

and \$0 in outlays for the House-Passed measure. I am adjusting the allocations and budgetary aggregate for the difference in emergency-designated appropriations in the House-Passed and conference measures.

Finally, the conference report on H.R. 2217, the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, provided emergency-designated appropriations for wildland firefighting. Those appropriations totaled \$400,000,000 in new budget authority and \$289,000,000 in outlays. Emergency-designated appropriations were not provided in the House-Passed measure.

To reflect these adjustments, I hereby increase the 302(a) allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to \$701,447,000,000 for budget authority and \$707,946,000,000 for outlays. The increase in the allocation also requires an increase in the budgetary aggregates in \$1,666,635,000,000 for budget authority and \$1,615,644,000,000 for outlays.

These adjustments apply while the legislation is under consideration and take effect upon final enactment of such legislation. Questions may be directed to Dan Kowalski at 67270.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OBEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

H.R. 3113, TANF REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to advise this House that I have introduced a bill, H.R. 3113, which seeks to amend and reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program (TANF). H.R. 3113 currently has 49 sponsors. I hope that more Members will join in support of major changes to the TANF law that Congress enacted in 1996. The TANF block grants must be reauthorized next year. It is not too early to begin the review and discussion of necessary changes.

TANF replaced the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, which had distributed welfare benefits since the 1930s. Benefits under the AFDC program were provided as an entitlement and although benefit levels varied from state to state, the overall system was regulated by the federal government. TANF repealed the entitlement and made much of the eligibility and program structure subject to state law.

TANF also imposed a cumulative lifetime time limit of 5 years on the receipt of benefits. TANF went into effect in 1996 and many of the families enrolled in the program are now

reaching their 5-year limit. Five hundred families in Hawaii will be cut off in December of this year. In some states, thousands of families already have been cut off because the TANF law allows states to have even shorter time limits.

The recession we now are suffering cost 415,000 jobs in October 2001 alone. Thousands more jobs lost in November spread economic vulnerability through wider segments of our population. This vulnerability is especially severe for TANF families. In October, 111,000 jobs were lost in the service sector, where many current and former TANF recipients have been employed. Layoffs are especially harsh for TANF families that do not qualify for unemployment insurance and who are no longer eligible for welfare. Of the 415,000 people who lost their jobs in October, only 40 percent were eligible for unemployment insurance. Of the thousands of workers who are not protected by the unemployment insurance system, many are mothers who have left TANF for the labor market.

According to its proponents, TANF promotes labor market work as the way out of "welfare dependency." Yet most of the jobs that are available to recipients pay such low wages that fulltime employment does not raise their families above the poverty line. So even for TANF recipients who do have jobs, employment has not yielded economic security. TANF actually impedes recipients' efforts to move into jobs at living wages. TANF does not allow recipients to meet the work requirement by pursuing post-secondary education; it limits vocational education to one year; and it caps the percentage of recipients who can be counted as engaged in a work activity by virtue of vocational training.

TANF's work requirement stresses getting a job, any job, regardless of what it pays, what benefits it provides, and whether the combination of earnings and benefits are sufficient for a family to survive on. The failure of TANF to count post-secondary education as a work activity is its biggest hypocrisy and is one of the key problems H.R. 3113 seeks to correct. Research has long established that women with education beyond high school, especially a college education, are more likely to earn living wages.

Child care is another nagging problem under TANF. Without dependable and appropriate child care there is little hope for a parent to be able to stay in an employment situation. Under the Family Support Act of 1988, child care was an entitlement. TANF repealed the entitlement for individuals, making it even harder for poor mothers to assure care and supervision to their children while they are away from home meeting their work requirement. One of the powerful ideas in the 1996 welfare debate was the strong view that one of the ways to help children in welfare families is to find their fathers and make them provide child support. TANF requires women seeking welfare to disclose the identities of biological fathers and to help government locate them. It enforces these requirements with new sanctions reducing family benefits when mothers don't comply. These harsh provisions totally disregard a mothers' own best judgment about what's best—and safest—for herself and her children. What's more, TANF provides that all child support money collected by the government stays with the government as reimbursement for welfare.

What Congress needs to do is to undo punitive regulation of mothers on welfare. Instead, we need to encourage states to make job training and educational opportunities available to recipients so that leaving welfare for the labor market means leaving poverty. We need to make it possible for mothers to seek job training and education, as well as to keep jobs that pay living wages. We need to treat women on welfare the same way that we treat all women—with the respect, dignity, and rights we all cherish for ourselves.

TANF needs to take into account the many different reasons that people are forced to turn to welfare. Many poor mothers lack the skills needed to land better-paying jobs. They need access to training and education. Many cannot afford to be employed, because they lack child care or can't find affordable transportation or aren't assured crucial benefits such as health care. They need to be protected by all labor laws, be guaranteed child care, and receive Medicaid benefits for as long as they are income-eligible. Some mothers suffer from substance abuse or mental health problems or debilitating illness or domestic violence. These mothers need access to treatment, recovery, legal remedies, and skills-building services before entering the labor market. All children desperately need loving care in the home. Their mothers need the resources and the flexibility to decide when their children need a mother's care, not that of a sibling or baby sitter.

I urge my colleagues to consider H.R. 3113, which seeks to: 1. Expand the definition of "work activity" to include education and job training at all levels as well as a parent's caregiving for a child under the age of six or over the age of six if ill or disabled or if after school care is not provided; 2. Stop the 5 year clock from running if the recipient is engaged in an allowable work activity, including education and job training; 3. Prohibit full family sanctions that punish whole families when the adult recipient doesn't meet a TANF rule; 4. Make paternity establishment and child support enforcement voluntary, while encouraging cooperation by directing all child support collections to the family; 5. Count treatment for domestic and sexual violence, mental health problems, and substance abuse as "work activities"; 6. Prohibit states from establishing "family caps" that withhold benefits from a child born to a mother on welfare; 7. Replace the "illegitimacy bonus" with a poverty reduction bonus for states that lower poverty rates the most; 8. Restore the child care entitlement for TANF families when the parent enters the labor market or in a work activity leading to participation in the labor market; 9. Guarantee equal access to TANF regardless of marital or citizen status and enforcement antidiscrimination and labor laws, as well as due process guarantees; 10. Stop the clock for all TANF families during recession and temporarily restore TANF eligibility for families who have exceeded their time limit but who are otherwise eligible (recession equals 5.5% unemployment rate or higher); 11. Provide incentives to states to provide programs to reduce barriers to employment, to offer job training, and to encourage education; and 12. Stipulate that the statutory purpose and goal of TANF is to reduce child and family poverty.

These changes will put TANF to work helping mothers parent in dignity and helping children grow up with economic security. I urge

my colleagues to join in support of H.R. 3113 by co-sponsoring this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ECO-TERRORISM, THE CHARACTER COUNTS PROGRAM, MISSILE DEFENSE, AND MILITARY TRIBUNALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to take a few minutes to talk about a number of subjects which I think are very important, especially considering the times that we are in.

The first subject that I want to talk about is domestic terrorism. Specifically, I want to focus in on ecoterrorism and talk a few minutes about that.

Second, an exciting program which has been implemented in many schools across the country, the program Character Counts. This evening I am just going to do kind of a teaser on it and discuss some of the elements of the program, but I intend later to go into much more depth about the program and why it would be important for my colleagues to try to encourage their local schools to adopt the program Character Counts.

Then I would like to move on to a subject which I have addressed many times, and that is missile defense and the importance of missile defense.

I would also like to touch on the military tribunals that the President has proposed for war criminals, not for American citizens but for those individuals who have committed acts of war against the United States.

Keep in mind that military tribunals were first used by George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and President Roosevelt. The United States Supreme Court on a number of occasions has found that military tribunals are constitutional, so our discussion this evening about military tribunals will not be on constitutionality because that issue has been determined. Our discussion this evening should center more instead on why they are necessary, why they are important and of what benefit are military tribunals to the United States of America in its continued and long-lasting fight against terrorism worldwide.

Let me begin with terrorism on a domestic picture. For some reason, over the last few years there seems to be kind of a Robin Hood image given to

those people who are so dedicated to the environment that they think that their dedication to the environment justifies acts of terrorism against the property of others and at some point in time against humans and other citizens in the United States.

This Robin Hood picture is kind of being played on by the media. It is not a noble act. Environmental terrorism is not the way to accomplish their means. There are many active organizations in this country who care very, very deeply about the protection of the environment. Many of us on this floor, including myself, care very deeply about the environment.

Obviously, on many occasions we have a difference of opinion. In fact, on this House floor, the two sides of the aisle are sometimes urban versus rural. We have deeply held differences with the people from the other side of the aisle or with our colleagues from another State. For example, in Colorado we generally find ourselves with strong differences on issues of Colorado water when we discuss that issue with Members from the State of California, which is a large user of water from the Colorado River.

But never on this floor, never on this floor do we engage in conversation or strategy or do we engage in the actual act of terrorism against our colleagues who disagree with us on this floor. We have never even heard of that. It has never been considered. If it were considered, it would be quickly squashed by my colleagues under our own self-policing process. Members just do not do it.

In America we have a process which has been defined more accurately against September 11, a process which allows us a legal venue to carry these disputes. There is no justification for domestic terrorism. I do not care whether we are talking about a bomb on the Greenpeace ship, or a threat on an abortion clinic, or if Members are talking about organizations like ELF, which is an organization completely focused on accomplishing goals for the environment through the tool of terrorism. It has no place in the United States of America.

Recently, I contacted a number of environmental organizations across the country and asked them to join me, to join my coalition, my coalition consisting of several of my colleagues' joint effort with me, our coalition, to come out as a group and speak against, regardless of which side of the spectrum Members are on, come out as a coalition, just like we have done for international terrorism, to come out as a coalition and speak against domestic terrorism under the name of the environment.

I have actually been a little surprised by some of the responses I have received. Over the weekend, there was a nasty article in the Denver Post, a letter to the editor. It is amazing how people squirm to somehow say why do you ask us to join your team against

environmental terrorism? Do you think that we are terrorists? I have never said that. Organizations like the national Sierra Club, other organizations, I do not think that they are terrorists. But there are some organizations that, under the guise of the environment, are terrorists, and they commit acts of terrorism.

It is justified to ask every legitimate organization in this country to join the coalition that we are putting together to speak out as a unified voice, to speak out against acts of terror and against those people who think that it is the lesser evil for protection of the environment.

I had some negative responses to my letter, asking, not accusing anybody of terrorism, asking them to join our team, kind of like the President said, you are either with us or you are not with us. The same context as this letter. Hey, join us, help us. Because, frankly, environmental organizations like the Sierra Club, like some of these other national organizations, a lot of people look to them for guidance on the environment.

In a lot of cases I disagree with the national Sierra Club, not so much with the local but the national policies, especially when it regards the Colorado Rockies in my district. But the fact is I have never considered that organization or the organization of Greenpeace a terrorist organization. They do not advocate it. I have never seen any evidence that they are proponents of terrorism.

On the other hand, these groups are nationally recognized, and perhaps some of the radicals who are committing ecoterrorist acts will listen to what these organizations say and listen to their experienced opinion that terrorism does nothing but hurt the cause. It does not help forward the cause of the environment. Committing acts of ecoterrorism, as they did in my district and throughout this Nation, those acts did not further the cause of the environment.

In fact, what it does is it makes the people who really care about the environment, the organizations like the national Sierra Club and others, it kind of draws them in by association. Even though they are not associated, it draws them in by association and starts to give a black eye to what otherwise might be a legitimate cause.

□ 2015

So why would someone not join our effort, our coalition? I got some positive responses, though, and I think some very mature responses, one might say, very well thought-out responses. I would like to read one of them from the Natural Resources Defense Council:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCINNIS and CHAIRMAN HANSEN:

Thank you for your letter of October 30 in which you and your colleagues invited us to repeat our long-held position concerning violence by some who claim to be part of the environmental movement. Let me state, therefore, that the Natural Resources Defense