

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FLOOD RELIEF ASSISTANCE GIVEN BY THE STUDENTS OF KEYSTONE COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA TO THE RESIDENTS OF KEYSTONE, WEST VIRGINIA

HON. DON SHERWOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 2002

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to rise today in praise of the efforts of the students and faculty of Keystone College, LaPlume, Pennsylvania, who recently came to the aid of the residents of Keystone, West Virginia. Due to recent devastating flooding in West Virginia, Keystone College President, Dr. Edward (Ned) G. Boehm, Jr., put out the call and challenge for his students and college to rally to the aid of the flood victims. I am pleased to report that they all met that challenge head on.

On May 14, Keystone College representatives delivered a check for \$ 1,000, food and clothing, which they had collected, to Mayor Larry Martin at the Keystone Town Hall for distribution to the flood victims. It is clear that the communities of Keystone College and Keystone, West Virginia, share more than a common name. They share a bond which was formed out of adversity and need.

Community service is part of the curriculum taught at Keystone College. It is one thing to be taught an idea or concept, such as community service, but it is through its implementation that true learning occurs. The students and faculty are to be commended for their thoughtful and giving deeds. But the story does end with this one finite act. This fall, a group of Keystone students will travel to Keystone, West Virginia, to help with the repair and recovery efforts.

Truly, community service is the "keystone" which brings all our communities closer together. It is through such selfless deeds and acts that we see our true reflection.

IN HONOR OF THE 25TH ANNUAL JOSÉ MARTÍ STUDENT AID FUND AWARD DINNER

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 2002

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 25th annual José Martí Student Aid Fund Award Dinner, which was held on May 18, 2002, at the Radisson Hotel in Secaucus, NJ. Two important individuals were honored at this event, Carmen Pardo and Clara Garcia, for their many years of dedicated service to the José Martí Student Aid Fund.

In 1975, Mrs. Carmen Pardo and Mrs. Clara Garcia began recognizing students who excelled in the study of the Spanish language. In 1978, the resulting scholarship fund was legally registered as a nonprofit organization. Today, it is a scholarship for high school students graduating from Union Hill, Emerson, and Memorial High Schools, which promotes the understanding and appreciation of the Spanish language, heritage, and culture.

Thanks to charitable contributions, and various civic and social activities organized by the institution, the José Martí Scholarship Fund has awarded over \$120,000 in scholarships. Over two hundred outstanding students have been honored.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the José Martí Student Aid Fund Award for its positive influence and the important role it plays in celebrating our Nation's Hispanic heritage.

RECOGNITION OF SBC COMMUNICATIONS FOR RECEIVING THE RON BROWN AWARD FOR CORPORATE LEADERSHIP

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 2002

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to recognize SBC Communications for receiving the Ron Brown Award for Corporate Leadership. This award highlights SBC Communications' commitment to South Texas and many other communities it serves. It is a tribute to SBC's desire to expand small business and volunteer opportunities in America.

Few companies have matched SBC's efforts to foster economic development in the communities it serves. By creating and maintaining relationships with diverse companies, the Supplier Diversity Program, an initiative developed to ensure minority-owned companies are an integral part of SBC's supply chain, has been extremely successful in integrating local minority entrepreneurs into its economic development strategy. In 2001, SBC spent \$2.8 billion, or 23.5 percent of all procurement, the companies highest level of diversity spending ever, with companies owned by minorities, women, and disabled veterans. SBC continues to be a model of corporate responsibility.

SBC has not only been recognized by Commerce Secretary Donald L. Evans with this Presidential award, but it has also been recognized by the Women's Business Enterprise Council, the National Minority Business Council, Working Woman magazine, Fortune magazine, and the National Minority Supplier Development Council, NMSDC, for its tireless efforts to provide opportunities for minorities. The company has set the standard for minority involvement and has never shied away from its responsibility to facilitate community involvement and service.

As evidence of this commitment, SBC spends more than \$1 billion annually with diverse businesses and was one of 10 companies inducted into the Billion Dollar Roundtable, an initiative of the publishers of Minority Business News U.S.A. and Women's Enterprise Magazine to recognize corporations that make investments in minority owned enterprises a priority. In addition, SBC challenged its fellow telecommunications companies to improve their supplier diversity and, because of that challenge, 70 telecommunications companies have pledged to do so.

We should all commend SBC for its 30 years of dedication to creating opportunities for minority business owners. I am proud that SBC calls San Antonio home. The city is a better place because of SBC's efforts, and our

communities across America are stronger because of its service. I wish SBC Communications the best in its future endeavors and urge it to continue to reach out to minority communities.

THE PROMPT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 2002

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention an issue that is extremely important to all of our constituents: private property rights. We have all heard from constituents in our districts who are frustrated with the process by which the federal government provides compensation to landowners for property it obtains through condemnation proceedings. While the federal agencies obtain land for a variety of reasons, the acquisition process often takes years to complete. Though legally the property owner may develop their property during this process, realistically they are discouraged from doing so. In essence, they are being held at the federal government's whim. It is for this reason that I have introduced The Prompt Compensation Act of 2002.

Currently, the federal government has two available procedures for obtaining property. The first is "straight condemnation," wherein a federal agency requests that the Justice Department file a "complaint in compensation" with a district court. It is the court's responsibility to ascertain the value of the land. Once the court has come to a decision, the federal government has the option of compensating the property owner with the adjudicated price or moving for dismissal. However, the landowner is compensated only if the federal government accepts the adjudicated price. While the federal government forfeits its interest in the property if they move for a dismissal, the property owner has been deprived of time, revenue, and in some cases, the overall value of their land.

The second and more expeditious procedure is commonly referred to as "quick take." In this procedure, the United States assumes title of the property immediately by simply filing a "declaration of taking" along with the complaint in condemnation and depositing with the court an amount of money equal to the estimated value of the land. Normal protocol is then followed with the court ascertaining the value of the property and the balance being issued to the landowner.

The Prompt Compensation Act will ensure that private land holders are not held in limbo by the federal government during a land purchase. My bill will require the government to obtain land only through the "quick take" procedure. The Prompt Compensation Act will make a significant impact in curbing the abuses of the federal takings proceedings, while at the same time strengthening the private property rights of America's landowners. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cosponsor this important legislation and take the power from the federal government and place it back in the hands of the private property owners.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY,
WORK, AND FAMILY PROMOTION
ACT OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2002

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, welfare rolls have been cut in half. In 1996 we had over 5 million families on welfare. Today, there are about 2.2 million families on welfare. The work requirement has forced over 3 million families to leave welfare. Most States will advise that they are not certain whether these parents are working. The guess is that about half are not. We are not sure how these families are doing. Just getting off welfare does not mean that the family is no longer in need. We certainly don't know whether the children have adequate food, clothing, or shelter. Reports tell us that most are still in poverty.

Welfare should be about children. But sadly this debate is not about what is good for children in poverty. Congress and the White House have turned welfare into a hardball game aimed at the single moms. Few have turned their questions to the children.

There is no real dispute that preschool age children are better off if they can be cared for by their own mothers. If their mothers must work then these children must be placed in quality child care programs. Secretary Tommy Thompson says they must be provided with child care. Anticipating this work requirement Congress has provided some child care funds under this program, but not nearly enough. A child care program is made available for all low income working families. Currently there are over 15 million preschool age children eligible for federally funded child care programs. But only 1.8 million are actually provided with help.

Welfare mothers mostly have to fend for themselves in finding child care. They ask neighbors or family to help if they live close by. It is a myth to say that welfare mothers are made to work and that child care is provided. Any wonder that 30 percent of these moms work nights and another 30 percent work weekends to make their work hours as required under TANF. They obviously have to work these odd hours because they can't find child care and by working nights or weekends they can leave their small children in the care of the older children in the family or with acquaintances in the building. This is a far cry from quality child care.

Poor children are already at risk. Keeping them apart from their mothers is pushing them further into harm. If welfare is about children, we need to pay special attention to the fragile frames upon which their lives are built.

When children are of school age, it is reasonable to expect that the mother could use her free time to work or to improve her chances of getting a good paying job by stepping into various education career-building opportunities.

Legislation must be designed to make this possible. Education must be considered a work activity. As such, it would qualify for child care support. The parent could qualify for a Pell grant, work study program, or a subsidized student loan.

The reports indicate that 42 percent of welfare recipients today lack a high school di-

ploma. Their first priority must be to get a GED diploma. After that further post secondary options should be considered.

Any reauthorization of TANF must provide for educational opportunity. If Welfare to Work is about ending poverty, education is the best tool to make that happen.

It is important to recognize that many on welfare come for help because of the dire circumstances they face. Personal problems like divorce, husbands sent to prison, serious illnesses in the family, substance abuse, domestic violence, severe depression and mental illness in the family are some of the reasons families have been forced into welfare. All of the above are barriers to getting a job and to holding on to one. With good intentions they find a job, but find that they can't keep it. Without work, they soon find themselves pushed off of welfare.

We should be helping these families. We should be referring them to other programs that can help them recover, offer treatment, counseling, etc. The Republican bill provides only three months of treatment once in two years. Without help these families will be locked into poverty and the children will pay the price of our neglect. Those that cannot be helped should be moved into permanent assistance programs like SSI.

In the long run, if we help them overcome these barriers, they will be able to hold down a job, and support their families as society expects them to.

All we are talking about today is continued eligibility for cash assistance for a welfare family. Current law says the longest they can stay on welfare is 5 years. But please note that 21 States have enacted much lower time limits. Texas for one has a limit of 1 to 3 years, Tennessee is 18 months, Connecticut is 21 months, Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Nevada, North Carolina, Nebraska, Arizona, Florida, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Virginia, Oregon, and South Carolina all have 2-year time limits. Delaware, Ohio, and Utah have a 3-year limit and Georgia is four.

And what about the cash assistance?; 24 states pay a family of three \$141 to \$291 a month. At \$291 a month that's not even \$3,500 a year that a family of three would receive.

Under current law that welfare family is expected to work at least 30 hours a week. At minimum wage the total monthly income would be about \$700 a month.

Often the states will reduce the cash benefit when the single mother finds a job, or drop her entirely.

There are two ways to reduce the welfare rolls: the single mom gets a minimum wage job or fails to find or hold a job and is sanctioned. That is basically how the rolls were so dramatically cut in half in the past 5 years.

Yet the Republican bill complains that the States have not done enough. They haven't kicked the welfare families off fast enough. They complain that of the current case load 57 percent are not working. Consequently their new bill increases the work participation rate to 70 percent in 5 years. This means that the heat will be on, and the States will have to press harder for the welfare mothers to find work or be pushed off of welfare.

The 70 percent work rate is an unconscionable demand upon the States who all have made good faith efforts up to now. This pressure coupled with the increased hours to 40 of

approved activity leaves little room for any mother to nurture and care for her children.

Two weeks ago, in Missouri, a 9-year-old girl died a horrible death in a fire caused by a lit candle. Her mother could not pay her electric bill. Without electricity, she used candles to light her apartment that housed 11 people.

This tragic end of a child's life, because the family was too poor to pay the electric bill is a reminder that we must think of our children as we write laws that purport to benefit them.

Sadly I had prepared four basic amendments to offer for this debate which the Rules Committee refused to allow.

The first would have provided services for single mothers who were victims of domestic violence so that they could comply with the work requirements, and while being treated would not be sanctioned. Reports advise that perhaps as many as 60 percent of the women on welfare have suffered from domestic violence at some point in their lives, and that 30 percent report abuse within the last year. Many live in shelters and are still in danger for their lives.

The second amendment would have prohibited sanctions against mothers who could not work because they could not find child care.

The third amendment would have allowed all education programs as a work activity.

The fourth amendment would have included participation in services and programs to help recipients with barriers to employment as allowable work activity. The barriers are mental and physical illness, substance abuse, literacy and learning disabilities. A GAO report states that 38 percent of the adult welfare recipients have severe physical impairments. Further it reports that 20 percent of the families have a child with a disability, and that 20 percent have a substance abuse problem. Four out of ten mothers report severe clinical depression. Help for all these conditions are prerequisites for successful work experiences.

Until we face the reality of why people apply for welfare, and help them we are not fulfilling our responsibility to provide a safety net for the neediest of this country.

I urge a "no" vote against H.R. 4737.

TRIBUTE TO HONORABLE
KATHLEEN O'FERRALL FRIEDMAN

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 2002

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Honorable Kathleen O'Ferrall Friedman whose legal career and civic works have made life better and safer for all Marylanders.

A 1962 graduate of the College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Judge Friedman received her LLB from the University of Maryland School of Law and was awarded an MSW from the University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work.

She began her legal career in January 1971 as a staff attorney at the Legal Aid Bureau. For the next six years, she specialized in domestic law, becoming the Managing Attorney of the Domestic Law Unit. In private practice from 1977-1985, she specialized in domestic law, and was named in the Seaview/Putnam Book *The Best Lawyers in America*.