

Ballenger Graves
 Barr Green (WI)
 Bartlett Greenwood
 Barton Grucci
 Bass Gutknecht
 Bereuter Hansen
 Biggert Hart
 Billirakis Hastings (WA)
 Blunt Hayes
 Boehlert Hayworth
 Boehner Hefley
 Bonilla Herger
 Bono Hilleary
 Boozman Hobson
 Brady (TX) Hoekstra
 Brown (SC) Horn
 Bryant Hostettler
 Burr Houghton
 Buyer Hulshof
 Callahan Hunter
 Calvert Hyde
 Camp Isakson
 Cannon Issa
 Cantor Istook
 Capito Jenkins
 Castle Johnson (CT)
 Chabot Johnson (IL)
 Chambliss Johnson, Sam
 Coble Jones (NC)
 Collins Keller
 Combest Kelly
 Cooksey Kennedy (MN)
 Cox Kerns
 Crane King (NY)
 Crenshaw Kingston
 Cubin Kirk
 Culberson Knollenberg
 Cunningham LaHood
 Davis, Jo Ann Latham
 Davis, Tom LaTourette
 Deal Leach
 DeLay Lewis (CA)
 DeMint Lewis (KY)
 Diaz-Balart Linder
 Doolittle LoBiondo
 Dreier Lucas (OK)
 Duncan Manzullo
 Dunn McCreery
 Ehlers McHugh
 Ehrlich McInnis
 Emerson McKeon
 English Mica
 Everett Miller, Dan
 Ferguson Miller, Gary
 Flake Miller, Jeff
 Fletcher Moran (KS)
 Foley Morella
 Forbes Myrick
 Fossella Nethercutt
 Frelinghuysen Ney
 Gallegly Northup
 Ganske Norwood
 Gekas Nussle
 Gilchrest Osborne
 Gillmor Ose
 Gilman Otter
 Goode Oxley
 Goodlatte Paul
 Goss Pence
 Graham Petri
 Granger Pickering

NAYS—200

Ackerman Cardin
 Allen Carson (IN)
 Andrews Carson (OK)
 Baca Clay
 Baird Clayton
 Baldacci Clement
 Baldwin Clyburn
 Barcia Condit
 Barrett Conyers
 Becerra Costello
 Bentsen Coyne
 Berkley Cramer
 Berman Crowley
 Berry Cummings
 Bishop Davis (CA)
 Blagojevich Davis (FL)
 Blumenauer Davis (IL)
 Bonior DeFazio
 Borski DeGette
 Boswell Delahunt
 Boyd DeLauro
 Brady (PA) Deutsch
 Brown (FL) Dicks
 Brown (OH) Dingell
 Capps Doggett
 Capuano Dooley

Pitts
 Platts
 Pombo
 Portman
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Ramstad
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reynolds
 Riley
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roukema
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryon (KS)
 Saxton
 Schaffer
 Schrock
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skeen
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Souder
 Stearns
 Stump
 Sullivan
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Tancredo
 Tauzin
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thune
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Toomey
 Turner
 Upton
 Vitter
 Walden
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Watkins (OK)
 Watts (OK)
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

Holt
 Honda
 Hooley
 Hoyer
 Insee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 John
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind (WI)
 Kleczka
 Kucinich
 LaFalce
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Luther
 Lynch
 Maloney (CT)
 Maloney (NY)
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)

NOT VOTING—15

Boucher
 Lucas
 Gibbons
 Hall (OH)
 Kolbe
 Mascara
 Miller, George
 Murtha
 Napolitano
 Peterson (PA)

□ 2020

Mr. SKELTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4737, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY, WORK, AND FAMILY PROMOTION ACT OF 2002

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 422 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 422

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4737) to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate on the bill, with 50 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 40

minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Cardin of Maryland or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 422 is an appropriate, but fair, rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4737, the Personal Responsibility, Work and Family Promotion Act of 2002.

This rule provides for a total of 2 hours of general debate in the House, with 50 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and, finally, 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

After general debate, it will be in order to consider the substitute amendment, if offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) or his designee, printed in the Committee on Rules report, which is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill as well as against the amendment printed in the report.

Finally, the rule permits the minority to offer a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to clarify for my colleagues that H.R. 4737 represents a new version of our welfare reform legislation and incorporates one new change. That first bill was filed on Thursday. The new legislation contains two new provisions. It continues to provide broad authority to the executive branch to waive provisions of law in an effort to streamline certain administrative and programmatic requirements of several programs related to welfare assistance. However, this bill now contains a new provision, G, on page 118, and H, on page 119, which basically maintains the congressional responsibility for this country's pursestrings, those set forth

in article 1, section 7 of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago many of us stood in this very Chamber surrounded by skeptical eyes and wary glares. The debate before us then was welfare reform. The day we voted on the final conference report, August 1, 1996, was also payday for many Americans. But unlike many Americans, and contrary to the central tenet of the American Dream, 14 million people who cashed their check that day did not work for that money. Such was the nature of our welfare state 6 years ago.

On that day, back in 1996, Congress passed one of the most historic reform bills of all time, one that truly changed the culture of the system from one of cynical dependence across generations to one of personal responsibility. Since 1996, we have witnessed welfare rolls drop from 14 million persons to 5 million nationwide.

In my own home State of Ohio, we were passing out welfare checks to the tune of \$82 million per month. Post the reforms, the price tag has been reduced to less than \$27 million a month, and it is going to those who really need the help. In one State alone that is a savings of \$50 million a month of hard-working taxpayer money.

And while I speak with great enthusiasm about the extraordinary achievements of our friends and neighbors, those who have moved onward to the path of independence, I speak with equal pride of the compassionate Nation that we call home. We live in a country that is built on the rewards of hard work and the generosity of a society that offers assistance to those in need of a helping hand. The underpinnings of our democracy give us reason and incentive to take responsibility for our lives, but to ask for assistance if we really need it, and then be ready to get back on our feet, when we can, with the help of our neighbors and our community.

We will not turn our backs on those who need help. Instead, we will provide them with the tools and the resources they need to overcome adversity, to reverse course, and to rebuild their lives. We have before us today a tremendous opportunity to build on the success of welfare reform. H.R. 4737 is a product of strong reflection and cooperation between the House leadership and the committees of jurisdiction.

While I have the honor and distinction of introducing this legislation on behalf of the House, it is the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), chairmen of the committees and subcommittees of jurisdiction, and many others who have worked the long hours together to craft a bill that truly will protect children, strengthen families, and increase State flexibility. At the same time, it will support further de-

clines in poverty through job preparation, stronger work requirements, and healthy marriages.

First, H.R. 4737 provides \$16.6 billion for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, block grant, which is the program we created in 1996. Funding for this block grant goes directly to state-designated programs to help move more welfare recipients into productive jobs.

H.R. 4737 will require more welfare families to be engaged in work-related activities from the current 50 percent to 70 percent by fiscal year 2007. Increased work requirements are a critical aspect of welfare reform, because according to the Health and Human Services' "Third Annual Report to Congress," 58 percent of welfare recipients are not participating in work activities as designated by Federal law.

Not only will this save money, it will help recipients achieve self-sufficiency, give them that pride that goes with responsibility, and then they can pass it on to their children and their grandchildren.

This bill also offers parents the tools and resources they need to secure a job and provide for their independence. In addition to the \$4.8 billion support for child care through the Child Care and Development block grant, we have provided an extra \$2 billion in child care money as well as an increase in the amount of money States can transfer to the block grant from 30 percent to 50 percent.

By providing access to reliable child care, recipients will have peace of mind knowing their child is safely cared for as they train for, find, and keep a job.

We all know that training and education are the backbone of advancing one's professional opportunities. Since the average workweek for most Americans is 40 hours, H.R. 4737 brings welfare reform up to par by requiring recipients to be engaged in work activities for 40 hours per week, up from the current 30. While 24 of the 40 hours must be spent in actual work, the remaining 16 hours may be defined by States and can include education and training.

□ 2030

This bill will also allow for up to 4 months during a 24-month period to be counted toward State work rate requirements if the individual engages in education or training programs leading to work.

Additionally, H.R. 4737 directs up to \$300 million annually for programs that encourage healthy, stable marriages, and authorizes \$20 million grant funds to support community efforts to promote responsible fatherhood.

Finally, H.R. 4737 gives unprecedented flexibility to States by establishing broad new State flex authority which has the support of the Nation's governors because it will provide the States and their governors with new and creative tools to meet their own State's needs. In an attempt to cut

down on the arduous, costly and burdensome waiver application process, States will be able to improve program effectiveness by submitting a single application to tailor Federal education, child care, nutrition, labor and housing programs to fit their State's welfare needs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the reality of welfare reform success will silence the grumbles that echoed throughout this Chamber back in 1996. I wish to extend an invitation to my colleagues who may be hesitant to support this rule for partisan reasons to take a good look at where we were 6 years ago and where we have come today. Members will find hundreds of children and families in their districts that are better off now than they were 6 years ago. They are working, they are proud, they are teaching their children about the dignity of having a job and providing for their families. They see a better future for themselves and their loved ones, and they are encouraged to tell their stories.

A check in the mail every month will not teach responsibility, will not build confidence, and will not break the cycle of intergenerational dependence we witnessed for decades. A check in the mail for a job well done will open up the doors of opportunity and offer all Americans an endless supply of pride and self-worth for generations to come.

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

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

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill is one that impacts millions of Americans. Many of them are our most vulnerable constituents, but the process before us today shuts out any meaningful debate, and blocks consideration of important amendments affecting the elderly, mothers and children. This is not a welfare reform bill; this is spite.

Moreover, the entire legislative body is put on hold. The Committee on Rules, as I said earlier, was shut down at midnight and forced to postpone our vote on the rule until 8 this morning, but then we repeated the process a little while ago with yet another version of the bill. As has been pointed out, in 24 hours this bill has become three. Today's drafting and redrafting makes a mockery of regular order, and Mr. Speaker, this has got to stop.

It is duplicitous for the Committee on Rules to take testimony from our colleagues while they know full well that the bill before us will not be considered in its final form. I oppose this heavy-handed process and the cynicism it embraces, and urge my colleagues to defeat this ill-conceived rule.

In the light of day, we can see that the underlying bill is one that can desperately use some improvement, and is clearly not ready for prime time. In fact, the Committee on Rules went out of its way to ensure that these much-needed changes will not be considered.

Several critical amendments were struck down repeatedly on a party line vote in the Committee on Rules. In a slap to legal immigrants, the committee voted down efforts by the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) to protect legal immigrants from being singled out in the measure.

My colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), attempted to provide adequate funding for child care; but he, too, was rebuffed. And the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) found her years of work on the farm bill to protect food stamp recipients under attack only days after significant improvements to the program were signed into law by President Bush. The Committee on Rules saw fit to shut her out as well. Most of my colleagues' efforts suffered a similar fate.

Moreover, it is becoming clear that the underlying bill fails to address the most fundamental goal of welfare reform, moving recipients into real jobs and out of poverty. While caseloads since 1996 have fallen over 50 percent nationally, the poverty rate has decreased only 13 percent over the same period. This means that even during a time of historical economic expansion, many who have left welfare remain dependent on food stamps, WIC and other public assistance. Recipients are raising children without the education, training or child care that is necessary to move to real independence.

We have heard from governors, mayors, State legislators, welfare directors and poverty experts who all say the same thing: The bill is a step in the wrong direction. We have heard from a bipartisan group of Senators, led by Senators BREAUX and HATCH, that we should expand access to vocational education, give States credit for placing people in real jobs, maintain State flexibility, increase child care funding, and remove restrictions on serving legal immigrants. But, unfortunately, none of these proposals are contained in this bill. In fact, the legislation eliminates vocational education from the list of activities that count as work-related activity.

The message is clear: Education is the key to every American's future except for poor single mothers with children.

Child care also takes a hit. The new legislation stiffens the work requirements, but fails to increase the child care money beyond the additional \$400 million a year that the House majority proposes. Instead, parents get care vouchers, and it is up to them to find the care. And how many welfare parents have been able to find accessible, high-quality child care near their homes, or care available on nights and

weekends? How many vulnerable kids in our communities are now in what is known in the welfare reform business as self-care, which is to say, they go home after school, lock the door and stay inside. No one has any idea.

The Congressional Budget Office has informed us that implementing the new work requirements in the bill would cost States between \$8–11 billion over the next 5 years. In addition, the Congressional Budget Office has indicated that maintaining the current purchasing power of the child care block grants will cost States another \$7 billion over 5 years. This unfunded mandate could force States to cut child care funding for the working poor in order to finance the additional day care costs in the workfare programs.

Moreover, new requirements in this bill will focus States on placing recipients in make-work activities, rather than in real jobs. In fact, 41 of the 47 States surveyed by the National Governors' Association indicated that the proposal would require them to make fundamental changes to their welfare programs.

A recent study by the University of Washington found that States' workfare program had much less impact on the wages of former welfare recipients than preemployment training did.

This research is one of the reasons that very few States have implemented large workfare programs over the last 6 years. Some jurisdictions that did create work experience programs are now beginning to scale them back. For example, New York City enrolled less than 10 percent of its adult caseload in work experience programs at the end of last year compared to 15 percent 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, there is a better way, one that maintains State flexibility, one that focuses on real work, and one that seeks to help families escape poverty. My colleagues and I support strong work requirements that seek to move people into real jobs. We believe States should have the flexibility to determine the best mix of services and activities to move welfare recipients towards self-sufficiency.

We want to end discrimination against legal immigrants and provide welfare recipients with access to vocational training so they can find good jobs. And we support providing the necessary resources, especially for quality child care, to help families leave welfare for work. I am afraid this measure fails to do just that.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, assistance to those in need is not only important, it is vital. However, that assistance must be enabling, not disabling. To me, welfare reform success must be measured by how many people no longer need temporary

assistance, food stamps, or Medicaid, and how many are moved to a life of self-sufficiency, dignity, opportunity and hope.

Before moving forward, it is useful to review and look back on the welfare reform legislation from 1996. It had three goals. First, reducing welfare dependence and increasing employment. Today 4 million fewer people are living in poverty than when welfare reform was enacted.

Second, reducing child poverty. Since welfare reform, welfare dependence has been cut nearly in half.

Third, reducing illegitimacy and strengthening marriage. For nearly three decades, out-of-wedlock births as a share of all births rose steadily at a rate of almost 1 percentage point per year. Welfare reform has stopped this trend in its tracks.

H.R. 4737 is based on the principles of this past reform. It increases minimum work requirements, but it builds in cushions for sick days and holidays, simulating a typical American work schedule.

It makes special accommodation for parents with infants, and for individuals who need a substance abuse treatment, rehabilitation or special work-related training.

It provides financial incentives to the States to give as much money as possible to mothers and children, and it directs up to \$300 million for programs that encourage healthy, stable marriages, including communications and conflict resolution training.

It provides grants to support community efforts to improve parenting skills and promote responsible fatherhood.

It encourages State innovation that will help States design revolutionary programs to help bring welfare reform to the next level.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this rule and to support H.R. 4737.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, this process of the rule shows contempt for poor people and poor children, just as legislation also shows contempt. Welfare legislation should not demonize poor children. Yes, first we must remember that the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Act is a safety net program for children, for poor children. Helping mothers to find jobs is only a means to accomplish the end of providing necessities for children.

These children are a vital part of the fabric of America. History clearly exposes the fact that poor children of America have grown up to supply the majority of the foot soldiers who have been maimed and killed by the wars of

this Nation. The overwhelming majority of the heroes whose names are engraved on the Vietnam War Wall Memorial are soldiers who came from families who would qualify for free school lunches, food stamps and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

If we are so unfortunate that we are entrapped into a prolonged war against terrorism and it becomes necessary to institute a draft again, the first and greatest number to be drafted will be the children from the poorest families in America.

Helping children out of poverty and not harassing the so-called welfare mothers should be the goal and mission of the reauthorization of TANF legislation. After 5 years of this program, which has been labeled a great success, why are there more children living in poverty than before? Have the infant mortality rates decreased? Are children who have been pushed off Medicaid receiving adequate health care? Are there more children in juvenile delinquent detention facilities? What proportion of the prison population were teenagers on welfare 5 years ago?

To bring legitimacy and humanity into this lawmaking process, these are a few of the questions that we should answer. We have rushed to declare a success without applying any basic scientific research principles. Instead, we are passing a rule tonight which facilitates a cold-blooded grab for another pound of flesh from the demonized welfare mothers.

Today it is approximately 2 weeks since we passed the largest safety net under congressional jurisdiction, the farm subsidy program. Although it has a few other features, it is primarily to convey \$20 billion per year to so-called poor farmers who constitute less than 2 percent of the population.

This is not the only tax dollar giveaway orgy that we have seen recently. In the nearly \$400 billion defense bill, we threw billions of dollars at several unnecessary weapon systems, such as the dangerous Osprey helicopter gadget, a missile defense system that will not protect us from terrorists, and other high-tech overweight gun monsters that the Secretary of Defense has declared obsolete.

□ 2045

There have been other tax giveaway orgies, but the farm bill is the most relevant comparison because the farm subsidy is a safety net program. Most people do not understand; it is a safety net program. The means test for the agriculture safety net benefit is \$2.5 million. If you make more than this, you are not eligible for the safety net benefits of the farm program. In any one year, you can only receive \$390,000. Do farmers have to work for these taxpayer dollars? Or are they paid not to work to grow food? Farmers are important, but no more important than the families that supply the majority of the foot soldiers who fight and die in the wars of America. Poor children in

America are as important as anybody else. We should not continue to demonize them. We should understand what Osama bin Laden and a number of people in the Islamic world understand. They are precious, they take them and they train them to hate; and they have become a resource to be used against America. Our children deserve the same kind of attention, not to be demonized but to be nurtured.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and the underlying bill. It seems to me that we often devote most of our time in this body attempting to fix that which is broken and very little time preventing damage before it occurs. The greatest cause of poverty in this Nation is fatherlessness. Children without fathers are five times more likely to live in poverty. They are five times more likely to depend on welfare. The greatest cause of dysfunction among young people is fatherlessness. Fatherless children are three times more likely to have behavioral problems, two times more likely to commit a crime, and much more likely to be involved in teen pregnancy, drugs, suicide and dropout from school. We have 18 million fatherless children in our country today.

The President's welfare reform plan addresses these problems. It eliminates the higher work requirements for two-parent families. It removes a disincentive to marriage. It provides \$300 million to allow States to provide marital preparation programs, to provide counseling to strengthen marriages, and to promote fatherhood programs which encourage fathers to take responsibility. This bill strengthens families and attempts to eliminate the root cause of poverty. It is proactive rather than reactive.

I urge support for this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask Members to vote against this rule. The American taxpayers who pay our salaries deserve a full and open debate on the most significant piece of legislation concerning the lives of families and children across this country. If this were an open rule, of course, I would try to offer an amendment that does in fact enhance the position of fatherhood and fatherhood programs in a State. But, Mr. Speaker, States around the country are financially strapped. Indiana alone would be affected \$211 million with the passage of this incredible legislation. Because it is as significant as it is, it deserves full and open debate. We have pushed unfunded mandates for education of our children from the Federal Government to the States; and the last time I looked at this bill, by whichever number it may be at this particular point, it would even deny

persons an opportunity to get vocational education which would push them into the economic mainstream, into the job opportunities that would be afforded them from vocational education.

I think that it is grossly unfair to punish American families and to punish children by this bill. That will be why, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the Members to vote against the rule and recall the words of Abraham Lincoln, I believe, that a House divided cannot stand. Certainly this particular legislation is very divisive, and we should not support the rule.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to express my great dismay, consternation and disillusionment with the decision of the Committee on Rules to deny every single amendment that had been proffered for debate in this House on this very, very important bill. I cannot fathom the reason why there would be a total rejection of all of these important measures. They could select out some. The four that I proposed could easily have been eliminated. I would have been angry, but at least the process would have been preserved. This House has a world reputation to maintain as a great deliberative body. What are we afraid of in terms of a full debate? There is no way in which you can take a general debate and a debate on a substitute, to have that constitute an amendment on specific provisions of the bill.

An amendment would allow us to single out an issue, to target it, to talk specifically about one particular provision, such as education, why that is so important. It seems to me that the leadership of this House, the Committee on Rules, has completely abdicated its responsibility to preserve the very heart of this Chamber and, that is, to allow the diverse opinions, the discussion and debate to formulate the final outcome of this bill. As it turns out, none of the amendments are going to be considered. We will have just the debate on the main bill and a debate on the substitute. All the other things of importance will be relegated to the trash heap. I think that that is really a disgrace.

I hope that the Members of this House will understand that this is a degrading operation on the integrity of this House, and I hope they will vote down this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, we need to block this block grant proposal. This welfare reauthorization bill

that the House leadership has finally brought to the floor still contains a proposal to allow five States to elect a food stamp block grant in lieu of the regular program. And in addition, it allows the food stamp program the opportunity or the provision of a super waiver. This is a bad idea on procedure; it is flawed policy and should be defeated.

I offered an amendment to remove from the bill these two provisions, the five-state block grant provision and the super waiver provision. The Committee on Rules denied that amendment. This rule, therefore, needs to be defeated on process.

This block grant proposal ought to be blocked for a number of valid policy reasons: first of all, this proposal undermines the ability of the food stamp program to respond to human needs during economic downturns. The States will face pressure to transfer food assistance spending to employment and training.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that between 2002 and 2007, expenditures for food stamp benefits, administrative costs and employment and training programs will increase by 13 percent, from \$21 billion to \$24 billion. Indeed, if this should occur, where would this money come from? Fixed block granting of food stamps would not allow for those expenditures.

Finally, the restoration of legal immigrants, unlikely under food stamp block grants. Just Monday, I stood beside the President when he bragged about the fact that he was restoring legal immigrants to have the provision of food stamps. Well, they will not have it if five States can block grant, because the immigrant cost is not in the base of it; and that cost, therefore, would be impossible for States to assume, and that provision would not happen.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to act responsibly by indeed responding to the increasing need of food assistance during economic times and not to block-grant food stamps. The States cannot afford it. Therefore, I implore my colleagues not only to defeat this rule but also to defeat this bad proposal.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in strong opposition to this unfair rule. I am strongly disappointed that my friends on the other side of the aisle decided that a debate about the future of working families, working poor families in this country does not deserve more than a few hours of discussion. And I am disappointed that they decided that amendments on important issues like child care and restoration of benefits for legal immigrants, legal immigrants, does not deserve to be heard on the floor of this

House. These are vital issues to my community.

In Los Angeles County alone, there is a child care crisis. Only 16 percent of the children in my community there receive child care. And for a family earning the minimum wage in my community, it takes about 61 percent of their income just to place one infant in child care. So I attempted to offer an amendment to allow mothers who are receiving welfare benefits and have infant children or a child or a disabled child to stay at home and care for that child because it is so costly to place these children in child care. It is hard to get, and it costs a lot of money. This request was denied.

Mr. Speaker, I also represent a community with a large number of immigrants, many from Mexico, Central America, and Asia. I attempted to offer an amendment with the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) to restore welfare benefits to legal immigrants. But this request was also denied. I cannot support a rule which does not even allow me to debate the issues that matter most to men and women from my district who are struggling to get out of poverty. They want to have dignity. They want to have a job. But they also need assistance from this government.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this unfair rule and oppose the previous question so we can make our voices heard and allow for a free and fair debate.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this welfare reform rule should be defeated in that there is really no reformation of welfare here. There are just some glib statements of people who would not know a poor person if they saw them walk by them tonight. They need to get into the shoes of poor people. Then they can realize that this bill does nothing to increase self-sufficiency of poor people.

We use a lot of buzz words here in the Congress. We keep talking about self-sufficiency. You do not find it here. None of your welfare reform bills or your welfare programs have brought self-sufficiency, because the people you say will be out of poverty are still in poverty. You are not meeting the child care needs. The children are getting poorer and poorer. Poverty resides just away from here, not two blocks from here. Yet you cannot realize that this bill does nothing to address self-sufficiency.

In 1999 in the middle of the economic boom, ex-welfare recipients who worked earned an average of nearly \$7,200 a year, approximately \$6,000 below the poverty line for a family of three. Think of that. Nearly one out of

five children in the United States are still living in poverty. And we are here in this great land, we are able to give away money to everyone; but we cannot look down to the least of those, our small children who need help in this country. Poverty is not so that we cannot overcome it. Other governments have tried it. Why is it that our government is so bitterly opposed to helping poor people? You are helping the rich. Why not put the same measurement on the poor? You are not helping them.

Are we providing recipients with the education and training? I see these women who come in and out like they are on an escalator with all of these training programs. There are people who are getting rich off your poverty program under the guise of bringing about welfare reform. That is why we sit here and make these obsolete kinds of measures, not letting people talk about them. You have got to have some real jobs, not dead-end jobs, so that these people can become self-sufficient and educate and train them. It can be done if we really want to do it.

Defeat this rule.

□ 2100

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, 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. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this rule.

A fair rule should give us a chance to build a consensus; this rule does not. Women on public assistance with children under 6 years of age have three full-time jobs. They are expected to work, as they should, in exchange for their welfare benefits; they are expected to get an education so that they can leave welfare and get a better job, and they are expected to be full-time moms 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. Only a magician can pull off that triple-threat problem, unless she has adequate child care.

There are Members in this Chamber who believe strongly that the work requirement should be increased to 40 hours, and there are those of us who believe that that increase is punitive and counterproductive. There is an opportunity and a possibility for compromise, and that compromise would be to guarantee, not to promise, but to guarantee first-rate child care when needed for these moms that we are telling to get out and get an education and go to work. Amendments that would have given us a chance to strike that compromise have been stricken from this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule fails the test of serious compromise and it should fail the vote of this House. I would urge my colleagues to defeat the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is two words to describe what is wrong with this welfare bill: Riley-ya Wilson, this beautiful baby. Right now, this 5-year-old child from my State is missing somewhere in this country, and this Congress wants to give full responsibility to under-funded State agencies without any Federal oversight.

It is truly an outrage that we are tonight debating how much money to dedicate to the weakest, when the President and the Republicans want to make permanent extending tax credits to the richest in our country to the tune of over \$500 billion. And worse, the children of Florida have double jeopardy because we have a governor, Jeb Bush, that gives all of the money to the wealthy businesses instead of making sure that the State can account for all of its children.

Our priorities are all wrong. It is time that we start thinking of the children first. What happened to "Leave No Child Behind?" Well, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are really good with coming up with catchy statements, but I have one for you: Where is the beef? I say, where is the beef?

The Republicans do nothing to improve the state of children in this country. The Republicans want welfare recipients to work 40 hours a week, but where is the money for child care? This bill does nothing to allow parents to receive an education and training to get good jobs to get off the welfare rolls.

The proof is in the pudding. Do not just talk the talk, walk the walk. Instead of sending money to the States to try to get people to get married, we need to focus all of our energy on what is really important: making sure that the States are equipped to take care of all of the children. We cannot afford another tragedy like this precious, precious baby.

Mr. Speaker, to whom God has given much, much is expected, and they are expecting much from this Congress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. It is an unfair rule, and it does not give the minority party a chance to engage in a meaningful, substantive debate about the base bill by offering amendments.

Now, during the course of this debate as it resumes tomorrow, we are going to hear a lot of fluff and a lot of bluster about empowering individuals with work and jobs, but if we are truly interested in lifting people out of poverty, we must be interested in giving them an opportunity for work. Yet, an amendment that myself and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN)

wanted to offer which would have established a work credit, an incentive for States to move people off of welfare into meaningful, respectable paying jobs, is denied an opportunity to be fully heard.

We are also going to be hearing a lot of talk about the importance of two-parent families and the role of fathers with welfare reform. Yet an amendment I wanted to offer with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) that would create an incentive for States to make sure that noncustodial parents get work and also pay child support payments, which is important for the upbringing of these kids, is denied a meaningful debate during consideration of this legislation.

Also, another important area that needs to be addressed with the base bill, and that is victims of domestic abuse and sexual assault are in a unique situation. They sometimes have deep psychological scars and it is not easy for them to turn their life around. Yet, consideration of those issues, which are very important for a lot of people currently on welfare rolls throughout the country, is not given meaningful attention under the base bill.

These issues, however, have been addressed in the Democratic substitute, one that we will be hearing more about and the differences, the basic differences between the two bills, and that is why I would encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule so that we can open up the base bill for more discussion. But if that fails, support the Democratic substitute and vote "no" on the Republican underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for following the time-honored tradition of allowing the Democrats to have a substitute under the rule, but let me urge my colleagues to vote against the rule, because in a bill of this importance amendments should have been made in order and no amendments were made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to many people who were saying they are going to support the underlying bill talk with pride of what we have accomplished during the past 5 years, but then they are supporting legislation that moves backwards and takes away a lot of tools that States currently have that have been responsible for the success during the past 5 years. Our States have said that if these new requirements become law, it is going to require them to have workfare programs rather than getting people real jobs.

But let me talk about the amendment that I took to the Committee on Rules that deals with education, because I think education is key. The current law allows vocational edu-

cation training to count towards a State's work participation rate for up to 12 months. That is the current law. The Republican bill takes that out of the law. It says basically that education is important for everyone in this country, except the most vulnerable, the people that are on welfare. Is that the message we really want to give to the American people?

The amendment that I submitted to the Committee on Rules would have continued education as a core requirement under the work participation. It would have expanded it to 2 years. It would have included English as a second language and GED, and expanded the opportunities of using education so people cannot only be lifted out of cash assistance, but can have a good job and lifted out of poverty. That is the type of debate that we should be having tomorrow. But the rule that we have before us denies us that opportunity to debate that issue.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue, TANF reauthorization and welfare. It deserves debate in this Chamber so that we can talk about education and we can talk about the other issues as to whether there is adequate resources for our States but, unfortunately, the rule before us will not let us do it. I urge my colleagues to reject the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I understand my colleague has no further requests for time, nor do I, so I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow us to consider two important amendments denied in the Committee on Rules.

The first amendment, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), would remove the ban on welfare benefits to legal immigrants. Legal immigrants contribute greatly to our society and they paid an estimated \$50 billion in surplus taxes just last year, and 20,000 legal immigrants serve in our Nation's Armed Forces but they are banned from receiving funds in this bill. We would have an opportunity to vote to change this, and the amendment would give us that chance.

The second amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) would strike the food stamp program from the super waiver in the five-state block grant. Food stamps are often the only source of Federal assistance for many low-income working Americans. This program should not be tampered with by the House.

Please vote "no" on the previous question so that we can have an opportunity to debate and vote on these two very important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House resolution 422.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time. In closing, I ask my colleagues to look back at the welfare reforms of 1996 and to remind them that we have come a long, long way.

Today we will find children and families in each of our districts better off than they were 6 years ago. We have reduced the welfare rolls and helped those who were once down and out to lift themselves up. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4737 builds on these efforts to further protect the children, to further strengthen families, to further increase State flexibility, and to further continue the decline in poverty.

It is often said that the best social program is a job. This legislation provides the needed tools for people to move from welfare to work and opens up for them the door of opportunity, pride, and a better future. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and bill before us today.

I want to make it clear that I strongly advocate giving the states the flexibility that they need to effectively serve those citizens who strive to break the cycle of welfare dependence. That is why I am troubled by the provisions in the bill before us today that severely restrict the flexibility of states such as Texas to continue the activities that have been successful in their welfare to work programs and place a tremendous unfunded mandate on states.

For my own state of Texas, this bill would create an unfunded mandate of \$166 million a year, in addition to the \$78 million shortfall they will face under current law by 2007. Under the bill, Texas would be forced to implement policies which Texas has already rejected as unworkable and change parts of its welfare reform effort that have been a success in moving welfare recipients into real jobs because of the mandates in the bill. The welfare reform effort in Texas has been a success. It would be the height of arrogance for me to stand here in Washington and vote to require Texas to implement policies on welfare reform that the Texas legislature has already considered and rejected.

The so-called "super-waivers" advocated in this legislation has the potential to undermine

current food stamp policy that has a sound track record of providing nutrition assistance to all eligible citizens if they face economic hardships. The question is not whether states should or should not receive the flexibility under waiver authority to tailor the food stamp program rules. States already have that flexibility. The question is whether states should be allowed even greater flexibility to change the very nature of the food stamp program.

If there are innovative reforms that states would like to implement that are prohibited under current law, we should examine how to address those specific problems. That is what the Committee process is intended to do. Let state administrators testify before the Agriculture Committee about the changes they believe would allow them to run the program better, let the Committee examine the consequences of those changes, and then come up with legislation to address those concerns.

The delay in bringing this bill to the floor today highlights the problems of ignoring the committee process and writing bills in the leadership offices. Welfare reform is too important to consider under a process that has more to do with scoring political points than building on what has been successful.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4737 is a top priority for President Bush and one of the most important bills we'll consider this year.

The 1996 welfare reform law—one the most successful social policy initiatives in recent memory—is set to expire later this year. In February, President Bush unveiled his principles for reauthorizing this important law; H.R. 4737, the Personal Responsibility, Work and Family Promotion Act, is based on those principles.

Its goal is simple: to put even more Americans on the path to self-sufficiency and independence. While the '96 law has been an unqualified success, there is more work to be done. A majority of TANF recipients—58 percent—still aren't working for their benefits.

That's why H.R. 4737 strengthens current work requirements. It asks welfare recipients to engage in work-related activities for 40 hours a week—16 of which could be in education, job training, or other constructive activities as defined by states.

The measure also gradually increases the work participation rate required of states—by 2007, 70 percent of a state's TANF recipients must be in work-related activities, up from 50 percent in current law.

Moreover, the bill makes significant improvements to the Child Care and Development Block Grant. It adds \$1 billion in discretionary funding to the program over five years and requires states to devote more money to improving child care quality. The bill also incorporates key elements of President Bush's Good Start, Grow Smart early childhood education plan, encouraging states to make sure children are developmentally prepared to enter school.

H.R. 4737 also significantly enhances flexibility for states and localities to integrate a variety of federal programs, including TANF, food stamps, housing assistance, the child care block grant, and workforce investment programs.

This innovative plan will give states and localities the opportunity to respond creatively to recipients' needs and improve the efficiency of federal welfare and workforce programs. As a

recent Wall Street Journal editorial noted, the State Flex proposal "has the potential to spur the next wave of reform."

With this bill, we have the chance to build on the success of the last five years. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue as we move forward.

This proposal has been approved by three different House Committees; many Members have had the opportunity to consider and amend this bill. The rule today before us is a fair rule, and I urge members to support it.

The amendment previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. ____) to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to State for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours, with 50 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution or the amendments specified in section 2. Each amendment specified in section 2 may be offered only in the order specified. The amendment printed in the report of the Rules Committee may be considered only after the amendments specified in section 2. Each amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report or in section 2, as the case may be, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report or in section 2, as the case may be, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendment are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Sec. 2. The amendments referred to the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(1) Amendment to be offered by Representative Becerra of California or Representative Solis of California or Representative Wu of Oregon or Representative Crowley of New York or a designee, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE ____—TREATMENT OF ALIENS
SEC. ____ . TREATMENT OF ALIENS UNDER THE TANF PROGRAM.

(a) EXCEPTION TO 5-YEAR BAN FOR QUALIFIED ALIENS.—Section 403(c)(2) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity

Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1613(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(L) Benefits under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program described in section 402(b)(3)(A).”

(b) BENEFITS NOT SUBJECT TO REIMBURSEMENT.—Section 423(d) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1138a note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) Benefits under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act except for cash assistance provided to a sponsored alien who is subject to deeming pursuant to section 408(h) of the Social Security Act.”

(c) TREATMENT OF ALIENS.—Section 408 (42 U.S.C. 608) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO THE TREATMENT OF 213A ALIENS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In determining whether a 213A alien is eligible for cash assistance under a State program funded under this part, and in determining the amount or types of such assistance to be provided to the alien, the State shall apply the rules of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), and (6) of subsection (f) of this section by substituting ‘213A’ for ‘non-213A’ each place it appears, subject to section 421(e) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, and subject to section 421(f) of such Act (which shall be applied by substituting ‘section 408(h) of the Social Security Act’ for ‘subsection (a)’).

“(2) 213A ALIEN DEFINED.—An alien is a 213A alien for purposes of this subsection if the affidavit of support or similar agreement with respect to the alien that was executed by the sponsor of the alien’s entry into the United States was executed pursuant to section 213A of the Immigration and Nationality Act.”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect October 1, 2002.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by the provisions of this section apply to benefits provided on or after the effective date of this section.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

(2) Amendment to be offered by Representative Clayton of North Carolina or a designee, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes.

Page 113, line 10, insert “or” after the semicolon.

Page 113, line 13, strike “; or” and insert a period.

Page 113, strike lines 14 through 16.

Page 118, line 6, insert “or” after the semicolon.

Page 118, strike lines 7 through 18.

Page 118, line 19, strike “(F)” and insert “(E)”.

Page 124, strike line 5 and all that follows through line 7 on page 137.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 204, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—213

Aderholt
Akin
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggett
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte

Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence

NAYS—204

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)

Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Bachus
Burton
Cunningham
Gibbons
Gordon
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Kolbe
Mascara
Miller, George
Murtha
Reyes
Stump
Stupak
Tauzin
Thornberry
Traficant

□ 2136

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, HILL and MARKEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 205, answered “present” 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—214

Aderholt	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Akin	Goss	Petri
Armey	Graham	Pickering
Baker	Granger	Pitts
Ballenger	Graves	Platts
Barr	Green (WI)	Pombo
Bartlett	Greenwood	Portman
Barton	Grucci	Pryce (OH)
Bass	Gutknecht	Putnam
Bereuter	Hansen	Quinn
Biggert	Hart	Radanovich
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Blunt	Hayes	Regula
Boehlert	Hayworth	Rehberg
Boehner	Hefley	Reynolds
Bonilla	Herger	Riley
Bono	Hilleary	Rogers (KY)
Boozman	Hobson	Rogers (MI)
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Bryant	Hostettler	Roukema
Burr	Houghton	Royce
Buyer	Hulshof	Ryun (KS)
Callahan	Hunter	Saxton
Calvert	Hyde	Schaffer
Camp	Isakson	Schrock
Cannon	Issa	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Istook	Sessions
Capito	Jenkins	Shadegg
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Shaw
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Shays
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Sherwood
Coble	Jones (NC)	Shimkus
Collins	Keller	Shuster
Combest	Kelly	Simmons
Cooksey	Kennedy (MN)	Simpson
Cox	Kerns	Skeen
Crane	King (NY)	Smith (MI)
Crenshaw	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
Cubin	Kirk	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Knollenberg	Souder
Cunningham	LaHood	Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann	Latham	Sununu
Davis, Tom	LaTourette	Sweeney
Deal	Leach	Tancredo
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Tauzin
DeMint	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Terry
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Thomas
Dreier	Lucas (OK)	Thune
Duncan	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Dunn	McCrery	Tiberi
Ehlers	McHugh	Toomey
Ehrlich	McInnis	Upton
Emerson	McKeon	Vitter
English	Mica	Walden
Everett	Miller, Dan	Walsh
Ferguson	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Flake	Miller, Jeff	Watkins (OK)
Fletcher	Moran (KS)	Watts (OK)
Foley	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Fossella	Ney	Weller
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Whitfield
Gallely	Norwood	Wicker
Ganske	Nussle	Wilson (NM)
Gekas	Osborne	Wilson (SC)
Gibbons	Ose	Wolf
Gilchrest	Otter	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Oxley	Young (FL)
Gilman	Paul	
Goode	Pence	

NOES—205

Abercrombie	Boyd	Davis (IL)
Ackerman	Brady (PA)	DeFazio
Allen	Brown (FL)	DeGette
Andrews	Brown (OH)	Delahunt
Baca	Capps	DeLauro
Baird	Capuano	Deutsch
Baldacci	Cardin	Dicks
Baldwin	Carson (IN)	Dingell
Barcia	Carson (OK)	Doggett
Barrett	Clay	Dooley
Becerra	Clayton	Doyle
Bentsen	Clement	Edwards
Berkley	Clyburn	Engel
Berman	Condit	Eshoo
Berry	Conyers	Etheridge
Bishop	Costello	Evans
Blagojevich	Coyne	Farr
Blumenauer	Cramer	Fattah
Bonior	Crowley	Filner
Borski	Cummings	Ford
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Frank
Boucher	Davis (FL)	Frost

Gephardt	Lynch	Roemer
Gonzalez	Maloney (CT)	Ross
Green (TX)	Maloney (NY)	Rothman
Gutierrez	Markey	Roybal-Allard
Hall (TX)	Matheson	Rush
Hastings (FL)	Matsui	Sabo
Hill	McCarthy (MO)	Sanchez
Hilliard	McCarthy (NY)	Sanders
Hinchey	McCollum	Sandlin
Hinojosa	McDermott	Sawyer
Hoeffel	McGovern	Schakowsky
Holden	McIntyre	Schiff
Holt	McKinney	Scott
Honda	McNulty	Serrano
Hooley	Meehan	Sherman
Hoyer	Meek (FL)	Shows
Insee	Meeks (NY)	Skelton
Israel	Menendez	Slaughter
Jackson (IL)	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Jackson-Lee	McDonald	Snyder
(TX)	Miller, George	Solis
Jefferson	Mink	Spratt
John	Mollohan	Stark
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Stenholm
Jones (OH)	Moran (VA)	Strickland
Kanjorski	Morella	Tanner
Kaptur	Nadler	Tauscher
Kennedy (RI)	Napolitano	Taylor (MS)
Kildee	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Kilpatrick	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Kind (WI)	Obey	Thurman
Kleczka	Oliver	Tierney
Kucinich	Ortiz	Towns
LaFalce	Owens	Turner
Lampson	Pallone	Udall (CO)
Langevin	Pascrell	Udall (NM)
Lantos	Pastor	Velazquez
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Visclosky
Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Waters
Lee	Peterson (MN)	Watson (CA)
Levin	Phelps	Watt (NC)
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy	Waxman
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Weiner
Lofgren	Rahall	Wexler
Lowey	Rangel	Wooley
Lucas (KY)	Rivers	Wu
Luther	Rodriguez	Wynn

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ryan (WI)

NOT VOTING—14

Bachus	Kolbe	Stump
Burton	Mascara	Stupak
Gordon	Murtha	Thornberry
Hall (OH)	Reyes	Traficant
Harman	Stearns	

□ 2150

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:
Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that on the immediate past vote, rollcall 166, I voted; but somehow my vote was not recorded. Had I been recorded, I would have voted "no."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3686

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from cosponsorship of H.R. 3686.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3215

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have

my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3215.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CHAIR TO POSTPONE FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4737 TO A TIME DESIGNATED BY THE SPEAKER ON THE LEGISLATIVE DAY OF THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2002

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 4737, pursuant to House Resolution 422, the Chair, notwithstanding the order of the previous question, may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker on the legislative day of Thursday May 16, 2002.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

RAILROAD SAFETY

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, we have had in this Nation in recent weeks several high-profile train accidents, one in Southern California and one in Florida. In light of these accidents and in light of ongoing problems with railroad safety, I have asked the chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroad on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN), and his ranking member, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT), to hold a hearing and consider new legislation on railroad safety.

As my colleagues know, an Amtrak auto train crashed and derailed near Crescent City, Florida, last month. While the National Transportation Safety Board is still investigating, we have to wonder if the four deaths and over 100 injuries could have been prevented by the previous enactment by this body of real railroad safety legislation.

In the Southern California crash, a Burlington Northern engineer and conductor missed a yellow light that