

body seem more interested in securing tax breaks for the wealthiest 2 percent than they are in closing the homeownership gap or the creation of affordable housing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in opposing these cuts.

WAR IN IRAQ MAKES U.S. LESS SECURE

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the President last night, I questioned just how much longer he will milk the tragedy of 9/11 to defend his actions in Iraq.

Maybe he does not know yet that the Iraq situation had nothing to do with 9/11, but the people of this Nation absolutely do know; and what we would want from the President and what we wanted last night was a promise to the troops, to their families, and to this country that he is putting together a plan to bring them home.

But, no. He continues to use 9/11 for his excuse for a preemptive war, a war that has made the United States less secure, not more secure.

REAUTHORIZING AND FULLY FUNDING THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, ending violence against women should be a concern not just for the victims; it should be a national priority.

In 1994, Congress moved violence against women from behind closed doors into national policy. The Violence Against Women Act was reauthorized in 2000, and it must be reauthorized and fully funded this year.

The Violence Against Women Act is a comprehensive program that strengthened legal sanctions against stalkers, batterers, and rapists. It established a toll-free national domestic hotline. It funded battered women's shelters, and it provided funding for programs to improve both prosecution and victim services.

Last year, Congress strengthened VAWA by passing the Justice For All Act, which included my legislation with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN). Our legislation gave law enforcement tools to process the backlog of rape kits containing DNA evidence that could convict rapists.

But there is still much, much more that remains to be done. We must pass the reauthorization and fully fund it this year.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE ACT OF 1962 AMENDMENTS

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Energy and Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1282) to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to strike the privatization criteria for INTELSAT separated entities, remove certain restrictions on separated and successor entities to INTELSAT, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 1282

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF OFFICERS, MANAGERS, OR DIRECTORS.

Section 621(5)(D) of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 763(5)(D)) is amended—

- (1) by striking “(I)” in clause (ii);
- (2) by striking “signatories, or (II)” in clause (ii) and all that follows through “mechanism;” and inserting “signatories; and”;
- (3) by striking “organization; and” in clause (iii) and inserting “organization.”; and
- (4) by striking clause (iv).

SEC. 2. CRITERIA FOR INTELSAT SEPARATED ENTITIES.

Subtitle B of title VI of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 763 et seq.) is amended by striking section 623 (47 U.S.C. 763b).

SEC. 3. PRESERVATION OF SPACE SEGMENT CAPACITY OF THE GMDSS.

Section 624 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 763c) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 624. SPACE SEGMENT CAPACITY OF THE GMDSS.

“The United States shall preserve the space segment capacity of the GMDSS. This section is not intended to alter the status that the GMDSS would otherwise have under United States laws and regulations of the International Telecommunication Union with respect to spectrum, orbital locations, or other operational parameters, or to be a barrier to competition for the provision of GMDSS services.”

SEC. 4. SATELLITE SERVICE REPORT.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Federal Communications Commission shall review competitive market conditions with respect to domestic and international satellite communications services and shall include in an annual report an analysis of those conditions. The Commission shall transmit a copy of the report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce.

(b) CONTENT.—The Commission shall include in the report—

- (1) an identification of the number and market share of competitors in domestic and international satellite markets;
- (2) an analysis of whether there is effective competition in the market for domestic and international satellite services; and
- (3) a list of any foreign nations in which legal or regulatory practices restrict access to the market for satellite services in such nation in a manner that undermines competition or favors a particular competitor or set of competitors.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later today.

TANF EXTENSION ACT OF 2005

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3021) to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3021

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “TANF Extension Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2005.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Activities authorized by part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, and by sections 510, 1108(b), and 1925 of such Act, shall continue through September 30, 2005, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2004, notwithstanding section 1902(e)(1)(A) of such Act, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose. Grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority through the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2005 at the level provided for such activities through the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2004.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 403(a)(3)(H)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(3)(H)(ii)) is amended by striking “June 30” and inserting “September 30”.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL RANDOM SAMPLE STUDY OF CHILD WELFARE AND CHILD WELFARE WAIVER AUTHORITY THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2005.

Activities authorized by sections 429A and 1130(a) of the Social Security Act shall continue through September 30, 2005, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2004, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose. Grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority through the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2005 at the level provided for such activities through the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3021, the TANF Extension Act of 2005, as amended. This legislation will extend for 3 additional months certain welfare programs, including the Temporary Assistance For Needy Families and child care programs within the Committee on Ways and Means's jurisdiction, so those programs would continue to operate at their current funding levels through September 30, 2005.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Under the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution, it is necessary to offset the cost of the Transitional Medical Assistance extension, TMA. It is my understanding that the gentleman from California has agreed to extend TMA for an additional 3 months as part of this welfare extension bill. It is my further understanding that the gentleman has agreed to include this provision, with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce, which has jurisdiction over the TMA program, will bear the cost of this and any subsequent extensions.

I yield to the gentleman from California to determine whether or not that is his understanding.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct in his understanding. The Transitional Medical Assistance is an important work support for low-income families making the transition from welfare to work. Therefore, it is important that we are here today to continue this program.

Let me remind the House that the House has extended TMA nine times since the welfare reform law expired in 2002. In the course of these extensions, the Committee on Ways and Means has been charged with more than \$500 million in costs associated with extending the TMA program, which is, as the chairman correctly noted, under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to continue this important program as he has in the past.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to further clarify how this TMA extension and future TMA extensions will be handled by the House.

Is it the gentleman's understanding that the TMA extension and future

TMA extensions will be paid for with offsets under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce that are in excess of the savings required under the budget resolution?

I yield to the distinguished chairman to find out if that is his understanding.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's understanding is correct. This TMA extension and any further extensions will be offset with savings in addition to those required by reconciliation.

I would note that the proper place to address a TMA extension beyond the next 3 months would be in the context of Medicaid reform as part of reconciliation. However, the committee that I chair reserves the right to include these offsets in other legislative vehicles, as necessary.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to thank both of these distinguished chairmen for their cooperation. I would commit, on behalf of the House Committee on the Budget, that when this bill and subsequent extensions of TMA are offset as part of the reconciliation or other legislation, the Committee on Ways and Means will be held harmless for the cost of this and any future extensions of TMA.

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

Mr. Speaker, this will be the 10th extension of these programs since the original authorization of the 1996 welfare reform law expired in 2002. That law produced remarkable results. Work among welfare recipients doubled. The poorest single-mother families reported a 67 percent increase in their real earnings between 1995 and 2002. Single mothers' real wages continued to increase during the 2000–2004 period, despite the 2001 recession and terrorist attacks.

Despite predictions of welfare reform opponents that the 1996 welfare bill would increase poverty, the number of children in poverty fell by more than 1 million. The black and Hispanic child-poverty rates hit record lows. Welfare caseloads fell 60 percent to their lowest levels since 1965. Welfare funds stayed constant, and child care funds grew, even as caseloads plummeted. Taxpayer resources per family on welfare more than doubled from \$7,000 per year to \$16,000 per year today.

In 2002 and 2003, the House passed comprehensive welfare reform legislation that would have extended these programs for a full 5 years. That legislation also included modest adjustments designed to encourage and support more work, higher incomes, stronger families, and less poverty. These House-passed bills offered up to \$4 billion over 5 years and added child care funding to support more work.

Unfortunately, our friends in the Senate did not follow suit, and so we have been forced to come to the floor with repeated short-term extensions.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we continue these programs, and I urge all

Members to support this legislation. But while we mark time, we are missing out on many ways to help even more low-income parents and families leave welfare for work. We must do more to encourage States and local communities to support strong, healthy families.

The subcommittee I chair has, once again, approved legislation that tracks the comprehensive welfare reform bill of the House that the House passed before. I expect in the coming months the full committee on Ways and Means and this House will once again act on comprehensive welfare reform legislation as part of the budget reconciliation process. Regardless of the process, our goals remain the same: to encourage and support more work, less poverty, and stronger families.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this process of continued extensions of welfare programs is finally nearing an end. I look forward to working with our Members to get this done so more families can know the dignity of collecting paychecks instead of welfare checks.

□ 1100

In the meantime, I urge support of the legislation before us that continues these welfare programs in their current form.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, these are going to be the two classic glass-half-empty/glass-half-full speeches because the chairman has told you the good things that have happened, and there are some. But, today, we have two bad choices in front of us. The first is to support this BandAid approach that has temporarily continued the funding for TANF and the child care development block grants for yet another 3 months. The other alternative is to abandon our most vulnerable citizens until the Republican majority accepts its responsibility to chart a new course that provides a helping hand, not a slap on the wrist.

Now, I deplore these kind of crossroads at which we stand. Ten times in the last 3 years we have stood right here, as we do today, the lives and welfare of the disadvantaged hanging in the balance. At a time like this, America should shine. Instead, the Republican majority strains the needs of our most vulnerable citizens to the breaking point.

Ten temporary extensions over 3 years should send the House a clear and unmistakable message. We need to treat America's disadvantaged as first class citizens by charting a new course for the long-term reauthorization of the TANF program.

On this Republican watch, the House has taken up hopelessly divisive bills that have drawn the condemnation of mayors, governors, welfare directors, religious leaders and poverty experts.

Time and again, the Republicans have tried to terminate Federal responsibility by replacing State flexibility with unfunded mandates and changing the focus of welfare reform from real jobs to make-work. Nothing good comes from this approach.

Instead, this wrong path has led to legislative gridlock. Those who suffer most are those who most need our help. The disadvantaged need our compassionate ideas and commitment to promote reforms that will help them leave welfare and actually escape poverty. This goal is particularly important when you consider that an additional 4.3 million Americans have fallen into poverty over the last 3 years for which we have data. In 2003 alone, almost another 800,000 children fell into poverty. Now, that should be a rallying cry, driving us to act.

But, instead, the Republicans use the misfortune of some Americans to suggest that poverty is rising because welfare recipients are not working hard enough. That is just wrong. It is callous and cold-hearted. The problem is not the unwillingness of people on welfare to work. The problem is too many of those leaving welfare are not finding work, or they are finding jobs that do not lift them out of poverty. We could, of course, help by providing more child-care assistance, job training and a higher minimum wage, but the Republican leadership and the President have resisted such reforms. Instead, the Republicans try to sell the same worn-out threadbare suit of clothes again.

It happened again in March when the majority unveiled their new 3-year old idea from the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources. Nothing has happened since. Nothing, leaving many to believe the Republican leadership intends to include the welfare legislation as part of the upcoming budget reconciliation bill rather than considering it as a separate measure. Such a process will make it harder to provide the necessary investments in child care because Republicans know the budget reconciliation process is meant to cut programs, not improve them. And that is just fine by the Republican leadership because they do not believe working families deserve any more help for child care. Like so much from their leadership, the rhetoric does not match the reality.

According to data from their own HHS, Health and Human Services Department, only about a quarter of the children who are eligible for child-care subsidies under State eligibility criteria actually receive assistance. This fraction drops to roughly one out of seven, if you use the Federal eligibility standard for daycare assistance. The data does not lie. We are falling short in helping low-income families meet the challenges of raising a family and at the same time going to work.

President Bush's response to this problem is to make it even worse. His proposed 2006 budget shows the number

of people receiving child assistance will decline, decline by 300,000 over the next 5 years. So the administration is proposing even greater work requirements for welfare recipients at the same time that the President proposes cutting child care. So much for a helping hand.

My friends on the other side of the aisle suggest their bill is modestly more generous on child care than the administration's budget. However, that Republican package, in reality, underfunds child care assistance by \$10.6 billion over the next 5 years. That is their calculation.

Republicans want to outsource Federal responsibility to the States without a dime more to address a \$10 billion deficit. That leads nowhere except forcing States to face deep cuts in child-care assistance for the working poor.

Mr. Speaker, there is a better way. We have proposed legislation that gives the States the flexibility and the funding needed to move welfare recipients into real jobs and out of poverty. It is the right thing to do, and this is the right time to do it. And with that hope, I support this temporary extension of the current law. I will not abandon disadvantaged Americans at the very time they need us most.

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

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

I would like to remind the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) that, during the last several years, we have passed out of this House two bills, both of which have offered as much as \$4 billion more for child care, both of which the gentleman from Washington opposed.

I might also mention that welfare case loads during this period of time of this legislation has fallen by 9 million, from 14 million recipients in 1994 to fewer than 5 million today. Again, the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

I think it is very clear how incredibly successful this program has been, and we need to move forward to make it even more successful.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell you, I am extremely disappointed. In 2002, the TANF law expired. This is the tenth temporary extension. These are missed opportunities. The Democrats believe that we should extend the TANF bill. But we should stop trying to micro-manage from Washington, one size fits all, and we should provide resources necessary for our States to be able to lift American families out of poverty.

Our objective in TANF reauthorization should be to lift families out of poverty, yet the bills that have passed this body that the chairman of the

committee has referred to fails to incorporate lifting families out of poverty as a core requirement of TANF.

We should be providing education and training to the mothers leaving welfare so that they can move up the economic ladder, yet the bills that have passed this body have restricted our States in their ability to provide education and training to the people on welfare.

We should be providing safe and affordable child care so that families can, in fact, move up the economic ladder and accept employment opportunities. Yet the bills that have passed this body have provided inadequate funds for child care. We have provided more mandates, \$11 billion more needed in child care alone, yet the bill that passed this body provides only \$1 billion, an unfunded Federal mandate. We can do better.

If we really want to lift families out of poverty, let us sit down now. Stop stalling. Let us work together, Democrats and Republicans, so that we can have a TANF reauthorization bill that will help American families out of poverty rather than the bills that have passed this body that will step backward.

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

I would like to remind, again, those who speak detrimentally of this legislation that, since their opposition to this, no additional \$4 billion for child care over the next 5 years has been able to have been offered. No assurance for full TANF funding through 2010 has been able to be available, that would be available in this legislation. No assurance of supplemental grants for low benefits in poor States. No assurance. And it goes on and on.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me just point out to the gentleman from California, we have worked together when he was chairman and I was ranking member. I would just urge the gentleman to sit down and try to work out a bill that represents the views of all people of this country and all 435 Members of this distinguished body.

I would point out very clearly that, the last time I checked, the Republicans controlled both the House and the Senate and the White House since 2002, and yet we have been unable to pass a TANF reauthorization bill.

Stop placing blame. Let us sit down and work together. Give us a chance to sit at the table, and you are going to have a much better bill that will help American families escape poverty and will give the resources necessary to the States so that they can get the job done and will provide safe and affordable daycare, child care for the families that need it.

In my own State of Maryland, the only way you can get child care is to go on welfare. That is the wrong message. Let us get it done right.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Instead of making the TANF law better, instead of giving welfare recipients the tools needed to move from welfare to self-sufficiency, we are once again extending a bill that has continuously moved people from welfare into permanent poverty.

Why are we not making education or training count as a work activity for welfare recipients so that individuals can receive the skills they need for jobs that actually pay a livable wage, jobs that pay above the poverty level?

Why are we not providing quality available child care that includes care for infants and for weekend and evening workers to help welfare parents keep their jobs and become self-sufficient, because if parents do not have a safe convenient place to leave their children, they cannot go to work? And if they do, they can really concentrate on their job. Believe me, I know because, over 35 years ago, I was a single mother with three small children. My children were 1, 3 and 5 years old, and their father financially abandoned us. Even though I was working full-time, I needed welfare to keep our lives together. But it was not until my mother moved to our town and I could have her take care of the children during the day that I could pay 100 percent attention to the work that I was doing. As soon as she moved into town, I was promoted to management in my company because I did not have one ear and eye home and one at the job. And then when I got home, I was 100 percent there for my children. But when I was at work, I was 100 percent at work.

So I was promoted to management, and later, I worked my way off welfare and off poverty. Eventually, I started my own business, and now I am a seven-term Member of the House of Representatives. Let me tell you, I am not sure any of that could have happened without the help and the leg up that I received from the welfare system. And believe me, I have paid back into the system many, many times over, and so have most of the women who have been given a chance for a higher education, who have been given the support of a good child care system to help them stay in the work force so that they can achieve.

So why are we wasting our time extending something that has moved welfare recipients, yes, out of welfare, but yes, into poverty with an idea they may never be able to move out of poverty because they have not gotten the assistance that they need? They will pay back to the system many times over, I promise you.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

□ 1115

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as mentioned, this would be the 10th extension. And everyone has the right to ask, why another extension, instead of our buckling down and being able to pass a welfare reform bill.

There is an effort, I think, to blame the Senate. I do not think we forget who controls the Senate. But let us forget about that. Because I think the main problem is the approach of the House majority, and when it comes to this as has been true of so many other programs, it is their way or no way. And so far when it comes to further work on welfare reform, it has been no way.

Now, that may be better, and I think it is, than what they have proposed here; but still we should be able to, as I said, buckle down and tackle this issue. We have not done so.

There has been zero effort by the Republican majority in this House to sit down with Democrats and see where we go from here. Zero.

There has been success under welfare reform as we passed some years ago. There have been some successes. The rolls have been cut in half and the majority of those who are leaving welfare have worked since they left. And two-thirds now of the people receiving welfare or TANF are engaged in work. But the problem is that so many of them are not moving up the economic ladder.

These are the government figures: 60 to 70 percent of those who have moved from welfare to work, 60 to 70 percent are essentially earning at the poverty level or worse. In contrast, those who leave welfare and move into higher starting wages were 40 percent more likely to be working 2 years later, and those receiving child care assistance, the same way.

So some years ago we worked, President Clinton proposed it, there was passage by the House and Senate. He vetoed it twice because there was inadequate child care, inadequate health care. The Congress, with a number of us working on it, paid attention to those and it passed on a bipartisan basis. But there is no effort to move to another stage of welfare reform, and that is to make sure that it is structured so that people can move off welfare into jobs that do not lead them into poverty.

Instead, the Republican majority here has proposed not moving people off welfare into work that takes them out of poverty, but emphasizing or talking only really about those who are on welfare and moving into work regardless of the consequences. And we in the minority here have proposed bills that would continue State flexibility which would be taken away by the majority here and would reward States if they moved people off welfare into good-paying jobs. They would take

care of the technical problems with health care, transitional Medicaid and also would restore full funding to the Social Services block grant.

So in a word, I say to the chairman of the subcommittee, instead of simply extending this bill because you are unwilling to sit down on a bipartisan basis and work on further important welfare reform, I urge you to instead of just kind of stonewalling, sit down with us and see if we cannot do still better.

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

Mr. Speaker, it really speaks volumes that there is no one who wants to come out here and talk about what happens to ordinary people here in this country.

The last election was one in which people said the issue was whether people had values or not. The values that the Democrats have stood for for 70 years, really since the Depression, were a minimum income for everyone.

Now, let us start with the minimum wage. We have not raised the minimum wage in this House since 1997. We raised our own salary yesterday 2 percent or whatever it was. I do not know. But the people at the bottom have not had an increase since 1997.

We take a young woman who has got a kid and got out of high school and did not graduate, and we send her out and say, go get a job, go get a job; and she gets a job at minimum wage which amounts to about 50 percent of the poverty level. That is not a value that I support.

Housing is another value that we should be talking about. These people are struggling to find a place to live in the city close to their job. In Seattle you cannot find very many places inside the city. As we gentrify the centers of the city, the people have to move out farther and farther and farther to the point where the bus lines require a couple of hours to get into the city to work at a minimum-wage job.

Health care, another value. There should not have to be a colloquy over here about whether we are going to provide health care for these people. We know that we need a workforce that is healthy. We need people going to work who are healthy, and we need children who are healthy who can go to school and learn and become part of an educated workforce. To fail these children in their earliest years is to present ourselves with a problem. Maybe not us, because we will not be here when the kids who are on welfare today become a problem for the Congress, but 20 years from now people are going to say, why did we not have health care?

The reason we wound up with a school lunch program in this country was because when they went to drafting people in the Second World War, they had so many recruits that had nutrition-related diseases that they had

to reject them. And so, Mr. Truman, it was not some big-hearted thing, he started the school lunch program so that we would have healthy kids. And yet we are still questioning whether these youngsters, we are putting the pressure on the States to make cuts in welfare in every single jurisdiction.

The chorus of hollering is going to start when these bills start passing and State governments have to deal with what we have put out there as an insurmountable problem for them, a mandate from us that they have to find the money for.

Finally, education of kids. That is a value. You want kids to have an education. You want parents to have an education. Kids follow the model of their own parents. If we do not help these people on welfare get an education, if we make it an insurmountable task, the kids do not see their own mother or own father get an education.

My belief is we can do better than this, and I hope when we pass a permanent bill we will.

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

Mr. Speaker, in 2002 and 2003 this House passed long-term reauthorization legislation to encourage more work among welfare recipients and to provide more resources for States to assist low-income families. And I have heard several on the other side, my good friend from Washington, talk about values, talk about Democrat values, Republican values. He spoke about the amount of funding.

Let me just mention that under the Democrat values of the programs that we had twice as many who were on welfare than were on welfare today because caseloads were cut in half during our current legislation while Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, TANF, funds were fixed and child care funds grew, Federal funds per TANF families more than doubled. As a matter of fact, in 1996 the average family under the old Democrat plan had \$6,934 average approximate per family. In 2004 these same families had \$16,185 because the program was block granted, and it was an equal amount of funding coming in and it was not reduced.

This, Mr. Speaker, would be the 10th extension of these programs since 2002. However, I believe this process of continued extensions of welfare programs is finally nearing an end. I expect that the House will soon act on and pass comprehensive welfare reform legislation as part of the budget reconciliation process. But until that happens, it is important that we continue these programs and we do need to pass this bill today. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3021, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3021.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. 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 H.R. 3058 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER AMENDED VERSION OF H.R. 3058, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 3058, pursuant to House Resolution 342, the amendment that I have placed at the desk be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole and considered as the original text for purpose of further amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to H.R. 3058 offered by Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

Strike the dollar amount on page 176, line 26, and insert in lieu thereof "\$283,975,000".

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

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 342 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3058.

□ 1129

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3058) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. McHUGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House the Fiscal Year 2006 Transportation, Treasury, HUD appropriations bill which was passed out of committee via voice vote last week.

Before getting into the specifics of the bill, I want to commend the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for their tireless work to finish these bills by the end of this week.

Here we are on June 29 marking up the final of the 11 spending bills. I am sure that the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) has been saving best for last.

Mr. Chairman, I must acknowledge the role that my ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), played in assembling this bill. I consider him a partner in creating the product before you because his input has been invaluable. We have found common ground more often than not, and what few differences remain are the result of honest disagreement.

□ 1130

He and I have had several conversations about almost every facet of this bill. The staff has met repeatedly, and information has been shared in a timely manner. I believe the bill is stronger because of the input the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) has provided.

I also want to mention, of course, the staff which has contributed heavily and in mighty ways, extraordinary ways, to the completion of this bill. My clerk, Dena Baron, Cheryl Tucker, David Gibbons, David Napoliello, Steve Crane, Tammy Hughes, Kristen Jones; and on the minority side, Mike Malone, the clerk, and Michelle Burkett. They have done tremendous work.

As my colleagues know, this is the committee's first year with its current jurisdiction, and I believe the product before us is worthy of this body's