

Kline	Nadler	Sensenbrenner
Kuster	Napolitano	Sessions
Labrador	Neugebauer	Sewell (AL)
LaMalfa	Noem	Shea-Porter
Lamborn	Nunes	Sherman
Lankford	Nunnelee	Shimkus
Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Shuster
Latta	Olson	Simpson
Levin	Palazzo	Sinema
Lipinski	Pascrell	Smith (NE)
Loebsack	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Lofgren	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Long	Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Lowenthal	Perlmutter	Southerland
Lowe	Perry	Speier
Lucas	Peters (CA)	Stewart
Luetkemeyer	Petri	Stockman
Lujan Grisham	Pingree (ME)	Stutzman
(NM)	Pitts	Swalwell (CA)
Luján, Ben Ray	Pocan	Takano
(NM)	Polis	Thompson (PA)
Maffei	Pompeo	Thornberry
Maloney,	Posey	Tiberi
Carolyn	Price (NC)	Tierney
Maloney, Sean	Quigley	Titus
Marino	Reichert	Tonko
Massie	Rice (SC)	Tsongas
Matsui	Richmond	Upton
McCarthy (CA)	Roby	Van Hollen
McCarthy (NY)	Roe (TN)	Vargas
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Wagner
McCollum	Rogers (MI)	Walden
McHenry	Rokita	Walorski
McIntyre	Ros-Lehtinen	Walz
McKeon	Roskam	Wasserman
McKinley	Ross	Schultz
McMorris	Rothfus	Waters
Rodgers	Roybal-Allard	Watt
McNerney	Ruiz	Waxman
Meadows	Runyan	Weber (TX)
Meehan	Ruppersberger	Webster (FL)
Meeks	Ryan (WI)	Welch
Meng	Salmon	Wenstrup
Messer	Scalise	Westmoreland
Mica	Schiff	Whitfield
Michaud	Schneider	Williams
Miller (FL)	Schock	Wilson (FL)
Miller (MI)	Schrader	Wilson (SC)
Miller, Gary	Schwartz	Wolf
Moran	Schweikert	Womack
Mullin	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth
Mulvaney	Scott, Austin	Yoho
Murphy (PA)	Scott, David	Young (IN)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—15

Cantor	Hunter	Royce
Costa	Lynch	Serrano
Gohmert	Markey	Sires
Granger	Murphy (FL)	Terry
Huelskamp	Rangel	Young (FL)

□ 1542

So the Journal was approved.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

**PRESERVING THE WELFARE WORK REQUIREMENT AND TANF EXTENSION ACT OF 2013**

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 107, I call up the bill (H.R. 890) to prohibit waivers relating to compliance with the work requirements for the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 107, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-3 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 890

*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 "Preserving the Welfare Work Requirement and TANF Extension Act of 2013".*

**SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON TANF WAIVERS RELATING TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE TANF WORK REQUIREMENTS.**

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Health and Human Services may not do the following:*

*(1) Finalize, implement, enforce, or otherwise take any action to give effect to the Information Memorandum dated July 12, 2012 (Transmittal No. TANF-ACF-IM-2012-03), or to any administrative action relating to the same subject matter set forth in the Information Memorandum or that reflects the same or similar policies as those set forth in the Information Memorandum.*

*(2) Authorize, approve, renew, modify, or extend any experimental, pilot, or demonstration project under section 1115 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315) that waives compliance with a requirement of section 407 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 607) through a waiver of section 402 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 602) or that provides authority for an expenditure which would not otherwise be an allowable use of funds under a State program funded under part A of title IV of such Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) with respect to compliance with the work requirements in section 407 of such Act to be regarded as an allowable use of funds under that program for any period.*

*(b) RESCISSION OF WAIVERS.—Any waiver relating to the subject matter set forth in the Information Memorandum or described in subsection (a)(2) that is granted before the date of the enactment of this Act is hereby rescinded and shall be null and void.*

**SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES PROGRAM AND RELATED PROGRAMS THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2013.**

*Activities authorized by part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (other*

*than under section 403(b) of such Act) shall continue through December 31, 2013, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2012, 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 on a quarterly basis through the first quarter of fiscal year 2014 at the level provided for such activities for the corresponding quarter of fiscal year 2012.*

**SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

*The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 890.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 890, Preserving the Welfare Work Requirement and TANF Extension Act of 2013.

In July of last year, the Obama administration's Department of Health and Human Services issued an information memorandum saying they would accept and approve applications from States seeking to waive the requirement that 50 percent of their welfare caseload be engaged in or preparing for work.

This work requirement was a critical part of the 1996 welfare reforms that created the current Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, cash welfare program. Those reforms also led to more work, more earnings, less welfare dependence, and less poverty among families headed by low-income single mothers.

Yet, without any thought of consulting Congress, as is required by law, the administration saw fit to unilaterally waive the work requirements and risk the progress that has been made in the last 16 years. And that's why we are considering this legislation here on the floor today.

Simply put, this bill would block waivers, so HHS can't allow States to bypass the work requirements and financial penalties Congress put in place in 1996 for failing to engage welfare recipients in work.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will argue that Republicans are making a big deal out of nothing and that we're responding to a problem

NAYS—120

Amash	Graves (MO)	Nugent
Andrews	Green, Al	Pallone
Bass	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Benishek	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Bentivolio	Griffith (VA)	Peters (MI)
Bera (CA)	Grijalva	Peterson
Bishop (NY)	Hanna	Pittenger
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Poe (TX)
Broun (GA)	Heck (NV)	Price (GA)
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Radel
Butterfield	Holding	Rahall
Capuano	Honda	Reed
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Renacci
Chaffetz	Hudson	Ribble
Clarke	Jackson Lee	Rigell
Coble	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Conaway	Jones	Ryan (OH)
Conyers	Joyce	Sánchez, Linda
Cotton	Kilmer	T.
Courtney	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Crowley	Kinzinger (IL)	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cummings	Lance	Slaughter
Davis, Rodney	Langevin	Stivers
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Thompson (CA)
Denham	Latham	Thompson (MS)
Dent	Lee (CA)	Lewis
Duffy	Lewis	Tipton
Fattah	LoBiondo	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Valadao
Flores	Marchant	Veasey
Foxx	Matheson	Vela
Fudge	McDermott	Velázquez
García	McGovern	Walberg
Gardner	Miller, George	Wittman
Gerlach	Moore	Woodall
Gibson	Neal	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Negrete McLeod	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Nolan	

that doesn't exist since no States have applied for waivers—yet. But the American people have made their views clear. A survey last year revealed 83 percent support a work requirement as a condition for receiving welfare.

Clearly, the best way out of poverty is a job, and it's critical that our laws both foster job creation as well as ensure welfare is always a pathway to work. That's what this legislation is about: ensuring that work and other productive activities remain a central part of the TANF cash welfare program, as the 1996 reforms intended.

Setting aside the success of the work requirement in moving low-income individuals from welfare to work and the overwhelming support the policy enjoys among the American people, current law prohibits the administration from waiving the welfare work requirement. Waivers of certain State report requirements are permitted under the TANF program, but the work requirement may not be waived.

A summary of the 1996 reforms prepared by Ways and Means Committee staff immediately following the law's enactment could not be clearer on this point. It plainly states:

Waivers granted after the date of enactment may not override provisions of the TANF law that concern mandatory work requirements.

As a Member of Congress who helped write the welfare reform law and served as a conferee on the bill, the statement in this report actually captures the correct intent of Congress.

Historical precedent is not on the Obama administration's side, either. No prior administration, Republican or Democrat, has ever attempted to waive the work requirements in the 16 years between the law's enactment and the July 2012 information memorandum.

Following the July 2012 action, the Government Accountability Office looked into this and "did not find any evidence that HHS stated it has authority to issue waivers related to TANF work requirements." In short, no administration attempted to waive the work requirements because they knew it was illegal to do so.

Finally, if we need more evidence that, despite their promises to the contrary, the administration's policy would weaken the work requirement, we need look no further than the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office. This legislation saves \$61 million over 10 years because CBO recognizes the administration's waivers will allow some States that may otherwise pay penalties for failing to meet the work requirement to avoid such penalties through a waiver.

In addition to preventing the administration from waiving the work requirement, the legislation before us extends the TANF program's authorization at current funding levels through the remainder of this calendar year.

The TANF program provides helpful assistance to individuals most in need of a safety net as they look and prepare

for work. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION  
AND THE WORKFORCE,  
Washington, DC, March 8, 2013.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to the consideration of H.R. 890, the Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 890 on those matters within the committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 890, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration on this bill. However, I do so with the understanding that this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice the committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, DC, March 12, 2013.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,  
Chairman, Committee on Education and the  
Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 890, the "Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013," which is expected to be considered on the floor this week.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 890. I agree that your decision should not prejudice the Committee on Education and the Workforce with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 890 on the House Floor.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,  
Chairman.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

Bringing up this bill today is doubly unfortunate. Number one, this is a time when we should be coming together—or at least trying to. This is a time when we should not try some partisan efforts. Unfortunately, that's what this is all about. This bill is essentially a pure fabrication of what is true.

□ 1550

Last summer the administration came forth with a proposal: states would be allowed to apply for waivers and have some flexibility in terms of the application of the work require-

ments—not the end of them or changing them, but the implementation of them—provided any project would be required to increase employment by at least 20 percent. So this claim that what is being done here is an effort to put at risk the work requirements is fallacious.

What happened? After HHS spoke, the Romney campaign decided they might have a campaign issue. So they essentially put together a campaign ad with the fallacious claim that what the Obama administration was trying to do was to weaken welfare reform. The instantaneous reaction of fact checkers was four Pinocchios, pants on fire, complete untruth.

And this is what Ron Haskins had to say, the Republican person on the staff most involved with the chairman and myself:

The idea that the administration is going to try to overturn welfare reform is ridiculous. States have to apply individually for waivers, and they have to explain in detail why the approach would lead to either more employment or better jobs for people who are trying to stay off welfare.

Indeed, earlier in 2005, 29 Republican Governors wrote asking if they could obtain a waiver in terms of the implementation of the work requirements, and on three occasions the Republicans brought legislation to the floor which would have brought about this kind of a waiver.

Here's what was said by President Clinton, who worked on welfare reform and signed it in 1996:

When some Republican Governors asked if they could have waivers to try new ways to put people on welfare back to work, the Obama administration listened.

And I insert at this point that there was a request from the Republican Governor of Utah.

I continue with the quote:

Because we all know it is hard for even people with good work histories to get jobs today. So moving folks from welfare to work is a real challenge, and the administration agreed to give waivers to those Governors and others only if they had a credible plan to increase employment by 20 percent, and they could keep the waivers only if they did increase employment. Now, did I make myself clear? The requirement was for more work, not less.

So this was tried last year. There was an effort by the Republicans. They came forth with a bill. The campaign was full blast. And what they wanted to do was to reaffirm or to support a political ad by their candidate for President. That's what that was all about.

We had a vote along partisan lines. And as we said, it went nowhere in the Senate. By the way, I don't think it helped their Presidential candidate as it was so blatantly false, so patently political.

The election is over. The people have spoken. The President has been re-elected. Why bring up this political horse? It's worse than lame; it's mistaken.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, for 5 seconds that in the Statement of Administration Policy we got yesterday, they say that no States formally applied for State waivers.

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us today because Congress must ensure that work continues to be the centerpiece of the TANF welfare program, and I regret that we are here today debating the Obama administration's efforts to undermine work requirements.

I think that my Democrat colleagues would agree that our time would be better spent discussing bipartisan improvements to TANF and other programs designed to help low-income parents find and go to work. I look forward to having those discussions and conversations as the chairman of the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, bipartisan discussions were actually happening before the Obama administration announced they would waive work requirements for welfare recipients last summer. That announcement completely undermined bipartisan negotiations in our committee about ways to strengthen this program. Incredibly, administration officials knew about those negotiations and even had a draft of bipartisan legislation in hand before they announced their misguided waiver policy.

Usually, if an administration wants to change the law, they must submit a legislative proposal for Congress to consider, but that's not what the Obama administration did with its proposal to waive the TANF work requirements.

Even though the administration had said repeatedly in their annual budget they would work with Congress to reform welfare, they didn't propose any changes to the program. Instead, they simply claimed they could waive the current work requirements at the heart of welfare reform without even notifying Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised that the administration would proceed with its waiver policy, especially knowing that real bipartisan progress was being made.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, the President's waiver policy increases spending by \$61 million, according to CBO. There are currently 240 combinations of work, education, and training requirements falling under the 12 definitions included in this law. The administration does not have the authority to waive work requirements; that authority is not granted under the law. Therefore—this is very important—the misuse of authority is subject to congressional review and disapproval. That's why we are here today. This is

Congress' responsibility, and we were working together with the White House, which is also our responsibility.

Today I'm standing here asking my colleagues across the aisle and on my side of the aisle to support this bill and reject the administration's waiver proposal. That way we can get back to working together to close loopholes, strengthen work requirements and ensure that more welfare recipients go back to work and move up the economic ladder.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another gentleman who has worked on welfare reform over the years, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LEVIN.

Well, we're at it again. There is no greater misuse of time than re-fighting the last election. The last election is just that: the last election. It's over.

Governor Romney's pollster said at the time, "We're not going to let our campaign be dictated by fact checkers," after it was pointed out that there were so many mistakes and miscalculations in their proposal.

They might not have cared about the facts, but today I do. I chaired the Democratic position with Lynn Woolsey and Vic Fazio at the behest of Dick Gephardt at the time. One of the goals of welfare reform was to move unemployed Americans from welfare to work, and it did work. The legislation has been very successful in meeting that goal.

□ 1600

Welfare reform put people back on the work rolls. Welfare rolls have dropped by half, and poverty amongst children has dropped as well. The administration's TANF waiver initiative continues on this success of promoting welfare to work. It is ludicrous for our Republican friends to try to get in the way of people working by their stopping this waiver initiative—an initiative, by the way, that the Republican Governors asked for. Bill Weld was a very successful Governor of Massachusetts on the issue of welfare reform. He wanted the waiver. He asked for the waiver, as did George Pataki of New York. They asked for the waivers, Republican Governors.

The President is not dropping welfare's work requirements. He is allowing the States to experiment. You would think our Republican friends would be entirely in favor of letting Governors experiment on getting people back to work fairly quickly. Secretary Sebelius has stated that the Department's goal is to accelerate job placement, requiring States to commit to a plan that will move at least 20 percent more people from welfare to work compared to the last marker of the State's performance. Let me repeat: a 20 percent increase in getting people on welfare to work from the last marker.

I must be missing something here. I sat through months and months and

months of deliberation. We reached a compromise. Some of us were disappointed in parts of it, but the Clinton administration signed on. It worked. Those are the facts, not opinions.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 890, to prevent the administration from gutting critical TANF work requirements which have been central to TANF's success over the past two decades.

President Clinton shared the belief that welfare reform should be about moving people from welfare to work, and the 1996 bipartisan welfare reform law he signed promoted work as central to these reforms. The TANF program's statutory work requirements have reduced poverty and welfare dependence for the program's recipients. Since the enactment of the 1996 welfare reform law with its work requirements, the number of individuals receiving welfare has dropped by 57 percent, and employment and earnings among single mothers has increased significantly.

In my home State of Arkansas, TANF success stories are based on the core work requirements. We've got the story of Suzette. When she started participating in Arkansas' Work Pays program, she was a single parent without child care or transportation. With TANF assistance and support from her caseworker, within 6 months, she was promoted to shift manager at McDonald's and then on to a career at Tyson Foods. Now Suzette is providing child care and transportation herself, and her self-sufficiency was made possible through this program's key work requirements. This success story is exactly why Arkansas has not requested a waiver from the work requirements. In fact, no State has requested a waiver.

The administration's unprecedented action of pushing the waiver idea is a fundamental unwinding of years of progress made toward work as the cornerstone of moving people from poverty to self-sufficiency. We must uphold TANF's statutory work requirements and protect Congress' constitutional authority to legislate. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 890.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Human Resources with jurisdiction over TANF.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the value of work. That's one of the reasons that I voted for the 1996 welfare reform law, because I wanted to see more people move from welfare to work. Our laws need to encourage job opportunities, but in the effort that we have before us

today, it seems to me that this legislation as proposed is less malevolent and more irrelevant to those poor people.

Because of the way the TANF program is currently structured, only about 1 percent of working-aged adults across America who are poor are participating in TANF work activities at any particular time. So, this afternoon, for 99 percent of the poor Americans who are not participating in TANF work activities, this bill is not all that significant. These are people who are struggling to get up the economic ladder at about the first rung. What happens and whether there are waivers or there are not waivers, I think they basically just feel that we've waved goodbye to their plight and are not responding to it in a constructive way.

It also is important to remember that we have a higher proportion of our population living near the bottom of the economic ladder today than when welfare reform was first enacted. In 2011, about 46 million American neighbors lived in poverty. About 350,000 of those lived in the San Antonio area. Amidst this poverty, amidst this growing inequality in resources in our country, we have the lowest level of poor children receiving direct cash assistance from TANF in almost 50 years. In my home State of Texas, one in every 20 poor children receives TANF assistance directly, and when children get assistance, they don't get very much.

As we look at the whole question of extending the TANF law, what we've had are only short-term extensions, not long-term reform. And each of these has provided some convenient political opportunities to reenforce the old welfare Cadillac stereotypes that just blame the poor for being poor. A previous extension we had out here focused on whether we would prohibit poor people from withdrawing any of their TANF benefits at a strip club or at a casino. It's not an unreasonable restriction, but it's hardly going to the core issue of how to get more Americans out of poverty and into the workplace, and I don't think today's bill helps in that regard either.

I believe that poverty should be viewed as a major national problem that needs a resolution by our working together and not viewed as a weapon to just score political points out of the last Presidential campaign.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. I think the real poverty at stake today is the poverty of cooperation, that of seeking a bipartisan response to poverty, a poverty of balance that contributes to the many children and their parents who are out there and who are seeing so little progress.

If you evaluate the TANF program and how it has operated over the last decade and a half, based upon the number of poor people who have been denied assistance, it has been a tremen-

dous success; but if you evaluate it based on how many poor people have moved out of welfare and into the workforce—into a job with a living wage that they're still in—I think the progress has been very spotty, at best.

The responsibility for those failures is shared broadly here in Washington and in the States, many of which just used the TANF resources to replace other things they were doing in the social service area. I believe that today's attempt to restrict State authority to strengthen welfare to work initiatives is totally contradictory with what's going on right now in the Budget Committee on block granting health assistance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. So, Mr. Speaker, rather than arguing over whether the States have all the flexibility they need, our goal ought to be: For the taxpayer and for poor Americans, how can we get more people into the workforce? And today's bill contributes little to that process.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that waiving the work requirement isn't going to get more people into work.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to rise in support of this proposed legislation before us today.

I have been sitting here, listening to the arguments of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I've heard conflicting messages. I've heard that this is an irrelevant piece of legislation, that it's not necessary because no one is requesting a waiver, that HHS and the administration have not engaged in a policy that allows waivers to occur; yet in the same breath, in the same argument, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, But many Republican Governors are asking for waivers from States in going forward.

The point is: this needs to be clarified. This needs to be firmly stated in our record and in the laws of the land that TANF requires a work requirement for our welfare program.

I am a firm believer in the work requirements as they empower our unemployed, our underemployed—the folks who need it the most—to have the skill sets and the resources to put them back to work for generations to come so as to take care of their children and the people who are below them in regards to their needs.

□ 1610

What I would say is any effort to send a conflicting message that somehow waivers are an acceptable policy should be fought on both sides of the aisle and rejected. That's why this leg-

islation is necessary, and it is also necessary to get the reauthorization in place so that we can set the stage for a comprehensive, vigorous debate on welfare reform at the end of this 9-month reauthorization that this legislation does.

So I encourage my colleagues, this is not about a Presidential election; this is about firm, solid policy when it comes to our welfare rolls in America. This is about giving people the tools to get back to work, and that work under the welfare program makes sense and is good, sound policy. I urge my colleagues to join with us and support this reauthorization.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), another member of our committee, and a most active one.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LEVIN. I rise in opposition to this bill today.

The underlying premise of this bill has been roundly and routinely denounced by fact checkers. This bill is at best a solution looking for a problem. In 1997, I carried legislation in California to implement the Federal Government's welfare reform. It was the California welfare reform measure. We took our work seriously, and we took the work requirements in the Federal legislation seriously in California, and we worked across the aisle to adopt practical welfare reform. My bill was signed by the Republican Governor at the time, Governor Pete Wilson, and it's still being followed by the Democratic Governor of California today, Governor Jerry Brown.

Welfare reform in California has contributed to substantial increases in the employment of very low-income earners and markedly helped families in California move from welfare to work. Fifteen years later, the program caseload in California is roughly 60 percent of what it was in 1998, even in the face of this Great Recession that we're coming through.

Waivers can be an important tool to allow States the flexibility to run Federal programs in the most efficient and effective way, a tool used to move people from welfare to work, and it shouldn't fall the victim of politics. Every State is different—we hear that on this floor all the time. States should have the flexibility to do what they need to do in order to effectively and efficiently move people from welfare to work, and that's what this provision does.

And the idea that we're standing here today debating this, whether or not it should be expunged from the Federal tool chest, is purely politics, and it should not happen. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we spend a lot of time in this body talking about the need to be bipartisan. People rightly feel, I think, that

things get too polarized around here. I think back to the mid-nineties when Republicans controlled the House. We had a Democrat President, and people back then thought things were a bit too polarized as well. Yet in the midst of that atmosphere, Bill Clinton and Newt Gingrich came up with landmark legislation to reform our welfare programs, and they did so in a bipartisan fashion.

One of the keys to the success of those reforms were the work requirement provisions that led to more jobs, bigger paychecks, and fewer people in poverty, children in particular. As President Clinton said at the time:

First and foremost, welfare reform should be about moving people from welfare to work.

As further proof that this is not a partisan issue, Republican or Democrat, I look to my own State of Indiana. Before the 1996 welfare reform law was passed, then-Governor Bayh, a Democrat, created similar work requirements for Hoosiers who received certain government benefits. Not only did Indiana's reforms ensure that those who needed assistance were able to receive it, but it also helped ensure that they were quickly back to taking care of themselves.

As Mr. Bayh later said:

The bottom line was trying to make someone self-sufficient. We were trying to achieve two values—one was the notion of community, and also responsibility.

Indiana's welfare-to-work initiative was a very successful program that remains a hallmark of his governorship.

With bipartisan consensus on this issue, and for all the talk in Washington about the need to be bipartisan, work across the aisle, it amazes me that HHS would unilaterally try and waive these work provisions. The welfare reform of the 1990s lifted millions out of poverty and put them on a path to self-sufficiency. It was a signature bill for bipartisanship in this town. Let's not undue these positive results by allowing HHS to gut key provisions of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, rarely have I been a fan of the concept that one size fits all. Therefore, I find it necessary to not be in favor of this legislation. However, I am strongly in favor of TANF. TANF is a greatly needed program. It provides temporary assistance to needy families, and we need to try to make those programs as effective as we possibly can. TANF is designed to help people who may have become parents too soon. Their jobs may have gone out of

business. They may have dropped out of school, don't have much in the way of formal education and training, and may even have a prison record.

In order to provide the most effective help, their State may need the flexibility to design and implement the best program they possibly can. They may even have clients who have three or four children and no husband or no wife. They may need babysitting help and cannot find it. They may need a waiver. I agree with the administration's position; and if a State determines that they can do a better job with the waiver, and Health and Human Services agrees, then they ought to be able to get one.

I've been told, and I believe, that if you give a man or woman a fish, they can eat for a day; but you teach them how to fish effectively, and they can eat for a lifetime. I disapprove of this restriction on this bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND), a cosponsor of the underlying bill.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Chairman for yielding me time this afternoon.

I am proudly standing here as an original cosponsor of this bill, H.R. 890. I think today gives us an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to speak with clarity and say once and for all, regardless of the interpretations and regardless of the arguments on this floor, that we require an individual, before they benefit and they take, that they must work. I think it is a very safe thing for us to do. It mirrors the culture of this country down through the years.

You know, I support these requirements because working is the best way to lift people out of poverty and give them the opportunity for earned success. I remember in my youth, my father, he clearly made us work. He made us understand the value of hard work. It wasn't a punishment; it wasn't cruel. He knew that through hard work that our character would be molded, and we would understand that through work and through the sweat of our brow that we would find the destiny for our own lives.

I think today what this body should do, and will do, is clarify that the work requirements of TANF is a good thing. These work requirements are bipartisan. We've all heard on the floor today the bipartisan effort between Republicans and Democrats alike during 1996. What we're saying is they were good then, and they are good today. Most importantly, I am pleased with what occurred back in the mid-nineties. When you're talking about almost 73 percent of those who were on welfare moved to work, that's a positive thing for the lives of the American people.

□ 1620

The administration's unprecedented actions are clearly circumventing this law and the will of the people, with

over 83 percent of Americans today believing that these work requirements are a positive thing.

It's common sense, it's a self-evident truth: if you want a positive future, you must help create that, and part of that requirement is that you must work.

I urge my colleagues today to join me in supporting H.R. 890 because it returns us to the real work of helping people who need it most.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I now with great pleasure yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership.

I rise in opposition to this TANF reauthorization bill that would deny States the opportunity to help put more unemployed people to work.

With 26 million working-age adults in America living below the poverty line, and millions struggling to stay afloat, I'm appalled that the House Republican priority is to bring to the floor a bill that further restricts the TANF program's ability to improve job outcomes and get people to work.

Funding for the TANF program has not kept pace with need. As a result, four out of five children living in poverty today are not being reached. Instead of targeting the President's reforms, which would actually increase flexibility for States, mind you, Congress should be focused on creating jobs and ladders of opportunity.

Now, I was on the conference committee that Congressman THOMPSON mentioned. I was in the California legislature, and I was on the conference committee that negotiated California's TANF program. And let me tell you, I voted against it. I voted against my own conference committee's report because, as a former welfare recipient myself, I didn't want to see more welfare recipients being penalized by a work requirement with no real effort and initiative and resources to help primarily women move from welfare to work.

This administration's reforms would correct for this, finally. It would create that flexibility that was needed then.

That's why yesterday myself, Congressmen RAÚL GRIJALVA, JUDY CHU, and EMANUEL CLEAVER, we submitted an amendment to restore the TANF Emergency Contingency Fund to further support our Nation's jobless workers and put people back to work.

It's not surprising that our amendment was ruled not in order by the Republican-controlled Rules Committee, but it does underscore the reality that Republicans are far more interested in scoring political points than they are in putting people back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. American families need a national strategy to end poverty, and this should be part of that. As chair of the Democratic whip's Task Force on Poverty and Opportunity, I'm working with all of our colleagues to advance that goal. Unfortunately, this reauthorization, though, takes us in the exact opposite direction.

We need to extend the TANF program, but this is not the way to do it. We need flexibility.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Preserving the Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013. This extension of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program not only provides families the resources they need to lift themselves out of poverty, but also maintains a valuable and bipartisan provision of the 1996 welfare reform law.

When first created, TANF was designated to get individuals back to work. Congress took further action in 2006 to strengthen work requirements after some States began counting activities like personal journaling, bed rest, and even weight loss as work activities.

Getting individuals back to work must remain TANF's purpose. However, HHS' unprecedented attempt to allow States to waive this work requirement has undermined this goal. These requirements were included in TANF for good reason.

If you're unemployed, maintaining your skill set is incredibly important to the company who wants to hire you. The longer you're out of work and the more your skills deteriorate, the less employable you are.

I can speak with some authority about this because I've owned and operated multiple businesses employing thousands of people. All things being equal, I would hire the individual who was most prepared to step into the position immediately.

So this is not about punishing those who are out of work. This is about giving those who are down on their luck the best chance to get back on their feet and start providing for their families again. If you speak to those that are out of work, that is what most will tell you they want: a chance to earn more money, help their family, and improve their situation in life.

I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle generally want to help those who are out of work. Instead of heated rhetoric, we should be focused on our common goal: providing much-needed assistance for the unemployed, while also helping them find the work they so desperately desire.

I ask my colleagues to come together and extend this important safety net, along with simple reforms that will ensure the program's effectiveness.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

I want to associate myself with all of the members from the distinguished Ways and Means Committee who have tried to explain to the majority authors of this bill that the waivers are narrowly offered and do not allow States to alter their work requirements.

These waivers would only be granted to those States who prove that they can quantitatively increase the number of their welfare beneficiaries who find and keep jobs. This waiver is in keeping with the Republican mantra of States' rights and allowing them to be flexible.

So we have heard a lot of hyperbole and exaggeration about what this does. And I think that really is in keeping with what we have heard about welfare reform since 1976, when Ronald Reagan trotted out the Welfare Queen, the woman who had 80 names, 30 addresses, and an annual income of \$150,000 when you count Medicaid and food stamps, and who drove around in a Cadillac.

So it's difficult to get people to listen when, as social and political scientists have said, these stereotypes have been driven for decades by gender and racial stereotypes. And I think that's what we're dealing with here today, Mr. LEVIN.

We are not going to hear the level of levity that we need because I think that the low-wage workforce benefits tremendously by women, and particularly women of color, working for nothing. So the prospect of them getting customized labor training, in lieu of wiping down a table in a diner, is a little bit more than they can stand.

You know, if, in fact, we're going to have true welfare reform where we're going to lift people out of poverty, then this bill is not the direction we should be taking.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 890 and preserving one of the most significant and successful Federal reform initiatives in the last 20 years.

Seventeen years ago, a Republican-led Congress worked with President Clinton to fix a broken welfare system. The bipartisan law that resulted established the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program. This law also required individuals to work, prepare for work, or look for work as a condition of receiving public assistance.

In the years following passage, the number of individuals receiving welfare

dropped by a whopping 57 percent. The poverty level among single mothers fell by 30 percent, and I saw this in my practice as an OB-GYN physician. No question that it worked.

□ 1630

And this is while their income and earnings increased significantly. Poverty levels among young African Americans dropped to its lowest level in 2001. Last July, the Department of Health and Human Services issued an unprecedented guidance indicating that it would allow States to waive welfare work requirements. The law and the historical record are clear: the administration does not have this power.

But if there's any confusion, H.R. 890 will dispel it. This commonsense bill would prohibit the Secretary of HHS from moving ahead with this illegal waiver plan. More than 80 percent of Americans support the work requirements included in welfare reform, and this legislation ensures the hard work of the 104th Congress and President Clinton isn't undone by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, we should celebrate work in this country. We should help those who are down on their luck find a job—something all the House will do later this week when it considers the SKILLS Act. And for those Americans who need help, we should offer it—but not as a permanent entitlement.

I commend Chairmen CAMP, KLINE, and SCALISE, along with Mr. SOUTHERLAND, for their leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

It is, and I think should be, the law in this country if you're able-bodied, you can't get welfare unless you work. That became the law in 1996.

Last year, two Republican Governors approached the administration and said, Before we send people to work full time, what we'd like to do is get them some training. So instead of simply getting a job, a person gets a career so they make some more money and don't wind up back on the welfare rolls because they're in a string of entry-level jobs. And the administration said to those two Republican Governors, Well, we'll let you do that, but only if you can prove that the result of this experiment will be more people are working, not fewer. The only way you can get this waiver is if you can prove that there will be more people moving from welfare to work than under the present system. This makes perfect sense to me.

It's said around here all the time that Washington should not dictate the rules, that one size does not fit all, and

that some of the best ideas come from our State capitals and local officials. If you believe those things, as I do, then you should vote against this bill. Because what this bill says is there will be no waivers, under any circumstances, for any Governor, whether it makes sense in their State or not. Keep this in mind.

Under the administration's policy, you can't get a waiver unless you can prove that more people move from welfare to work than under the present system. This is common sense. It's federalism. It lets the States do what they think is best under the right circumstances. And we should vote "no."

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, welfare work requirements have helped Michiganders and millions of Americans reduce their dependency on government assistance and get back on their feet again, and that's a good thing. And that, for many people, is the American Dream.

In the 1990s, while serving in the Michigan Legislature, I had the privilege of cosponsoring legislation that did this very thing in promoting workfare and edufare that ultimately became, arguably, the pattern for the 1996 Federal reform. It changed lives. We had welfare recipients who were completely reliant on government now given hope. I'll never forget the single-parent mother who was on welfare for most of her adult life and said in a public service announcement that she asked to be involved with, after going on edufare and then workfare, I was angry when I was first approached with this requirement. Now I can only say it changed my life. It not only changed my life in developing self-sufficiency, but it changed my family's life. They know that they can indeed make it on their own.

Those were illustrations that we experienced; and I saw how it worked in Michigan and then later in our country as a whole after the 1996 reforms. Unfortunately, last July, the Obama administration offered guidance that would undermine this requirement. Without consulting Congress, and despite bipartisan support for work requirements, the Department of Health and Human Services began moving forward this agenda. Congress should repeal the HHS's waiver plan and prevent the administration from waiving the work requirements. It's the right thing to do. It's time to move past this waiver debate so we can move forward with building a stronger, sounder TANF program that promotes self-sufficiency and positive action.

Please join me in supporting H.R. 890.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the floor leaders for their hard work, but I have another explanation for where we are today.

My colleague before me indicated that flexibility is important. It means that we, your Representatives, are listening to you. But I'm listening to more voices than just those who are here on this floor. I'm listening to the voices of those who want to get out of poverty, and I'm delighted to be part of a newly established caucus that focuses on eliminating poverty.

I was here for the first reform bill, and I do believe there's something important about work; but let us understand that when we talk about poverty, we're talking about children, we're talking about parents who are raising children and who may need to be home. We've always made the argument that mothers working at home is work.

I'm disappointed in this legislation primarily because it takes the flexibility away from Governors to determine how best to get people back to work. But why don't we bring a bill to the floor to raise the minimum wage from \$7 to \$9? Why do we not listen to people who say, I barely can make it, such as one of my constituents who said, Not only am I at minimum wage, but they require me to pay for my parking. Can I please get a lift?

Or maybe we're not aware of title 3 in the housing act that has people in public housing being able to work, which was an amendment that I offered to that particular title to allow those to work on projects that the housing authority has. My housing authority just told me that people are lining up to work. They have people working.

So this is not about making people work. It's about ignoring and picking on, again, President Obama's administration because they decide to listen to Republican and Democratic Governors to work on behalf of the American people. Let's get it right. Let's talk about getting people out of poverty. Let's raise the minimum wage. Let's talk about the flexibility so that people can work. Because they want to work. I haven't heard anybody that doesn't want to work. But realize if you are getting TANF, you're getting it because of your children, because of some situation that puts you in a place that you hope to get out of.

I don't think it is the right thing to do to strangle the hands of the administration doing what the American people would like them to do. Let's vote against this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to simply express my disappointment in H.R. 890, The Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013, which it actually does not do.

I had an amendment prepared which would simply make the effective date for this bill of December 2035. This is not a whimsical attempt to delay implementation; but merely an expression of my frustration that Members on the other side have come to disagree with policies which their Caucus, past and present, helped to create and foster.

In 2012, the Department of Health and Human Services announced that it would consider requests from the states to operate dem-

onstration projects within the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program to help recipients prepare for, find and maintain employment.

The effort was partially a response to requests from governors throughout the United States—including many Republican governors—asking for just such flexibility to operate TANF. The Secretary of HHS has stated that any governor wanting such a waiver must commit that their proposal will move at least 20 percent more people from welfare to work.

Rather than embrace the Administration's efforts to provide states flexibility, however, Republicans in Congress have waged a disingenuous campaign against the waiver proposal, drawing rebukes from fact-checkers.

On Feb. 28, House Republicans introduced H.R. 890 to prohibit the Administration from granting such flexibility to states. The bill was unanimously opposed by my Democratic colleagues during a Committee markup held on March 6, 2013.

This year's action comes after Republicans took nearly identical action last fall. After passing it out of the Ways and Means Committee against unanimous opposition from Committee Democrats, House Republicans passed a resolution disapproving of the Administration's flexibility plan on Sept. 20, 2012.

Let's look at some facts:

Same Waiver Authority Used by President Clinton—On July 12, 2012, HHS issued guidance that it was exercising the agency's authority under Section 1115 of the Social Security Act to entertain requests from States to conduct demonstration projects under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. A legal analysis from the Congressional Research Service (CRS) found that HHS' current waiver initiative is "consistent" with the prior practice under the Clinton Administration, which permitted dozens of welfare waivers prior to the enactment of the 1996 welfare law.

Projects Must Focus on Increasing Work—The HHS notice clearly and repeatedly states that all demonstration projects must be "focused on improving employment outcomes." Such outcomes must be demonstrated by a rigorous evaluation, and states must meet targets for accelerating job placements for welfare recipients.

Cutting Red Tape and Increasing Performance—Governor Herbert of Utah, a Republican, informed HHS that his state would like to be evaluated on the basis of the state's success in placing welfare recipients into employment, rather than on their participation in certain activities, and that this approach "would require some flexibility at the state level and the granting of a waiver."

Providing States with Flexibility, While Holding them Accountable—HHS Secretary Sebelius has stated, "the Department is providing a very limited waiver opportunity for states that develop a plan to measurably increase the number of beneficiaries who find and hold down a job.

Specifically, Governors must commit that their proposals will move at least 20 percent more people from welfare to work compared to the state's past performance."

No Effect on Funding Levels or Time Limits—Nothing in the waiver authority applies to the current five-year federal time limit on TANF assistance. Additionally, demonstration projects will in no way affect the fixed block

grant amounts now provided to states under the TANF program.

Republicans Were For Welfare Waivers Before They Were Against Them—In 2002, 2003, and 2005 Republicans passed legislation on the House floor that included a provision allowing the waiver of TANF work requirements. While these waiver proposals were broader and affected many more programs than the policy now proposed by HHS, the Congressional Research Service confirms that all of these bills “would have had the effect of allowing TANF work participation standards to be waived” Chairman CAMP, along with Speaker BOEHNER and Representative RYAN, voted for all three of these bills.

Claims that Waivers Remove Work Requirements Are Clearly False—President Clinton, who signed the 1996 welfare reform law, said “When some Republican governors asked if they could have waivers to try new ways to put people on welfare back to work, the Obama administration listened because we all know it’s hard for even people with good work histories to get jobs today. So moving folks from welfare to work is a real challenge. And the administration agreed to give waivers to those governors and others only if they had a credible plan to increase employment by 20 percent, and they could keep the waivers only if they did increase employment. Now, did I make myself clear? The requirement was for more work, not less.”

Ron Haskins, the lead Republican Congressional staffer in charge of drafting the 1996 welfare reform law, has said “there is merit to what the Administration is proposing,” and “I don’t see how you can get to the conclusion that the waiver provision undermines welfare reform.” Politifact declared that Governor Romney’s claim that the waiver proposal would eliminate work requirements for welfare recipients was “pants on fire” false. The fact checker said the contrary was true, stating: “by grating waivers to states, the Obama administration is seeking to make welfare-to-work efforts more successful, not end them.”

FactCheck.org says Romney’s claims on the issue “distorts the facts” and is “simply not true.” It reiterates that work requirements are not being dropped under the waiver proposal, and that “benefits still won’t be paid beyond an allotted time.”

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate his hard work on this.

Mr. Speaker, Hoosiers understand that welfare checks are not a substitute for paychecks. Last year, President Obama’s administration really undermined commonsense and time-tested reforms by trying to weaken work requirements that were created in the 1996 bipartisan welfare reform law. These work requirements helped lift Americans out of poverty and into the workforce. In just 5 years, welfare dependency was nearly cut in half, more single mothers found jobs, and child poverty fell drastically. Unfortunately, President Obama’s decision to reverse course will drive up government spending without doing anything to lower unemployment.

Growing up on a farm in northern Indiana, I learned at a very young age

that a good neighbor is someone who will roll up their sleeves to help someone pick themselves back up, that neighbors look out for neighbors, friends look out for friends, and family looks out for family. And that’s exactly the commonsense approach that Chairman CAMP’s bill takes.

This legislation extends assistance to fight poverty by restoring the work requirements that made welfare reform a success in the 1990s. I appreciate and applaud Chairman CAMP for introducing this legislation to help American families without creating a permanent subsidy. Americans want to work, but we need to make sure that they have the skills and they’re capable and willing to perform the jobs that are provided to them in their communities.

□ 1640

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House will act to protect our Nation’s welfare-to-work programs, which have been enormously successful in moving millions of Americans out of poverty, off government dependency, and into jobs since 1996. Following the implementation of welfare-to-work requirements, the number of individuals receiving welfare dropped by 57 percent, poverty among single mothers fell by 30 percent, and child poverty decreased dramatically.

Welfare reform laws specifically forbid any administration from changing the work requirements without congressional approval. The current administration has ignored this and attempted to waive the work requirement, which would destroy critical aspects of welfare reform and years of progress.

With the passage of H.R. 890, the House will block the administration’s controversial waiver plan, and in the days ahead I hope the administration will work with Congress, instead of around it, to strengthen the TANF program and help low-income families achieve financial independence.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It’s so ironical it’s worse than that. The Republicans are in their budget saying, “let’s block grant Medicaid and all nutrition programs and send back those programs entirely to the States in the name of flexibility.” And now they come forth arguing that the proposal of this administration to provide

flexibility to the States, if requested, and if it increases work participation 20 percent, they throw up their hands and say, “no.” It’s worse than contradictory.

CRS has made clear the following:

The Secretary’s interpretation of her current authority under section 1115 with regard to waivable TANF provisions under section 402 appears consistent with the Secretary’s practice under the same provision as it existed under the AFDC program.

TANF is going to be extended. We don’t need to do it with this provision that harks back to the campaign. The 20 percent requirement, the Secretary made clear, it isn’t waiving the work requirement; it’s letting the States implement it. It was requested by the Governor of Utah, a Republican.

Bill Clinton has been mentioned so often. And I just urge everybody to listen to what he said. It strengthens the work requirements:

The requirement was for more work, not less.

So to come forth here and say that it weakens it is fallacious, to put it mildly.

Do you know what this is in a few words? This is an effort in 2013 to validate a fallacious political ad of the year 2012. And that’s worse than unhappy when this place is searching for some ability to work together.

The election is over. Let’s get on with the work ahead of us.

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

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

I would just say—as other speakers have mentioned—the 1996 welfare reform law has been tremendously successful. It has lowered welfare roles, it has lifted people out of poverty, it has reduced poverty for single mothers, and reduced poverty for children. And before that, before we had the 1996 welfare reform law, whether times were good or bad, welfare rolls only increased.

Clearly, the welfare reform law has been successful. Frankly, we need to protect the law from this administration, because what this administration wants to do is undermine the work requirement in welfare.

And what are we talking about here? The work requirement is really that only half of the welfare caseload has to be in work. That means for the other half, States have ultimate flexibility to determine how to move those people into job readiness and to work. For the half of the people that need to be in some form of work requirement there are 12 definitions of what is work in the law. Let me just list those off:

Subsidized private employment, subsidized government employment, job search, community service. You can be in community service and that qualifies for work.

Work experience, on-the-job training. If you’re getting training related to your job, that counts as work.

Vocational education. So you can be training in a vocational discipline and still have that qualify for work.



Caring for the child of a TANF recipient in community service. So you can care for somebody else's child and that counts as work. And we're only talking about half of the welfare caseload.

Job skills training, education related to employment, completion of secondary school. That all counts as work.

Let's look at the Statement of Administration Policy. They say that no States have formally applied for waivers. No States are asking for this because they already have tremendous flexibility.

But let me just say, if you're going to change the law—and what this administration is trying to do is change the law—you don't just send a letter, or what they're calling an information memorandum. What is that?

Frankly, when the Government Accountability Office looked at this, they said they can't do business this way. This is a rule. And to follow a rule they need to follow the Congressional Review Act, they need to follow the law. And the law says they need to notify Congress, which they did not do. This is something they did on their own.

So on many levels we need to turn this around. They've entered into a gray murky area that we really don't know what they're doing, whether it's legal or not, whether States will have authority to do this or not. Given that the law was explicit that there is no waiver of this work requirement, given that this work requirement was a condition for States getting a cash payment, a block sum amount in welfare, and given the flexibility that was written into the law, it's very important that we make this clear.

Frankly, I think my friends on the other side should be joining Republicans in protecting the constitutional authority of the Congress to make the laws, not the bureaucrats at the Department of Health and Human Services. So I would ask my friends, vote for this bill, support the work requirement, support the ability of the Congress to make the laws under the Constitution of the United States.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am voting against H.R. 890 because it, just like nearly identical legislation brought before the Ways and Means Committee last year, is based on partisan charges that have been widely discredited by independent fact checker. It would also block new and innovative ways to move more people from welfare to work. At a time when Congress confronts so many pressing issues, not the least of which is preventing the misguided cuts in the sequester from hurting our economy, H.R. 890 is a step in the wrong direction.

H.R. 890 prevents the administration from pursuing flexible, innovative ways to return people to work. As Health and Human Services Secretary Sebelius informed our committee, "the Department is providing a very limited waiver opportunity for states that develop a plan to measurably increase the number of beneficiaries who find and hold down a job. Specifically, Governors must commit that

their proposals will move at least 20% more people from welfare to work compared to the state's past performance."

The Congressional Research Service (CRS), in reviewing the administration's authority to permit demonstration projects, found that the current waiver initiative is "consistent" with prior practice. The CRS review found that dozens of waivers for demonstration projects have been approved in the past when their subject matter has been referenced in Section 402 of the Social Security Act (just as the administration currently proposes). CRS also found nothing in the law bars Secretary Sebelius from providing waivers related to employment activities in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program.

H.R. 890 seems more focused on politics than on policy. On that basis, and because it would impede progress in helping more welfare recipients move into work, I oppose this legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 890—Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Programs Act of 2013.

This bill prohibits the Secretary of HHS from using longstanding authority to issue waivers that allow states to conduct demonstration projects under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. It also reauthorizes the TANF program through December 31, 2013.

In Texas over 68,000 families receive TANF benefits. TANF is a block grant program to help move recipients into work and turn welfare into a program of temporary assistance.

In order to receive the maximum TANF benefit, families must be in compliance with work requirements and no one may remain on TANF for more than 60 months. Federal TANF law requires states to penalize families that fail to meet these requirements.

In response to a request from a bipartisan group of governors for more flexibility, the Obama Administration said the federal government would consider waiving existing work participation requirements for states that were experimenting with "new, more effective ways" of helping welfare applicants find work, "particularly helping parents successfully prepare for, find, and retain employment."

The Administration hasn't gotten rid of the work requirement or laid out a new theory of what it ought to include. It has given states the ability to seek executive branch approval for new methods.

This legislation is not needed, for no state has requested a waiver. This is the second time this bill has been introduced, as a solution to a problem that doesn't exist.

The House should focus on extending TANF benefits to needy families in the country.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 890. I urge members of both parties to oppose this legislation, which in only a few pages demonstrates all that is wrong with Washington—politicians putting partisan concerns ahead of constructive policy. Governors from several states have overcome partisan differences to support the waivers H.R. 890 wishes to eliminate. Let us follow their lead and defeat this legislation together.

H.R. 890 is a simplistic bill. It prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from giving effect to the July 2012 guidance that granted states waivers regarding the design of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families

(TANF) programs. It also prohibits further experimentation, banning pilot programs or demonstration programs that could potentially revolutionize TANF, making it more effective and less costly. Though these changes seem small, they can mean a world of difference for families in need of the training and educational opportunities that new approaches to TANF could provide.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is one of the most remarkable pieces of work that I have ever seen considered on this floor. Not because it is such a bad piece of policy. Not because of how abominably it misrepresents the current state of federal and state practices. Not even because we are still litigating a claim which was dreamed up by a failed presidential campaign last summer, and which was roundly rejected by the American people.

No, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is remarkable because my friends across the aisle are demanding that we wrest control from the states in favor of a more inflexible and inefficient approach. The claims of federalism invoked by my Republican colleagues in so many of legislative battles I have witnessed over the years are nowhere to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 890 is wrong—and it is wrong for all the wrong reasons.

Despite H.R. 890's claims, the waivers granted to TANF program operators in July 2012 do not weaken TANF's work requirements—they strengthen them. These waivers provide states with the opportunity to determine what works best for them. These waivers allow states to experiment with alternative employment and training programs that reflect the varied problems confronting TANF recipients who wish to join the work force. Successful programs can then be replicated in other states and limited resources can be stretched further to ensure more effort is expended finding jobs instead of complying with red tape.

Despite what H.R. 890 presumes, these waivers won't lead to TANF recipients laying on hammocks, but rather are the key to unlocking the potential of men and women who want their own piece of the American dream. The waivers will allow program officials to provide the training and education necessary for many beneficiaries to join the ever more competitive labor market. Further, they will allow states to tailor their programs to the specific demands of their local economies, and ensure that TANF continues to improve in its mission to see recipients become self-sufficient. This—Mr. Speaker—is what good government looks like. This—Mr. Speaker—is why Republican and Democratic governors across the nation support these waivers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my friends across the aisle to put aside partisan concerns for just this moment and vote their conscience on this matter. I want them to ask whether they can in good conscience continue to oppose these commonsense reforms simply because it plays well with the fringes of their party. I want them to consider what it will sound like next time I hear from them that the federal government is too large and should cede more authority to the states. I want them to consider what people will hear when they claim to favor state solutions to national problems. Quite simply I want them to consider their professed principles instead of partisan politics—for if they do, they cannot support H.R. 890.

I urge everyone, Democrat and Republican, to vote “no” on H.R. 890. We’ve litigated this long enough—lets finally put it to rest.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I must express my profound surprise by the Republican effort to undermine state flexibility to strengthen work outcomes for people who receive TANF. In contrast to prior Republican support for such TANF waivers, in contrast to longstanding Republican advocacy for greater state flexibility, and in contrast to the reality that the TANF waivers would actually accelerate job placements and dramatically improve work outcomes, the current Republican rhetoric jettisons past support for state flexibility to improve TANF outcomes and disingenuously charges the Administration with gutting welfare reform. It is in states’ best interests to improve the work outcomes of their citizens, which is why Republican and Democratic governors have asked for the type of flexibility provided by the Administration’s waiver.

Under current rules, a state can meet its work requirement even if no recipient finds a job. In contrast, approved demonstration waivers explicitly would focus on improving employment outcomes. Under current rules, states spend very little of their TANF funds on work activities and substantial resources monitoring participation in activities. In contrast, approved demonstration waivers would help states make more effective and efficient use of limited resources. Under current rules, people are discouraged from getting a high school diploma or GED, even though they’re more likely to find good jobs with such education. In contrast, approved demonstration waivers would allow states to focus on building a better skilled workforce.

Under current rules, people working in subsidized jobs don’t count toward the state’s work rate. In contrast, Illinois boasted one of the most successful subsidized employment programs in the nation while using TANF Emergency Funds. The program directly placed almost 30,000 unemployed and underemployed adults in jobs that paid approximately \$10 per hour, putting almost \$9 million dollars into the pockets of hard working Illinoisans and into the economy. Almost 5000 employers in Illinois benefited.

Why Republicans would oppose innovative programs to help the unemployed get solid jobs is simply puzzling. Rather than advancing political theatre, the Republicans should be working with Democrats to replace the across-the-board spending cuts, strengthen the middle class, create jobs, expand our economy, and responsibly bring down the deficit. It is these proactive steps at governing that my constituents seek.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 890, the Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Act of 2013. This legislation would overturn the Administration’s proposal to allow states greater flexibility to help more Americans move from welfare to good jobs. Several states have requested this flexibility, including some states with Republican governors and legislatures. This is a politically disingenuous bill which only prevents Congress from devoting our time to finding actual solutions to lowering our unemployment rate.

As a condition of receiving federal TANF funding, states are required to document the number of hours that welfare recipients spend

in paid jobs, voluntary work, or other activities directly related to finding employment. Many states have argued that the current law’s requirements are onerous and counterproductive to helping welfare recipients find work to lift their families out of poverty.

In response to state feedback, the Administration proposed a program to allow states to use alternate, outcome-based measures for job placement, rather than relying solely on numerical work participation standards. This waiver would give states the flexibility needed to improve the effectiveness of TANF programs by focusing on the outcomes that matter to our families. The Administration’s waiver program has strict requirements to hold states accountable for making measurable progress in job placement.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 890, which would hinder states’ autonomy and flexibility in finding solutions that work for their residents. Instead of wasting time on partisan proposals, we must work across the aisle to find real solutions for working families in my Dallas district and across the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 107, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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.

□ 1650

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. ENYART. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Enyart moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 890, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ PROTECTING UNEMPLOYED PARENTS, INCLUDING VETERANS, WOMEN, VICTIMS OF NATURAL DISASTERS, AND GRANDPARENTS WHO ARE RAISING THE CHILDREN OF MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.**

Nothing in this Act shall prohibit or limit a State which is receiving funds under section 403 (a)(1) of the Social Security Act from providing assistance, job opportunities, or educational training authorized in this Act, for—

- (1) unemployed parents, including veterans, women who are victims of domestic violence, and victims of natural disasters; or
- (2) grandparents caring for children who have a parent who is, or who had a parent who died while being, a member of the United States Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I haven’t been in Washington very long. Like so many in southern Illinois and across

our Nation, I answered the call to serve. I grew up in a household where I was taught the importance of fairness, duty, and honor. Whether it was walking the beans on my grandparents’ farm or working with my father on the line at Caterpillar, I understood the importance of hard work, fair pay, and taking responsibility for myself and our family.

When I was 19, I enlisted and arrived for duty at Scott Air Force Base, a vital component of our national security and major employer in the district I now represent. For 35 years, I served in the military. For the past 5 years, I served as the Adjutant General of the Illinois National Guard, where I led our response to natural disasters and oversaw the largest deployment of Guard troops since World War II. Serving alongside those 13,000 soldiers and airmen and hundreds of civilian employees proved to me that the resiliency of Illinoisans, whether recovering from floods, ice storms, or earthquakes, or coming together as a community to support our service men and women overseas, is unparalleled.

Today, I offer the final amendment to the bill. It will not delay nor kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage, as amended.

From my experience as an enlisted man to that of commander of the Illinois National Guard, I’m concerned about how this bill interferes with States’ rights and might unfairly affect unemployed veterans and their families, victims of domestic violence, and victims of natural disasters, as well as grandparents caring for children whose parents are deployed.

In January, families in Sparta, a town I represent in southern Illinois, had the joy and blessing to welcome home over 150 soldiers with the Guard’s 661st Engineer Company and 662nd Engineer Fire Fighting Detachment from Afghanistan. I was the commander who signed their deployment orders and sent them into harm’s way. I was honored to see their safe return. For many of these men and women, their return means making a young family whole again. They could not have borne their responsibilities in Afghanistan without support from grandparents, spouses, and a community like Sparta.

That’s why I’m so alarmed by this bill in its current form. Why would Congress seek to make it more difficult for a single parent or grandparent to care for children while their mother or father is deployed overseas? Is that the message we want to send our troops, that their service is a burden to those back home?

For our veterans in Sparta and across the Nation facing new, sometimes heartbreaking challenges in their transition to civilian life, know that the promises we made to them are on the line. For us in southern Illinois, I’ll be blunt. We need jobs.

Southern Illinois hasn’t seen an economic recovery yet. Out of 102 counties

in Illinois, six in my district in southern Illinois are among those struggling most, with more than 20 percent of families trying to make ends meet on incomes less than \$23,000 a year.

The fact is that our heroes, our veterans returning home, don't necessarily have jobs waiting for them. That's why this bill in its current form is so out of touch with the realities that our veterans face. Instead, Congress is telling our veterans and our military families: your service isn't good enough. You haven't done enough for our Nation. Once again, Congress has gotten it wrong.

Another example, in Illinois we don't qualify assistance for victims of domestic violence. That's why I have to ask, given the critical need for us to responsibly reduce the deficit and actually work on improving our economy, why would Congress focus on questioning the expertise and recommendations made by my State or any other?

Where I come from and where I'm proud to represent, we all share the southern Illinois values of hard work, integrity, and fairness. Veterans and military families, victims of domestic abuse, communities overcoming natural disaster, like Harrisburg, Illinois, these are the good people who shouldn't be pawns of politics in Congress, and we owe them the assurance that this bill will not reduce critical assistance.

I urge my colleagues to stand by our veterans and military families. I urge them to consider honoring our home State's authority. I ask they pass this commonsense amendment to invest in the resiliency of our communities.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most unnecessary and meaningless motions to recommit I've seen in my time in Congress. The definition of who's eligible for TANF is left to the States. So the idea that somehow this motion to recommit singles out unemployed parents, TANF applies to unemployed parents. TANF applies to people that are veterans. TANF applies to people who are grandparents. It's about getting the unemployed jobs.

So I have to say, I'm puzzled by this. It seems totally political and completely unnecessary. None of these groups mentioned in this motion to recommit are excluded from receiving TANF benefits.

What this is about is not weakening the work requirement. I understand why the administration may want to weaken the work requirement since their record on job creation is so atrocious. But the fact is that States have tremendous flexibility here. Half of the caseload doesn't have to meet the work requirement. They can be engaging in whatever activity or no activity the

State determines. The other half has 12 different categories, including vocational training and other job readiness activities, that will qualify as work.

This is a straight extension of current law. This is an extension of current law that has proven extremely successful. Let's not weaken the requirement. Let's extend the welfare program, the TANF program, at current levels, and let's get people back to work.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. ENYART. 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 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 199, nays 230, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—199

Andrews	Enyart	Lujan Grisham
Barber	Eshoo	(NM)
Barrow (GA)	Esty	Luján, Ben Ray
Bass	Farr	(NM)
Beatty	Fattah	Maffei
Becerra	Foster	Maloney
Bera (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Bishop (NY)	Gabbard	Markey
Blumenauer	Gallego	Matheson
Bonamici	Garamendi	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Garcia	McCarthy (NY)
Braley (IA)	Grayson	McCollum
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	McDermott
Brownley (CA)	Green, Gene	McGovern
Bustos	Grijalva	McIntyre
Butterfield	Gutierrez	McNerney
Capps	Hahn	Meeks
Capuano	Hanabusa	Meng
Cárdenas	Hastings (FL)	Michaud
Carney	Heck (WA)	Miller, George
Carson (IN)	Higgins	Moore
Cartwright	Himes	Moran
Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)
Castro (TX)	Holt	Nadler
Chu	Honda	Napolitano
Ciulline	Horsford	Neal
Clarke	Hoyer	Diaz-Balart
Clay	Huffman	Duffy
Cleaver	Israel	Duncan (SC)
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Duncan (TN)
Cohen	Jeffries	O'Rourke
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Owens
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Cooper	Jones	Pascarell
Courtney	Kaptur	Pastor (AZ)
Crowley	Keating	Payne
Cuellar	Kennedy	Pelosi
Cummings	Kildee	Perlmutter
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Peters (CA)
Davis, Danny	Kind	Peters (MI)
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Peterson
DeGette	Kuster	Pingree (ME)
Delaney	Langevin	Pocan
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Polis
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Price (NC)
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Quigley
Dingell	Levin	Rahall
Doggett	Lewis	Rangel
Doyle	Lipinski	Richmond
Duckworth	Loebsack	Roybal-Allard
Edwards	Lofgren	Ruiz
Ellison	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger
Engel	Lowey	Rush
		Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda T.	Sinema	Veasey
Sanchez, Loretta	Sires	Vela
Sarbanes	Slaughter	Velázquez
Schakowsky	Smith (WA)	Visclosky
Schiff	Speier	Walz
Schneider	Swalwell (CA)	Wasserman
Schrader	Takano	Schultz
Schwartz	Thompson (CA)	Waters
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Watt
Scott, David	Tierney	Waxman
Serrano	Titus	Welch
Sewell (AL)	Tonko	Wilson (FL)
Shea-Porter	Tsongas	Yarmuth
Sherman	Van Hollen	
	Vargas	

NAYS—230

Aderholt	Gowdy	Pearce
Alexander	Granger	Perry
Amash	Graves (GA)	Petri
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Grimm	Pompeo
Barr	Guthrie	Posey
Barton	Hall	Price (GA)
Benishek	Hanna	Radel
Bentivolio	Harper	Reed
Bilirakis	Harris	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Renacci
Black	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Bonner	Hensarling	Rigell
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Brady (TX)	Holding	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hunter	Rokita
Bucshon	Hurt	Rooney
Burgess	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jenkins	Roskam
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cantor	Jordan	Royce
Capito	Joyce	Runyan
Carter	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	King (IA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (NY)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kingston	Schock
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Coffman	Kline	Scott, Austin
Cole	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Shimkus
Conaway	Lance	Shuster
Cook	Lankford	Simpson
Cotton	Latham	Smith (NE)
Cramer	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Long	Southerland
Culberson	Lucas	Stewart
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Stockman
Denham	Marchant	Stutzman
Dent	Marino	Terry
DeSantis	Massie	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Tiberi
Duffy	McClintock	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Upton
Ellmers	McKinley	Valadao
Farenthold	McMorris	Wagner
Fincher	Rodgers	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walden
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walorski
Fleming	Messer	Weber (TX)
Flores	Mica	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Fox	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wolf
Gerlach	Noem	Womack
Gibbs	Nugent	Woodall
Gibson	Nunes	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Yoho
Gohmert	Olson	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Young (FL)
Gosar	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—2

Costa Lynch

□ 1735

Messrs. NUNES, JOYCE, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. CREN-SHAW, CARTER, COTTON, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. SCALISE and BURGESS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. COOPER changed their 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 181, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

AYES—246

Aderholt	Ellmers	Kinzinger (IL)
Alexander	Farenthold	Kirkpatrick
Amodei	Fincher	Kline
Bachmann	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Bachus	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Barber	Fleming	Lamborn
Barletta	Flores	Lance
Barr	Forbes	Lankford
Barrow (GA)	Fortenberry	Latham
Barton	Fox	Latta
Benishek	Franks (AZ)	Lipinski
Bentivolio	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Bera (CA)	Garcia	Long
Bilirakis	Gardner	Lucas
Bishop (UT)	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Black	Gerlach	Lummis
Blackburn	Gibbs	Maffei
Bonner	Gibson	Maloney, Sean
Boustany	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Marino
Brooks (AL)	Goodlatte	Matheson
Brooks (IN)	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	McCaul
Buchanan	Granger	McClintock
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Burgess	Graves (MO)	McIntyre
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Campbell	Grimm	McMorris
Cantor	Guthrie	Rodgers
Capito	Hall	McNerney
Carter	Hanna	Meadows
Cassidy	Harper	Meehan
Chabot	Harris	Messer
Chaffetz	Hartzler	Mica
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Michaud
Coffman	Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)
Cole	Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary
Collins (NY)	Holding	Mullin
Conaway	Hudson	Mulvaney
Cook	Huelskamp	Murphy (FL)
Cotton	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Cramer	Hultgren	Neugebauer
Crawford	Hunter	Noem
Crenshaw	Hurt	Nugent
Culberson	Issa	Nunes
Daines	Jenkins	Nunnelee
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Olson
Denham	Johnson, Sam	Owens
Dent	Jones	Palazzo
DeSantis	Jordan	Paulsen
DesJarlais	Joyce	Pearce
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Perry
Duffy	King (IA)	Peters (CA)
Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Peterson
Duncan (TN)	Kingston	Petri

Pittenger	Runyan	Tipton
Pitts	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Poe (TX)	Salmon	Upton
Pompeo	Scalise	Valadao
Posey	Schock	Wagner
Price (GA)	Schrader	Walberg
Radel	Schweikert	Walden
Reed	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Renacci	Sessions	Webster (FL)
Ribble	Shimkus	Wenstrup
Rice (SC)	Shuster	Westmoreland
Rigell	Simpson	Whitfield
Roby	Sinema	Williams
Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Rogers (MI)	Southerland	Womack
Rohrabacher	Stewart	Woodall
Rokita	Stivers	Yoder
Rooney	Stockman	Yoho
Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman	Young (AK)
Roskam	Terry	Young (FL)
Ross	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
Rothfus	Thornberry	
Royce	Tiberi	

NOES—181

Amash	Garamendi
Andrews	Grayson
Bass	Green, Al
Beatty	Green, Gene
Becerra	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Gutierrez
Bishop (NY)	Hahn
Blumenauer	Hanabusa
Bonamici	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)
Braley (IA)	Higgins
Bridenstine	Himes
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa
Brownley (CA)	Holt
Butterfield	Honda
Capps	Horsford
Capuano	Hoyer
Cárdenas	Huffman
Carney	Israel
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee
Castor (FL)	Jeffries
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)
Chu	Johnson, E. B.
Cicilline	Kaptur
Clarke	Keating
Clay	Kennedy
Cleaver	Kildee
Clyburn	Kilmer
Cohen	Kind
Connolly	Kuster
Conyers	Langevin
Cooper	Larsen (WA)
Courtney	Larson (CT)
Crowley	Lee (CA)
Cuellar	Levin
Cummings	Lewis
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack
Davis, Danny	Lofgren
DeFazio	Lowenthal
DeGette	Lowe
Delaney	Lujan Grisham
DeLauro	(NM)
Demeyer	Luján, Ben Ray
Deutch	Markey
Dingell	Massie
Doggett	Matsui
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)
Duckworth	McCollum
Edwards	McDermott
Ellison	McGovern
Engel	Meeks
Enyart	Meng
Eshoo	Miller, George
Esty	Moore
Farr	Moran
Fattah	Nadler
Foster	Napolitano
Frankel (FL)	Neal
Fudge	Negrete McLeod
Gabbard	Nolan
Gallego	O'Rourke

NOT VOTING—4

Cartwright	Lynch	Maloney,
Costa		Carolyn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remain-

□ 1742

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 68, I was detained off the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 1, noes 421, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—1

Cárdenas

NOES—421

Aderholt	Cassidy	Duncan (TN)
Alexander	Castor (FL)	Edwards
Amash	Castro (TX)	Ellison
Amodei	Chabot	Ellmers
Andrews	Chaffetz	Engel
Bachus	Chu	Enyart
Barber	Cicilline	Eshoo
Barletta	Clarke	Esty
Barr	Clay	Farenthold
Barrow (GA)	Cleaver	Farr
Barton	Clyburn	Fattah
Bass	Coffman	Fincher
Beatty	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Becerra	Cole	Fleischmann
Benishek	Collins (GA)	Fleming
Bentivolio	Collins (NY)	Flores
Bera (CA)	Conaway	Forbes
Bilirakis	Connolly	Fortenberry
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Foster
Bishop (NY)	Cook	Fox
Bishop (UT)	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Black	Cotton	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Courtney	Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer	Cramer	Fudge
Bonamici	Crawford	Gabbard
Bonner	Crenshaw	Gallego
Boustany	Crowley	Garamendi
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Garcia
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gardner
Braley (IA)	Cummings	Garrett
Bridenstine	Daines	Gerlach
Brooks (AL)	Davis (CA)	Gibbs
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Danny	Gibson
Broun (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Gingrey (GA)
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Gohmert
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Goodlatte
Buchanan	Delaney	Gosar
Bucshon	DeLauro	Gowdy
Burgess	DelBene	Granger
Bustos	Denham	Graves (GA)
Butterfield	Dent	Graves (MO)
Calvert	DeSantis	Grayson
Camp	DesJarlais	Green, Al
Campbell	Deuth	Green, Gene
Cantor	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Capito	Dingell	Griffith (VA)
Capps	Doggett	Grijalva
Capuano	Doyle	Grimm
Carson (IN)	Duckworth	Guthrie
Carter	Duffy	Gutierrez
Cartwright	Duncan (SC)	Hahn