing to be a partner with them and with Democrats in moving this ahead instead of moving backwards. Partisanship in welfare reform is a dead end. I hope you get off it and we can move as we did many years ago on a bipartisan basis and make a further improvement so people who are now on welfare indeed can move off it, can have the training, can have the child care, can have the health care so they and their kids can move out of poverty.

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

Just in response, the gentleman mentioned that the bill was inadequate in terms of funding. I would like to remind the gentleman to consider that the States have been offered some \$2 billion more in child care, that is in our bill, and that is on top of the \$170 billion of State and Federal welfare/child care funds currently available over the next 5 years. Also, there is some \$4 billion in TANF surplus that is available. I might also mention that another comment was made that there were unfunded mandates. The fact is that in this legislation, there are no unfunded mandates in H.R. 4.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond to the gentleman from California to point out that the only new money in this bill that passed this body, the only new money is some small dollars in regards to marriage promotion and \$1 billion guaranteed for child care. That will not even keep up with the current purchasing power, let alone provide the needed resources to deal with the new work requirements. In my own State of Maryland, we have frozen new enrollments into child care because of a lack of resources.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), who has been one of the leaders in this body on welfare reform, children's issues, and family issues.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2231 because to do anything else would be irresponsible. We must continue assistance to those who need help getting back on their feet, and we must continue that assistance through the TANF program. But, Madam Speaker, we can do much better.

I speak from whence I came. I know about welfare. I lived it. Over 30 years ago as a young mother with three children, they were aged 1, 3, and 5 years old, my husband left us. I immediately went to work full time; but to keep it all together, I went on welfare, aid for dependent children, while I continued my full-time work so that my children could have the health care and the child care that they needed.

□ 1345

Because I was educated, because I had good job skills and good job experience, because I was healthy and my

children were healthy, lucky me, and the Members know I was assertive, eventually, I worked my way out of poverty. But it would have been almost impossible without the help of the Federal Government; and, believe me, I think that others should have the same opportunities that I did.

I know that we need to make education and training count as work activity for welfare recipients so mothers will have access to educational opportunities and job training to give them the skills they need so that they can get jobs that pay a livable wage, so that they can actually take care of their families. I know that quality child care, child care that actually includes infant and weekend and evening work, helps parents keep their jobs so that they can become self-sufficient and that these programs are essential to any welfare plan to give support to families in need.

Madam Speaker, as Congress continues to debate welfare reauthorization, we have to remember that the goal of welfare is to move women and their families from welfare to self-sufficiency, not from welfare to poverty as it is now. Therefore, we in this body must do a lot more to make this a true bipartisan bill so that families can get the real help that they need. In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to join me in continuing under S. 2231 what is going on now, so that we can improve the safety net for families in need.

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

Madam Speaker, the very first words in the TANF program are: "The purpose of this part is to increase the flexibility of the States . . ." The law then highlights several purposes such as helping needy families and promoting work.

My concern is that the legislation that passed this body takes a major step backwards in our stated goal of giving State flexibility.

The House bill reduces State flexibility on providing education and training by removing it from a core work activity. This is an issue for the States to decide, but, no, in our legislation we make it a Federal issue.

The House bill reduces States' flexibility in addressing the individual needs of welfare recipients by doubling the number of required work hours for mothers with children under the age of 6 required in the legislation that passed this body. This should be up to the States to make those judgments. That is what State flexibility is about.

The House bill reduces the flexibility of States to design programs that focus on moving people from welfare to work by increasing work participation rates without providing an employment credit for those individuals who leave welfare for a wage-paying job. Once again, the States should be able to tailor their own programs to meet their needs. That was the commitment we made in 1996.

And the House bill reduces State flexibility by imposing full sanctions,

not giving States the opportunity to have their own sanctions system, once again taking away flexibility from the States. That is not what we should be doing.

The 1996 welfare reform worked because we trusted our States, we gave them the tools, and they developed programs that made sense to get people off of welfare and to get people employed. That is what we need to do again in the next chapter of welfare reform by not only empowering our States but making it easier for them to get families out of poverty.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that we can continue the current program, but I also urge my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle, to sit down with us and let us work out a sensible bipartisan bill that really will continue the commitment we made in 1996 to our families of America and to our States, giving the States the resources and the flexibility to get the job done.

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

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

The comment was made that somehow we are not funding as much or funding is less. Not only is this not accurate, the exact opposite in fact is the truth. In terms of case welfare, child care funds available per person on welfare, there is twice as much funding available today as there was in 1996 because the rolls have been cut in half and yet the funding has remained constant.

For example, in 1996 the average amount of money available per welfare family was about \$7,000. Today, the average amount available for each family is \$16,000, from \$7,000 to \$16,000, that is available.

Madam Speaker, again, as I have said during prior extension debates, it is my sincere hope that this will be the final extension needed and that the next 3 months will result in a final agreement that will help millions more families achieve independence and a brighter future. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2231, but I am discouraged that we find ourselves needing to pass this legislation.

The bill before us today will extend the Federal welfare law, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, or TANF, for another 3 months. This is the sixth time we have come to the floor to extend this program since its authorization expired in September 2002.

The 1996 welfare reform law is one of the most successful social policy initiatives in recent memory. However, we know there is more work to be done. A majority of TANF recipients—approximately 60 percent—still are not working for benefits.

To put even more Americans on the path to self-sufficiency and independence, the House passed H.R. 4 in February 2003. H.R. 4 strengthens current work requirements by asking welfare recipients to engage in work-re-

lated activities for 40 hours a week—16 of which could be in education, job training, or other constructive activities as defined by States.

The House-passed bill would ensure that no needy family would fall through the cracks. H.R. 4 creates a policy of universal engagement so that all families receiving welfare benefits must be in work or other activities leading to self-sufficiency. The House reauthorization measure also gradually increases to 70 percent the work participation rate required by States.

Moreover, the House reauthorization bill makes significant improvements to the Child Care and Development Block Grant. It adds \$1 billion in discretionary funding to the program over 5 years and requires States to devote more money to improving child care quality. These provisions will ensure that low-income parents have access to safe, quality child care as they move into work.

This week the other body is considering full welfare reauthorization. I am encouraged that the other body may soon pass its welfare reauthorization bill, and hope we will be able to resolve our differences quickly in a conference committee.

The millions of Americans still seeking to move off of the welfare rolls deserve no less. Those continuing to struggle to attain self-sufficiency need the assistance that H.R. 4 would provide.

While I hope this will be the last extension of current law we must pass, I urge my colleagues to support the bill before us today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2231.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2241) to reauthorize certain school lunch and child nutrition programs through June 30, 2004.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2241

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

SECTION 1. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN MILITARY HOUSING ALLOWANCES.

Section 9(b)(7) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(7)) is amended by striking "March 31, 2004" and inserting "June 30, 2004".

SEC. 2. CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM.

Section 17(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(a)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking "March 31, 2004" and inserting "June 30, 2004".

SEC. 3. REIMBURSEMENT TO STATES UNDER COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS.

Section 15(e) of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of