

## HONORING BILLY CASPER

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the first day of the Masters, one of the most prestigious sports events in our Nation and, indeed, the world. And I rise today to commemorate the fact that for only the second time in 45 years, one of the great golfers of this decade, in fact, one of the great golfers of this century, Billy Casper, is not playing in the Masters. Billy Casper, won the Masters in 1970. He also won a couple of United States Open championships. In fact, in 1966 at Olympic Country Club in San Francisco, he came from behind in what is considered to be one of the most stunning come-from-behind victories in the history of golf. That is when he was seven shots back to Arnold Palmer with only nine holes to go and Billy Casper, called by Golf Magazine the greatest putter in the history of golf, managed to shoot a 32 on the back nine at Olympic Country Club in San Francisco, one of the most difficult golf tracks in the world. He tied Arnold Palmer for the U.S. Open championship and the next day shot a 69 and beat Arnold Palmer.

If you add to that great win, that great success, and his other U.S. Open success and his 1970 Masters success the fact that Billy Casper won 51 times on the PGA tour, which puts him the sixth winningest golfer of all time, and you add to that the fact that he has the best Ryder Cup record in terms of wins and losses of any player in American history, and you add to that the five Vardon trophies he won on having the lowest scoring average on the U.S. PGA tour, then you have to conclude that Billy Casper indeed is one of the great heroes in sports history.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Billy Casper lives in San Diego, California. He still plays golf at San Diego Country Club, where he worked as a caddy as a kid. He has a big heart. He has been a great leader of junior golf in developing young golfers in our country and, indeed, the Nation. Billy Casper is joined by his wife, Shirley, in all of his efforts. He not only is a great athlete and a great teacher but a great person and a great leader in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the greatest golf field in the world is playing in the Masters right now. The game is still on. We will have a leader today; and ultimately on Sunday afternoon we will see who the champion is. But there is one great champion, the 1970's Masters champion who is not playing this time for only the second time in 45 years, but he will be down there because he is a wonderful person. He has a big heart. He loves this event. He loves the tradition. He loves the galleries which in turn love him because he is indeed a great sportsman, one of the great representatives of the game of golf. Billy Casper.

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

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

## WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minority leader's designation of this hour to the discussion of welfare reform.

The Bush administration has submitted various proposals. Most of them go to the technicalities of States' performance and percentages of people that must be in a work program. They have increased the work requirements from 30 hours to 40 hours, with some allowance for the use of 16 hours for other than actual work activity. But in most cases the administration's proposals do not go to the matter of the actual recipients and families that have been affected by the many changes that we made in 1996.

I do not think there is any dispute on either side of the aisle that the provision of the 1996 Welfare Reform Act did dramatically lower the number of welfare recipients all across the country. This was because there were mandatory requirements on work. If you did not work, if you did not register for work, if you did not go into some sort of a work project, you would lose the cash assistance. Therefore, the numbers that fell dramatically to about 50 percent of what they were in 1996 is basically because of the rules that were included in the 1996 TANF legislation.

The requirement to work has removed many of these families from the welfare roles. The problem with just removing these families from the welfare roles, however, is that they have simply gone to dead-end jobs, most of them earning minimum wage, perhaps some as much as \$6 or \$7 an hour, but that is it. So most of these families remain under the poverty level and, therefore, continue to be a responsibility of the national and State governments.

□ 1715

They continue to be eligible for housing support. They continue to be eligible for food stamps. They are eligible for Medicaid allowances and are, of course, as former TANF recipients, going to work under the TANF rules entitled to significant amounts of child care support.

The object of welfare reform, it seems to me, is to really take a look at the outcomes, not simply the mechanisms; what percentage, 50 percent, 60 percent are at work. The mechanisms have been proven to work, partly be-

cause of the flexibility that the States have been given to implement these new requirements.

The real way that we can measure the success of welfare reform, it seems to me, is to look at the quality of the family life after they have left welfare. Are these families earning sufficient funds to really take their family out of poverty, out of all of the support services that the poor in this country are entitled to? I think the answer to that question is that the substantial majority of families that have gone off welfare are still poor, are still below poverty and are still dependent upon the wide variety of support mechanisms that are there for the poor in America. So, therefore, welfare reform, it seems to me, has stopped short of accomplishing the real mission which it should be, and that is to bring these families up to economic self-sufficiency, to a matter of economic security.

One of the real mistakes I think that we made in the enactment of TANF in 1996 is that we did not consider these families as being those that might benefit from education. We have 1 year vocational training as a work activity, but for many of the individuals on welfare, additional educational opportunities ought to be provided. That is the number one goal of legislation that I have introduced in the House last November, which now enjoys 90 cosponsors. And it looks to the welfare reform legislation from the perspective of the recipient, not from the perspective of the mechanic, the percentages that are being held or the percentages that are being gotten off of welfare or all of those mathematical statistical charts.

What we have done in the bill I introduced, H.R. 3113, is to look to see how it impacted the families, and as a result of the legislation, H.R. 3113 currently enjoys the support and endorsement of over 80 organizations throughout the country, the YWCA, the National League of Women Voters, a large number of women's organizations, Business Professional Women, Center for Women Policy Studies, and on and on.

These individuals have not come on to support the legislation as casual observers. In most instances, they have participated in the writing of the bill from, again, the perspective of the child, of the family, of the single parent, to see what we could do to enhance their condition, their standing in our society.

The people on welfare have to be looked at as individuals who want desperately to improve their condition, and I think that the major item that is missing in the current law and in the Bush administration's proposal is the importance of education.

Our bill hopes to consider education as a work activity. The law says one must be in a work activity. So in order to comply with the law, and not to be sanctioned for failure to comply, we must first of all say education is a

work activity, and if we do that, then it would enable families to continue on to junior college, community colleges, major colleges and universities, to get substantial education so that they could really basically improve the future sustainability of the finances of their family. I think that is terribly important.

President Bush for his initial thrust, when he came to this Chamber and addressed the country from that podium there, he said that we must not leave any child behind. Following that message, we passed a major education bill, elementary and secondary education, H.R. 1, as it went through this House, and today it is Public Law 107-110. And the whole approach is that we have to uplift the standards of our public educational system so that no child in America is deprived of the basic opportunities to earn an education and to be somebody to the best of their talents and abilities.

That is the approach I think we should be taking with welfare reform. What can we do to uplift and enhance the quality of life of these children? It is still aid to dependent children, even if we call it temporary assistance for needy families. It is still based upon what can we do to support, help these children.

I think, for instance, that care giving is an important responsibility of all parents, not just those in the middle class and in the upper middle class and the rich, to be free and able to stay home and care for their own children, nurture them, raise them until they are school age. That should be the social, moral responsibility that is recognized by government for all mothers. But we do not do that in TANF. We do not do that in this welfare reform law that we enacted in 1996, nor do we do that in the current reauthorization versions that have been submitted.

Instead, we say that everyone on welfare must go to work, must have a self-sufficiency plan, must perform 40 hours of work, because we must train these individuals to understand what work responsibility is, and we ignore the fact that nurturing a child at home is as important a responsibility as engaging oneself in a minimum wage job.

Furthermore, many of these parents, in a collection of comments that I have been reading through in a publication called *Faces of Change*, written by welfare recipients and those that have left welfare and are now engaged in work, how troubled they are because they come from troubled families. They have many difficulties in their own personal situations. They have sickness in their family, a child that is asthmatic, or there are mental difficulties and other kinds of health difficulties within the family that makes steady employment almost impossible. And certainly if the child care is not adequate, they raise the concerns of the mother even more.

So I think we have to bear in mind that the individuals who are on welfare

need to have this special consideration. The legislation that I have put forth, H.R. 3113, explicitly says for the non-school-age children that the option ought to be left to the mother to decide whether to remain at home and to care for these small children. Even with the children who are in school, the teenagers who are apt to get into trouble, apt to find themselves in difficulty, need a parent at home.

Many of these parents who write their story say the only job they could get was something at night that brought them home at 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning. Their teenaged children were left unsupervised. How can we say that this is in the best interests of the children of these poor families not to have an adult or parent there to supervise them when they are home from school?

We do not have after-school programs also in many places, and as a consequence, school is over after 2 or 3 o'clock, these teenage children, age 14, 15, are out on the street. No one is at home to take care of them, because under our TANF law the parent is required to work; and now, under the new proposals, to work not just 30 hours but to work the full 40 hours, not necessarily in compensated work, because the assumption is that if they cannot get compensated work, they ought to be doing volunteer work or doing workfare for the State or for some charitable institution.

I think that this is all very, very wrong. It does not accord the respect to our mothers in this country who are struggling to raise their children. Just because they are on welfare, they do not love their children any less. They do not have any lesser responsibilities for their children. And therefore it seems to me that we need to put first things first, and that is to enact legislation that carries with it this sense of responsibility of this government and of the States for its smallest citizens, for the children.

So I am hoping that this perspective can come into the discussion and the debate as we work these bills in the two committees. The Committee on Education and the Workforce will be doing markup, the bill was only introduced yesterday, but will be doing markup next Wednesday. And I am told that the Committee on Ways and Means also has an expedited schedule.

The general public is not going to have adequate time to reflect on it, to react to it, to contact the Members of Congress to express their personal objections to the various changes that the administration is proposing, and therefore I take this means today to heighten the awareness of the community out there, which I know is engaged in this subject, and ask for their attention and urge them to contact members of the Committee on Ways and Means and of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and to convey their concerns about the recipients of welfare, or the children and the

children's welfare, and not to enact stricter requirements on work which will make it even harder for these families to survive.

I would like at this time to yield to my colleague who serves on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, has been a stalwart defender of the rights of families and mothers, and works hard to benefit the children of America. She is also a cochair of the Task Force on Welfare Reform on the Democratic side, and she has been working very, very hard to try to amass public opinion, learned discussions about this subject, so that this House can have the benefit of the best information, best records that we can put together. And I am really pleased at this time to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for the partnership she provides for me in this House of Representatives. I appreciate it so much.

We might want to just talk back and forth a bit, because I think there is a lot we can talk about that I think is so important. My colleague may have said most of it, but I think it bears repeating.

In 1996 when we passed welfare reform, after both of us voting against it because it did not provide a safety net for children, we warned the President, then Bill Clinton, and our colleagues, many of whom agreed with us and voted with us, that getting women off of welfare and into jobs would not be enough, that just could not be the end result of welfare reform, and we warned them that that was particularly important to look at if there was a downturn in our economy.

We did not mean to be prophetic. I mean, we did not want to be seers. We just knew, and there it is. We were right, because this recent economic downturn has exposed the problem that we talked about in the 1996 welfare reform bill.

The guiding principle of 1996 reform was that welfare was the enemy. But the enemy was not welfare, and we knew it. The enemy, and still is, is poverty. When I hear people brag about how successful welfare reform has been, I wonder how they are measuring the success. I know how they are measuring the success. We both do. The success of welfare reform must be measured by how we break down the cycle of poverty, not how many people have left the welfare rolls.

□ 1730

First of all, we do not know that everybody that has left the welfare rolls has gone to work. We just know how many people are no longer on welfare.

We have to measure when we are looking at the success of welfare reform, we have to measure if families have become self-sufficient, which means that they are able to raise their

families, that they have enough money for housing, enough money for health care, they have enough money for child care and the transportation that they need to get back and forth to their jobs and to take their children to school and the market. That is self-sufficiency. We are not saying that they have to live in mini-mansions. We are saying that they have a right to have a roof over their head; and when they are working every day and playing by the rules, they deserve to feel self-sufficient.

President Bush wants to increase the requirement to 40 hours a week from what is currently 30. The only way this requirement is going to work is if we count education as work. I know the gentlewoman just discussed this, but if we want self-sufficiency and women particularly to go from welfare and get out of poverty, we have to see that they have education and training to qualify for jobs that pay a livable wage.

Mr. Speaker, to that end I have introduced legislation called the Education Counts Act. What this does is allows education activities to count as work activities and not be counted against a welfare recipient who is going to school in order in the long run to earn a real living. Rather than penalize them, the clock is ticking and her welfare limits are disappearing while she is at school, I think that we should stop the clock entirely because only by giving women access to education and training will they have the background and skills needed for jobs that pay a livable wage so they can become self-sufficient.

Also, if we expect women to go to school or to go to work, in particular, because that is what the goal of the President's plan is, to put everybody into jobs, whether or not those jobs pay a livable wage, and if we want families to transition into self-sufficiency, we have to make sure that we have good child care available, quality child care and enough child care because we have to ensure that moms can free their minds when they are at work and know that their children are well cared for. By quality and availability I mean also nighttime work and weekend work. That is very important.

A lot of welfare moms are going into jobs working weekends and at night, and there is no child care available for them and for their children. We cannot afford to leave our children behind, and what is happening in the President's proposed welfare bill is flat-funding child care, which does not account for any increase in costs; and in the long run, it means a cut in child care when we need an increase because we are increasing the number of hours that these moms are expected to go to work.

Just as welfare recipients need to be held accountable for working their way off welfare, States have to be held accountable for how they use the taxpayers' money earmarked for welfare programs. The current system rewards

States for lowering the number of families on welfare without any regard to what happens to those families. That could be throwing money out the window because if States are not helping families be self-sufficient, then they are keeping families subsidized in the long run, and that costs money.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Self-Sufficiency Act, which helps States figure out how much it would cost for families in their States to be actually self-sufficient, to take care of their children without any public assistance. Once States have this information, they can better allocate resources to help families move towards self-sufficiency.

In doing that, they will be looking at housing costs, transportation costs, child care costs, and health care costs in their communities. Every community is different. Some are higher and some are lower, and each State can look at that individually.

I know what it means to need a leg up, to need some help, to hit hard times and realize that there is no place else to go but to one's government for help.

Mr. Speaker, 35 years ago my children's father left us when my children were 1, 3 and 5. He was emotionally and mentally ill, and would not get help for his illness, and plain abandoned us. Lucky me, I had good job skills, some college education; and I was able to go to work because my children were solely my responsibility. It never entered my mind that I was not going to take care of them.

In order to have the health care that we needed and the child care coverage and the food stamps, I went on Aid for Dependent Children while I was working. Without that, we would not be where we are today. That was exactly the safety net that it took, and it took 3 years for this mom with an education. I was very healthy; my children were healthy. Members have to know I was assertive. I could get through the system. I knew what needed to be done, but I could not do it without that help. And that was 35 years ago. It is way more difficult for young mothers now. It has never entered my mind, I did it, so can you.

Lucky me, I have four great, grown children; and I am a Member of Congress. My kids are successful in what they do in their lives, and I am here as a Member of the House of Representatives; and I can tell Members, we have paid back what the government invested in us many, many, many times over. But I can also tell Members if we had not had that help, I do not know what we would have done.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the public and I ask my colleagues, please, please, do not be hesitant to invest in young families and in moms who have fallen on hard times. Do not assume that if someone is having a bad time, they did it on their own and deserve it, and if they were worth their salt they would not be there in the first place because

that is just not true for any of the people who are in need today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for being part of the welfare task force with me. We know that the things that we need to be concentrating on child care, education counting as work, flexibility in the welfare system, making sure that individuals who have domestic abuse problems, substance abuse problems, mental illness, language difficulties, making sure that they get an opportunity to get their situations together before the clock starts ticking on them will make a difference in ensuring that welfare makes work pay and count, and these people all count.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for her contribution here today. It is very powerful, especially her own personal explanation of how much the program meant to her and her young family.

I think that is the message that we have to carry to our colleagues, that these individuals who are on welfare having hard times, they are worthy parents. They care about their children. They do not want to do anything to damage their future; but in many cases they need the time and the education, they need the training and they need the assurance that there is quality child care before they are forced off to work.

I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution to this afternoon. We will engage the House, I am sure, on many of these issues as we go to our markup in the committee and full committee and eventually on the floor.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and look forward to working with her in getting the message across that the enemy is poverty, the enemy is not welfare or the welfare recipient. The enemy is poverty. If we can get that message across and do something about it, we will have helped welfare recipients as well as the working poor.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us want to do what we can to provide a safety net. Every President that I have worked with talks about the necessity of a social safety net. That is really all that the welfare program is. It is a safety net for families that have fallen on hard times, have recently gotten divorced, or lost a family member, as my colleague explained in her situation; and they need a helping hand. They should not be treated as though they are of less worth and dignity than all of us. We want their children to have the benefit of the best possible family situation that they could have.

In talking about welfare benefits, I think Members have the feeling that there is this huge amount of money that is being remitted to the families on welfare, and that is certainly not true. The amounts of money that are allocated per month can be gotten by downloading the Congressional Research Service. It has a list of each

State and what they pay each month to a family, family of one, two, three, four, five or six. Let us pick a family of three, that is, a single mom and two children. Alabama's monthly benefit for a family with two children is \$164. One is barely able to keep oneself together with that amount of money; and yet we are saying to these families that they must go out to work and improve themselves. Arkansas is \$204 a month; Delaware, \$338; Florida, \$303; Idaho, \$293; Indiana, \$288; Kentucky, \$262; Louisiana, \$240; Mississippi, \$170; Missouri, \$292; North Carolina, \$272; Ohio, \$373; Oklahoma, \$292; South Carolina, \$203; Tennessee, \$185; Texas, \$201. The list is available for public scrutiny.

I recite this list of those that are in the lower threshold of monthly compensation to give Members an idea that we are not talking about very large sums of money that they are receiving to just tide themselves over. In addition, they have Medicaid and food stamps, and usually housing assistance as well to help them through.

So this work idea is to try to uplift them from their condition of dependency upon the State, but it is not a lot of money. So the notion is how do we uplift them; and it seems to me that the most logical thing that we can do is to help them improve themselves through education and to fill the jobs that are available in teaching, nursing, in high tech, in other kinds of occupations that are available.

The requirement of 40 hours is really punitive in rural America. I represent a rural district. I do not see how we are going to find jobs to fill the requirement of 40 hours. We cannot even fill the 30 hours in my remote areas on the Big Island, on Maui, Molokai, and Kauai.

□ 1745

So I think that there has to be flexibility. Like my colleague the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) suggested, we have to give States flexibility. We know that they can exempt 20 percent of their population. That is already in the old law. No one seems to be changing that. We have to bear in mind that in some areas of America it is just not possible to get a job, so we have to think of other alternatives. Certainly an alternative is through education to uplift them, to qualify them for professions and careers. If we were satisfied with just a poverty-level compensated job and say, well, we have done our duty under TANF, then what we are saying is that for the rest of time, this family is going to receive food stamps, Medicaid, housing support and other kinds of support services dependent upon a condition of poverty. If they work, they will also get earned income tax credit refunds, \$2,000, \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000 depending on how much they earn and how many dependents they have.

This is not the kind of policy that I think we want to perpetuate. What we

want to do is to give these families the hope and the realization that our government policy is going to recognize self-betterment.

And so if a woman, a single parent, wants to go to college, get a degree in nursing or some other profession, that should be encouraged, not discouraged by not considering it part of the program. Our bill is very modest. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and myself in our bills provide that education is a work activity. So when the law says you must be in a work activity, going to school constitutes a work activity, and you cannot be penalized because you decided that you wanted to go to school. The colleges can decide whether the individual is sustaining herself by keeping up her grades and attendance and so forth, and so those kinds of requirements can be levied. Going to college, that family will have Pell grants, undoubtedly, being on welfare. That will help to pay the tuition and other costs of getting there, transportation and so forth. She can probably qualify for work-study, so that she can produce some work hours and earn some money at the same time. This is the sort of support that a safety network ought to provide.

The TANF legislation that we passed in 1996 completely ignores this part of our government responsibility. We have passed countless pieces of legislation having to do with higher education, expanding the opportunity of young people to go to college. It should be no different for a family person who is on the welfare rolls. That person ought to have the same encouragement to get off welfare by getting an education that will then sustain that family at a salary that would lift them up from poverty so that they do not have to rely on food stamps, housing subsidies, earned income tax credit and all the rest of it.

So I think that this comprehensive look at what welfare reform should be, not just getting any job, but lifting people out of poverty, enhancing their condition and making it possible for the children of these families to have the kind of family life, family stability, with somebody who will be able to nurture them, carry them on to college because they themselves have had that opportunity.

It is this outlook that we hope to engage this House further upon as we take this bill up in subcommittee and full committee and bring the matter to the floor. It is expected that this legislation will come before us sometime in early or mid-May. So we have not much time. I invite the enlarged community to contribute their thoughts and views, because there are many, many organizations out there that have contributed already, in the hundreds of meetings that they have conducted where they have consulted with welfare recipients, and we have learned so much from them about the agony of raising families and how difficult it is

to match the requirements of the law with their responsibilities for their families.

I am delighted that we are joined here by my dear friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) who has, I am sure, many words of advice to give us on this very, very important area, particularly rural America which I was just talking about.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I want to thank the gentlewoman very much for holding this special order and raising this whole issue of welfare reform and giving us the opportunity, our colleagues and the American people, to know that this is an issue that is being debated and which the President now has made a proposal. We know Ways and Means will be debating those areas and the committee on which the gentlewoman from Hawaii serves, the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

We have a unique opportunity in the reauthorization of welfare-to-work. The whole idea for welfare-to-work was indeed to move people from dependency to independence. In our State we call it Work First. You have an opportunity to try to find a job. The requirement was to make sure you entered into those kinds of activities to prepare you for a job, and the State, supposedly with the assistance of the Federal Government, was supposed to do that. There was not a policy that we were going to move people out of poverty. That would have been a better one, but it was that we were moving people to work.

But we have learned some things during that process. I would caution us that even some of the things we have learned from State studies may not be as reflective as it should be, because when you understand that our State as a whole may have some areas that work better than others, we have some parts of our States that have more opportunities for jobs, more opportunities to move people to work, and you have some places where I come from, the rural areas, where there is indeed a great decline in low-skill jobs. The economy, as we know, has depressed even those jobs who were upward mobile and diminished agriculture opportunity, so we are having less opportunities to move people into.

Also, when we look at what we are doing or, better still, we are looking at how Governors in the States may use waivers. They use waivers in a variety of ways. Sometimes it is more of an advantage to the Governor or a State than it is to the individual communities for that. For instance, they can use waivers to exempt areas that have a high concentration of unemployment. But if the State looks at it as a whole, they may not see that, because the State as a whole may be in that. So States have not used those waivers to target resources strategically where people have opportunities or people have a lack of opportunities. I think we have some opportunity to refine that.

The area that I am most interested in, and I am interested in all of them, but is the area of day care and child care. The child care capacity for parents who have very young children, if we expect them to be independent, they need to have the assurance that there is adequate, safe, child care and affordable child care. In rural areas, just having the access almost to any child care is not there. And then to have the assurance that you have placed your child in a qualified, well-equipped, designed, child care facility is almost remote, particularly when you understand that child care gets to be expensive.

And if you are not investing in training the personnel, if you are not investing in the infrastructure of the community college, or you are not creating opportunities for nonprofits or faith-based organizations to provide that child care, saying that people should find child care without providing for it I think is not only grossly negligent, I think it is unforgivable when we are expecting that this should be strengthening families.

One whole premise is strengthening families. Very few families I know of think they are strengthening their family if they throw their kids at just any place without regard to the quality and the safety of it, and then when you are not affording the kind of reimbursement.

As you begin to craft the bill, I hope you will understand that there is some differential between our urban communities and our rural communities. The suffering may be the same. I am not arguing against anything that should go in the urban areas, but the infrastructure is different. We have to travel longer periods of time, for a longer distance, for health care, for education, for shopping. We travel for job opportunities. If you are going to ignore the lack of transportation to facilitate this, then you will have put my district and my communities within my district at a disadvantage.

So in order to make sure that there is access to that, child care must be there. That means providing sufficient money for training as well as reimbursement for opportunities.

Then when you think about actually getting to a job, if I live 10 miles from the Wal-Mart that is going to hire me, by the way for \$7 an hour, chances of me getting a car on \$7 and paying for it, hey, as our young kids say, we need to get real if we really want this to happen.

I think we want to make the welfare bill even better. We just do not want to have statistics that say we have moved people off of welfare. Moving people off welfare is much easier, I submit to you, than moving people off welfare into meaningful work, where they can move from dependency to self-sufficiency, working, advancing themselves.

Finally, the whole issue of education of the welfare mother or the welfare adult, that is critical not only to the

economy of our district but also to the stability of that person working and not going from welfare to work, laid off. If we understand, if we invest in their upward mobility by providing them training on a continuous basis, we are investing not only in the statistical of movement from welfare, but we are investing in the vitality of our community and a statistical reality that these people will stay as employed persons.

I commend the gentlewoman for giving attention to this. I just urge as you go forward that you will consider those infrastructure needs as well as the distance and the economies of scale and what that means in putting the same kinds of programs that we would have in urban areas, where things are relatively close to each other, and there may be a sufficient infrastructure there that would accommodate day care, where there are well-established church day cares or well-established nonprofits, and even for-profits.

They are not in my communities, unfortunately. I wish they were there. We have to find a way to give some incentives to those nonprofits or faith-based organizations investing in child care. We have to find ways of accommodating transportation in rural areas for the purpose of both education as well as for employment. We also have to find adequate resources to reimburse people for the day care.

Finally, the education of our mothers and people who are dependent is not only investing in that individual, which is worthy in and of itself, but we are investing in the vitality of that community and the stability of that community.

Again, I commend the gentlewoman for her leadership in this area. By the way, I say to you, we are trying to relieve the responsibility of food stamps out of day care. I am a part of the agriculture conference committee, and part of the idea as we considered that was to try to reform and bring new quality to food stamps. You remember, food stamps and welfare reform are partners. If you examine who is getting food stamps now, a little better than half of the people who are getting food stamps are working families. And if you take who those people may be, they are children of working families as well as their parents; and then senior citizens and children, just combine those alone, are over 60 percent.

So making food stamps and the transition from welfare or Work First to work, having the ability to supplement that \$7-an-hour job I talked about with food stamps with a family of three, that is a big help. And so we want to make sure that that goes in tandem with it. Just as Medicaid has been made a little easier for the transition, we are trying to make an alignment between Medicaid and welfare reform and food stamps, so that this will be a part of the package we put together in enabling the tools for a person moving from welfare to have those additional

tools to supplement a very low-wage job.

□ 1800

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I commend the gentlewoman for her contributions, and I certainly hope that in her conference on the farm bill that she can work this alignment so that the families that are moving off of welfare getting their minimum wage job will have easier access to food stamps.

Right now we are told that many of them fall between the cracks, because the eligibility requirements are so different and nobody is there to help them qualify, so many of these families, though they are eligible income-wise, are not really getting this benefit at all.

Mrs. CLAYTON. We are very hopeful, and I think it is moving in the right direction.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Wonderful. We had the opportunity to hear from Secretary Tommy Thompson the other day. He came and testified about the importance of child care. I want to say that I was very impressed with the passion with which he made his comments about child care, that you cannot have a national policy that requires work of single-parent families unless you provide adequate quality child care. So I think we have a friend there as far as the concept is concerned, but the mechanics of making this statement a reality for families is still short. It is not there.

In our bill, H.R. 3113, we say that if the government is not able to find child care for a family that it is requiring work activity out of, then the family is exempt from finding work activity until such child care can be made available, and the clock stops. It seems to me that is simple justice. If we believe that the work requirement cannot be enforced without child care, then we cannot put sanctions and penalties upon the family for something over which they have no control.

So I am hoping that we can work together with the administration and with Secretary Thompson to clarify this, because he feels that this is already current law, that if you cannot get child care, you are not required to go to work. But there is nothing in the legislation that exempts such a family from sanctions or from other kinds of prohibitions. So I hope we can work that out.

Child care is so important. There is a set-aside that requires the States, from the Federal monies it gets under TANF, to improve child care under the quality child care requirement. And I think that we need to up that ante, perhaps double it from 4 to 8 percent, so that more attention is given to quality child care services and not just simply child care and assume that the State has fulfilled its responsibility by finding any child care that might be available.

I think that these parents are entitled to have quality child care, and we

should be moving in that direction. Part of the problem is that we are not able to pay the individuals who work in these child care centers sufficient income to make it worthwhile for them to qualify as early childhood education personnel, so with their low pay and low expectations, we cannot upgrade the child care centers in the way we should be.

There are many aspects to this issue that are very important. The stop-the-clock things on education and child care, drug treatment services that might be needed by that family, domestic violence, sexual abuse conditions, any severe mental illness or physical illness ought to exempt that family from the work requirements.

So I hope that we look at this legislation from the perspective of the family and how hard they are struggling to comply, rather than impose new requirements that are based upon percentage of participation or performance rates that the States are required to do. Rural America cannot possibly meet the 70 percent work requirement that the administration is asking. There are simply no jobs to which these individuals could find any sort of satisfaction of employment.

So I think we have to bear that in mind and find some way in which we can soften the requirement based upon flexibilities given to the States or waiver provisions given to the States where we have large rural populations with high unemployment rates. I think that is a very important quest that we must make in this reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to expound on an issue that is very important to me and to 90 other Members of the House. I include for the RECORD a list of the 80 organizations that endorse H.R. 3113.

GROUPS THAT HAVE ENDORSED H.R. 3113, THE TANF REAUTHORIZATION ACT

1. Acercamiento Hispano/Hispanic Outreach.
2. African American Women's Clergy Assn.
3. American Civil Liberties Union.
4. Americans for Democratic Action.
5. American Friends Service Committee.
6. Arizona Coalition Against Domestic Violence.
7. Ayuda Inc.
8. Business and Professional Women/USA.
9. California Food Policy Advocates.
10. California Welfare Justice Coalition.
11. Campaign for America's Future.
12. Center for Battered Women's Legal Services at Sanctuary for Families.
13. Center for Community Change.
14. Center for Third World Organizing.
15. Center for Women Policy Studies.
16. The Center for Women and Families.
17. Center on Fathers, Families and Public Policy.
18. Central Conference of American Rabbis.
19. Chicago Women in Trades.
20. Child Care Action Campaign.
21. Child Care Law Center.
22. Choice USA.
23. Church Women United.
24. College Opportunity to Prepare for Employment (COPE).
25. Communications Workers of America.
26. Covenant House Washington.

27. Family Violence Prevention Fund.
28. Florida CHAIN (Communications Health Information Action Network).
29. Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quaker).
30. (GROWL) Grass Roots Organizing for Welfare Leadership.
31. Harbor Communities Overcoming Violence (HarborCOV).
32. Harlem Fight Back.
33. HELP USA.
34. Human Services Coalition of Dade County, Inc.
35. Hunger Action Network of NYS.
36. Jewish Women International.
38. Los Angeles Coalition to End Hunger & Homelessness.
39. Mothers on the Move Committee of the Philadelphia Unemployment Project.
40. National Association of Service and Conservation Corps.
41. National Association of Commissions for Women.
42. National Center on Poverty Law.
43. National Coalition Against Domestic Violence.
44. National Coalition of 100 Black Women, Metropolitan Atlanta Chapter
45. National Council of La Raza.
46. National Employment Law Project.
47. National League of Women Voters of the U.S.
48. National Organization for Women.
49. National Urban League.
50. National Welfare Rights Union.
51. NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby.
52. New Directions Center.
53. New Mexico Center on Law & Poverty.
54. Nontraditional Employment for Women.
55. NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund.
56. North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence.
57. Ohio Domestic Violence Network.
58. Oregon Law Center.
59. Public Justice Center.
60. Research Institute for Independent Living.
61. RESULTS.
62. Rural Law Center of NY, Inc.
63. Safe Horizon.
64. Southeast Asia Resource Action Center.
65. The Miles Foundation.
66. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
67. Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations.
68. United States Student Association.
69. Welfare Made A Difference Campaign.
70. Welfare Rights Organizing Coalition.
71. Welfare-to-work Advocacy Project.
72. Wider Opportunities for Women.
73. Wisconsin Council on Children and Families.
74. Women and Poverty Public Education Initiative.
75. Women's Committee of 100.
76. Women Employed.
77. Women Empowered Against Violence, Inc. (WEAVE).
78. Women's Housing and Economic Development Corporation (WHEDCO).
79. Workforce Alliance.
80. YWCA of the USA.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

- Mrs. ROUKEMA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.
- Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 1:00 p.m. on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOYER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- (The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
- Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. SIMMONS, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on April 9, 2002 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1432. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3698 Inner Perimeter Road in Valdosta, Georgia, as the "Major Lyn McIntosh Post Office Building".

H.R. 1748. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 805 Glen Burnie Road in Richmond, Virginia, as the "Tom Bilely Post Office Building".

H.R. 1749. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 685 Turnberry Road in Newport News, Virginia, as the "Herbert H. Bateman Post Office Building".

H.R. 2577. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 310 South State Street in St. Ignace, Michigan, as the "Bob Davis Post Office Building".

H.R. 2876. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Harlem, Montana, as the "Francis Bardanouve United States Post Office Building".

H.R. 2910. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3131 South Crater Road in Petersburg, Virginia, as the "Norman Sisisky Post Office Building".

H.R. 3072. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 125 Main Street in Forest City, North Carolina, as the "Vernon Tarlton Post Office Building".

H.R. 3379. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 375 Carlls Path in Deer Park, New York, as the "Raymond M. Downey Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 15, 2002, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows: