

it just is not for us to ask people, are you a citizen or not?

□ 1615

We should not. When deciding whether to help and feed our children, we should apply the same law, not just when we need it for taxes, but at the same time, when applying the law to feed our children.

We need the President to pick up the phone and say, get it done. We need his leadership now. This is about fairness; this is about our children.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Department Operations Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have been charged with the responsibility for attempting to work out this very difficult issue, and I commend the gentleman for his interest in the issue and for his efforts on behalf of people who are in need. However, I must strongly oppose the motion to accept the Senate language here, because to do so would be irresponsible.

The fact of the matter is that while there are certainly people here who are in need of assistance, it is definitely not the case that everybody that the Senate language would cover would fit into that category, and it is also not the case that the people that would be covered are as described by the gentleman.

For example, he refers to tax-paying legal residents. Well, it is not a requirement under the Senate language that the individual have ever paid a penny in taxes in order to receive these benefits. It only requires that they have been in this country as a lawful, permanent resident for 5 years. The fact of the matter is that some people who have been here for 5 years and may have been taxpaying, contributing members of our society and who, as a result of some misfortune, have fallen on hard times and need to receive food stamps, a good case could be made, as has been made by the President of the United States, that some individuals who have been here 5 years should receive them.

But the problem with the Senate language is that it has no definition of that. It does not say you have to have been a taxpayer; it does not say that you had to have been employed for a certain period of time.

Many people are not aware, but the fact of the matter is that a number of noncitizens receive food stamps right now. Children, the disabled, refugees, permanent residents who have been in the United States for more than 10 years and have 40 quarters of work history are just some of the categories for which people can receive these benefits right now.

The President has said that he would like to see that expanded. However, in making that expansion, we have to do it responsibly. We cannot just open the door and not say that there is no standard to be met, no criteria, such as having been a taxpayer, having had a work history, particularly for people who are able-bodied and are between the ages of 18 and 60, for example. Or we need to look at how long this should be allowed to be provided, because, for example, somebody who has been a lawful, permanent resident of the United States after they have been here for 5 years in that status are eligible to apply for United States citizenship; and when they do so, they then can receive the same benefits as any other American citizen.

There is a problem with that, however. The Immigration Service does not work very well. Sometimes it takes a long time for an individual who has qualified, met this 5-year criteria, that everybody has specified, the Republican conferees, the Democratic conferees, the President, have all talked about 5 years of lawful residence. But once you get to that point and you wanted to apply for citizenship to be treated exactly the same as any other American citizen, you cannot always get that done quickly. So we put forward a proposal that said that if you were to reach that point, that you would be entitled to 2 years of food stamps if you had a work history to support that.

The fact of the matter is that in 2 years' time, the vast majority of people who apply for citizenship would be processed and become citizens. We do not require you to become a citizen. If you do not wish to do so, then you had the opportunity to receive those benefits for 2 years anyway.

The point is that all of these things are in negotiation between the House conferees, the Senate conferees, and the White House to do the responsible thing, to do what recognizes the needs where they exist and provide them as the offer that the House conferees made, which included something the Senate conferees did not include in their most recent offer to us, which is for children, for disabled individuals, and for refugees to receive food stamps. Those are certainly areas that should be covered. But it should not be a blanket coverage where anybody gets it whether they have ever contributed anything or whether they have simply come to this country, stayed here for a period of time, and now want to receive government assistance.

So I would urge my colleagues to restrain themselves from saying that just because the Senate has put something out there that we should naturally rush to it. No, we should discuss this with the Senate, we should discuss this with the White House, we should work out a responsible plan, and that is what we are in the process of doing, and this motion to instruct the conferees, which is nonbinding, but none-

theless is an attempt to, I think, make a political statement is not helpful to that process; and I would urge my colleagues to defeat it.

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

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time. I commend him for his leadership and the leadership of the Hispanic Caucus in this conference in bringing up this important motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, as a new cochair of the Democratic Coalition, I am pleased to rise today in strong support of the Baca motion. This motion works to ensure that those who are here legally in the United States receive basic food stamp benefits. After the implementation of the 1996 welfare reform legislation, most legal immigrants lost their access to all welfare benefits, including food stamps. Although legal immigrants represent only about 6 percent of those on public aid, they took the brunt of the cuts made by the welfare law.

Many of those who lost benefits were people who could not support themselves. They were too disabled, too old, or too frail to work. Further, research has shown that since this legislation was passed, many immigrant children have experienced increased difficulty in obtaining the resources to purchase nutritionally-adequate food. The motion before the House today would restore food stamp benefits to legal immigrants.

Support for restoring this benefit crosses ideological and partisan lines. A report issued by the bipartisan U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform, subsequent to the welfare law's enactment, recommended against denying benefits to legal immigrants solely because they were noncitizens. In fact, President Bush's 2003 budget includes a proposal to restore food stamps to legal immigrants who have lived in the United States for 5 years; but now, that is being blocked by the Republican majority in Congress during this conference meeting.

As a New Democrat, I believe it is essential to support our legal immigrants. Our welfare reform law broke the long-standing agreement between future citizens and their adopted homeland. Legal immigrants share the same responsibility as citizens. They pay taxes; they serve in the military. Many, if not all, are working hard to become full-fledged citizens. The United States has always embraced legal immigrants who enrich our culture and work hard to make our Nation stronger; but just like anyone else, immigrants can sometimes fall on hard times. We now have an opportunity to do the right thing and reestablish the contract between legal immigrants and American society. I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has accurately stated that the President has put forward a proposal providing food stamps for noncitizens beyond those who already have them now. The gentleman from California, in his earlier remarks, said that the proposal that he is asking us to adopt here was the proposal that the President supported, and that is not the case. He has put forward a different proposal.

At another point in his remarks he also made reference to the fact that this would be at no cost to the taxpayers. I did not follow that at all. This is a \$2.485 billion cost to the taxpayers of this country, and I think people need to be aware of that.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in 1996 we had much of a similar debate on an issue of this nature. We debated the whole concept of welfare and determined that some change had to be undertaken. After several attempts by this body, by this Congress, to pass legislation, in fact, they did; the previous President had vetoed it a couple of times and eventually he got on board with it and decided that, in fact, it was a good thing. It has proven to be a very good thing. It has proven to be even more successful than many of the folks who had originally supported it could hope for.

The numbers of people, as we all know, on welfare have gone down dramatically. Percentages in some States have gone down so dramatically that it boggles the imagination. Somewhere around 70 and 80 percent the caseload has been reduced subsequent to the 1996 act. A lot of people say it has everything to do with the economy being better. But historically we can look at it and find out that over the past century, as a matter of fact, and at least for the past 6 years when we have had a much more intensive welfare program in the United States operating, that the number of people on welfare continued to go up. Regardless of the economic conditions in the country, whether we were in a recession or whether we were in good times, it did not matter; the number of people went up, the number of people on welfare went up. So we cannot draw a conclusion to this phenomenon based upon simply a good economy.

Now, we now know that that plan worked and the plan was to get people off of welfare. It was to do everything we could to get people off of welfare. That is a good idea. We undertook it, and it worked. Here we have a proposal to reverse that, to put more people back on welfare; and frankly, I would be opposing it if it was for a non-immigrant family, a native American family or anybody else. It is not a good idea basically; it is not a good idea to

expand the opportunities and expand the number of people eligible for food stamps or welfare in this country.

The fact is that the proposal from the Senate side goes much farther than even the expressed intent as described earlier on. One part of it actually eliminates a part of the law, or at least a concept that has been in practice in the United States for well over 100 years, and that is making someone responsible. If someone is applying for immigration into the United States, a document has to be filled out. This is it. It is an affidavit of the U.S. Department of Justice Immigration and Naturalization Service. The fourth item on this is, and this is called, by the way, an affidavit of support. It says that "This affidavit is made by me for the purpose of assuring the United States Government that the person or persons named in item 3," the person coming into the country, "would not become a public charge in the United States." Number 5, that "I am willing to be able to receive, maintain and support the persons named in item 3. I am willing to deposit a bond, if necessary, to guarantee such persons will not become a public charge to the United States."

Now, there is again a reason for this to be in the law, and a part of the law, by the way, that has been there for well over 100 years. And of course it is to not make the welfare system in any way, shape or form a magnet for immigration. I think everybody would agree that that should not happen.

Now, it is true that even under the present change that is being proposed, someone would still had to have been here 5 years; but they actually wipe out this part of the law of the Senate amendment. It says for this purpose, for food stamps for this purpose, this affidavit would not be required.

Now, I am not going to suggest here that we have been very judicious in our approach of enforcing this particular provision of the law. I do not know the last person that was actually forced to do it.

□ 1630

It is nonetheless a good idea. I have a letter from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) to the Attorney General asking him essentially why there has not been that kind of enforcement, and what we were going to do in order to try and begin the process of enforcing this particular provision. I hope, of course, that we will.

But we should certainly not eliminate it. We should not, and whether or not we forcefully employ it is one thing, but to actually strike it out of the law and say that we would not hold anybody responsible, if one comes here with a sponsorship, no one would be responsible for the financial well-being of the person coming into the country, as, of course, has been the case, at least in the law if not in practice; de jure, if not de facto, it is irresponsible of us to move ahead to accept the Senate

amendments. It is especially irresponsible to abolish this part of the law.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the Congressional Hispanic Caucus chair.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I was sitting there listening to my colleague speaking on the other side of the aisle, talking about the Welfare Reform Act that has proven to be a good thing.

I would ask him, since when is hunger a good thing? Since when is the fact that there are children going to bed hungry and going to school hungry a good thing for this country? It goes contrary to everything that we stand for.

In regard to the affidavit of support, the answer to that is that if we file an affidavit for support and someone is intending to go on welfare, then the immigrant visa will not be issued. I know about that because I spent 26½ years working in the immigration service.

But today, Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Baca motion that instructs conferees on the Farm Security Act. The House has passed the Farm Security Act without any protection in the nutrition title for vulnerable populations, and any farm bill reauthorization would be incomplete without a well-founded nutrition title that includes a clean and simple restoration of the food stamp eligibility for legal residents; again, legal residents.

I am pleased that we have united in a very bipartisan manner in an effort to restore food stamp benefits to legal residents. I believe that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as a whole are not committed to continuing an anti-immigrant, anti-Latino, anti-family pro-hunger campaign that we have come to equate with some of those on the other side of the aisle.

However, regrettably, the House Republican conferees have been relentless in their efforts to undermine a clean and simple restoration of food stamp benefits. It is unconscionable and regrettable that some Members in this House would use this issue and the issue of hunger that is faced by the most vulnerable of our population as a political ploy and a political tool. There is no compassion in withholding food from families and from children.

I welcome the administration's proposal to extend eligibility to legal residents who have lived in the United States for 5 years. The proposal is simple and straightforward, and every Member in this House ought to support it. I agree with the Baca amendment, and I hope my colleagues vote to support it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman, who has absolutely misrepresented the position of the House conferees, the Republican conferees, on the farm bill.

The gentleman asks how welfare reform is good if children are going hungry. The fact of the matter is, the proposal that we put forward in the conference on the farm bill provides food stamp benefits for children from day one, from the first day they enter the country. The proposal that the Senate had put forward made them wait 5 years. That is a long time to be hungry, 5 years, before they qualified for food stamps.

So to say that this is something that the House Republicans are trying to drive a wedge through is absolutely wrong, absolutely wrong, and it is the kind of partisan statement that does not promote working out a serious and complicated problem. But we have provided for children, the disabled, and refugees from the day they arrive in this country.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support the gentleman's amendment for the House. I serve as a ranking member of the committee on which the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) serves as a chair.

There is a fundamental disagreement over this issue. The issue is, indeed, to restore to legal residents or legal immigrants the right to food stamps. In 1996, we denied that. We took them off, for whatever reason, and perhaps, as one of our speakers have said, it was to reduce the incidence of welfare. We have re-examined that on many issues. We re-examined that on children, on senior citizens, and found it unacceptable and inconsistent with our moral values and the values of America.

Now, the Senate bill has certainly a more generous provision than the President's, but we must say, the President went a great step, and I support what the President has done. He said that legal residents who have been here 5 years indeed should have the right, the full right to be restored for food stamps. It also, in the Senate bill, the Senate bill said it would be only 4 years, so there is some room between what the President said and the Senate said.

But the core of this amendment is to say that every right should be given to legal residents. They serve us well in our employment. We do not complain about that. They serve us well in our military. We do not complain about that. It would seem inconsistent with our own stated views that we would not have consistency through that.

We indeed should support this amendment. I think it is very basic. In particular, the one that the President has offered is very basic: In 5 years you are legal and you have the right. It does not say that you would try to make differentials between ages of children. It does not try to make it more complex. Becoming a citizen is

complex enough. We should not make having the right to food tied to citizenship. It is unacceptable to our moral values.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond to my good friend and colleague from the committee.

The fact of the matter is, the President's proposal is simple, but it leaves out children who have been here less than 5 years. They do not receive anything under that proposal. We are trying, in cooperation with the White House, and we very much respect the President's efforts in this area to work that out with the President and with the Senate conferees and the House Democratic conferees. But the fact of the matter is that it is not so simple as to say, you do it for 5 years and that is it.

Now, the other thing that is critically important to recognize here is that the proposal that the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) is asking the conference to support, the Senate proposal, does not impose any standard whatsoever on an able-bodied working adult, whether or not they have children. If they have no children, they are between the ages of 18 and 60, they have absolutely no contribution. They do not have to have worked a day since they have entered the United States. As long as they have been a permanent, lawful resident of this country for 5 years, they are able to receive food stamps. Even if they have been in the country unlawfully, they are able to get food stamps.

There is absolutely no basis for giving food stamps to people who have made no contribution to the society. So all we are asking is, impose some guidelines and we can work this out.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I was about to ask the gentleman if he is suggesting that he would be willing to restate it, all the legal immigrants, plus your provision, if they had some standard? Is that a 5-year standard, a 4-year standard?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I would tell the gentlewoman, we offered a standard. The Senate did not accept that. We have been continuing to negotiate with the Senate, with the White House, on what that standard would be. Yes, we have been talking about how long an individual has to have been working, if they are an able-bodied individual.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Would the gentleman put a time limit on what a legal immigrant would have?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Absolutely. We put a time limit on it, as well.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the motion to instruct conferees of the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) to include Senate

provisions on restoring the food stamp benefits for legal immigrants.

Food stamps are a critical part of the safety net, and they are woven into helping individuals and families in time of need. This should hold true for immigrants who are legal immigrants and play by the rules and pay taxes. We are not asking for special treatment, we are asking that they be treated the same. To do otherwise would be discriminatory.

We are simply asking that legal immigrants, and we are not talking about illegals, we are talking about legal immigrants, be treated in a fair manner. Despite the calls by President Bush to provide legal, permanent residents access to Federal nutrition programs, House Republicans, conferees on the farm bill, have refused to budge.

I cannot understand the lingering biases against these immigrants. The President would allow legal permanent residents who have been in this country for 5 years to be able to get access. Why would not the conferees do that? We are talking about individuals that might be disabled, we are talking about people that might have lost their jobs, we are talking about possible children that are in need.

In too many cases, immigrant children suffer from hunger right here in our own back yards. Their parents work hard, they pay their taxes, and they play by the rules, but they are in need and require assistance. Nutrition is just the first step to a host of health and social problems.

Let us not play any more games with immigrant children. Let us treat them as we would treat anyone else. When we ask them to join us and fight in our wars, in fact, I want to share with the Members that we have over 62,000 immigrants serving in our military right now. Twenty percent of the Medal of Honor recipients are immigrants. In addition to that, of those, 19,928 are permanent residents that are still not citizens but serving our country. By the way, as we do not pay them enough, a lot of those military people qualify for food stamps, but not these particular ones.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has it exactly backwards. The proposal that we have put forward provides food stamps for children, the disabled, and refugees. The proposal that the gentleman refers to, section 452, only refers to citizens who have been in the country for more than 5 years. So if you are a child who has been here less than 5 years, you are not covered by the proposal of the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

This legislation, or this proposal, I suppose, and the opposition to this motion has been characterized as anti-

Latino and anti-family. Well, in a way I would suggest that it is an insult to suggest to anyone that in fact if you are doing something here to reform welfare, that the only people who would benefit by overexposure to welfare, give out more welfare, are Latinos. That, of course, I think is an insult to Latinos.

In fact, I believe everything we do to try to stop the expansion of welfare, especially, in this case, food stamps, we are doing as a pro-family activity. I will tell the Members why I believe that.

The welfare law, the reform law of 1996 to which I referred earlier, replaced AFDC with a brand new program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, often referred to around here as TANF. This reform has been widely acknowledged, once again I say, widely acknowledged by both opponents of it originally and its supporters as a tremendous success leading to a dramatic drop in dependence and child poverty.

Hear that: The TANF is an improvement, a reform of the system; something that had work requirements ingrained in it, something that had a number of other activities that were required before a recipient could get help. That improvement had a dramatic drop in dependence, a dramatic drop in child poverty, increases in employment, and it slowed down the growth of out-of-wedlock childbearing.

Critics of the original program said it would throw millions of children into poverty, and in fact, the opposite has occurred. Poverty rates of black children and children in single-parent families are now at the lowest point in our Nation's history. TANF requires people to work as a condition of receiving aid.

Food stamps continue to provide a long-term one-way handout. Work requirements are virtually nonexistent, and they are nonexistent in the proposal put forward by the Senate, the one this motion is designed to have our conferees accept.

So which of us is in fact here pro-family, which of us is in fact pro-Latino, if they continually reference that as part of this debate? Is it those who would suggest that welfare, especially the handout that does not have any work requirement tied to it, is not the best thing that we can do to the people of this country?

By all accounts, by empirical evidence, it is no longer theory, we now have 6 years of evidence to show that work requirements and a different kind of philosophy with regard to welfare is better. It does reduce poverty rates. It does do better things for families.

□ 1645

So I certainly take it as a personal affront when someone suggests that I would promote something that is anti-family, anti-Latino or any of the other anti-arguments that were thrown against it. I suggest to my colleagues that it is exactly the opposite.

Creating another system of welfare without the kind of requirements that

TANF has intrinsically brought to bear in this discussion is anti-family. That is what we can do to screw up families; to increase poverty is to expand this program of food stamps. My opposition to this plan is not designed to be anti-family. It is just the opposite.

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, what an interesting debate to talk about welfare when I know we are really trying to talk about hunger and poverty and children and the fact that legal immigrant children should not be treated differently just because maybe they speak a different language. Maybe they have parents from another country. Maybe they even have parents who are serving this country in the military. Some of those very parents represent children in my district. They are serving us right now proudly in Afghanistan and my colleagues are telling them that they cannot have food on the table, that they are not going to get a meal even though their dad or mom is probably out there serving our country on a 24-hour watch.

That is what we are talking about. The face of these children is not someone who just came over the border, and let me further say that some of these immigrant families, a majority happen to be children. They are not all on welfare. Many of them just lost their jobs. Believe it or not, there is a recession that is going on; and in our districts where unemployment is up to 9 and 10 percent, there are people who are very hungry.

They are not looking necessarily for a free handout. They are going to have to be here for 4 years and work. They are going to have to be here to prove themselves worthy of this kind of assistance that our great country should make available.

I think immigrants come to this country because they know there is a better life here for them; but most come with the thought that they are going to be working hard, and we should justly support this motion to instruct the conferees to reinstate those benefits and allow for children as well as seniors and as well as families, working families who are in this situation now, where recession is hitting them hard, they do not have enough food to provide three meals a day.

Some are lucky enough at school, our children, that they get maybe a snack there; and my colleagues are telling them that they cannot have the opportunity to have a full stomach for tonight. I think that is a bad message to send.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would say to the gentlewoman that I agree with a couple of the points she made, but the problem is she has not read the section that the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) has cited of the Senate bill that he wants us to support because that section provides

nothing for children who have been here for less than 5 years.

The proposal that we put forward covers children, refugees and disabled individuals who have been here less than that time, but she also said something else that is very important.

She said people would have to have been here and to have worked in order to receive these benefits, but the proposal that the gentleman from California asks us to support has absolutely no work-history requirement in it whatsoever, whereas the proposal we have put forward has a work-history requirement.

That is what we are asking for. Do not do this blindly. Let us help the people who truly need the help, but let us not give a blank check to people who have not contributed to our society.

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). The gentleman has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is great to be on the floor with a distinguished colleague like the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), and I thank him so very much for his leadership on this issue along with my colleagues.

It is equally interesting to be on the floor with my distinguished colleague from the Committee on the Judiciary, and let me frame the argument that I believe has limited merit. I do not even know why we are here arguing a point that is obvious.

It is interesting, when we were looking and debating the H-1B visas, giving benefit to individuals who would come in and give businesses opportunities for enhanced talent from other countries, we had no opposition from the other side. In fact, it was a midnight train that they passed the H-1B visas because those individuals were of a certain economic level, and no one had any anti-immigrant conversation at that time. In fact, they were rolling across those of who were talking about jobs and the opportunity for Americans to be trained in high technology.

Interestingly enough, when we talk about feeding people and making sure that families have the opportunity to apply, that is the distinction here. These are not handouts. The provisions that the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) is supporting is simply saying that people have an opportunity to, as a legal resident, to apply if they are in need. That is a legal resident who has worked. That is a legal resident who has children. That is a legal resident who is disabled. It is a legal resident who is fighting in the United States military right now, putting

themselves on the line and offering themselves so that we might live free.

When it is good for the goose, and high profile, expensive businesses, roll over the folks over here on the other side of the aisle. Vote on it when we are in airplanes, gone in the dark of night or in the late of day; but when it comes to dealing with people who are in need and they are making a point, suggesting that we are throwing food stamps all over the world, we are not. It is an application process, based upon a criteria of need; and if someone does not need it, they will not get it.

This is a sham and a shame. I think we should support the gentleman from California's (Mr. BACA) motion to instruct, and we have got to realize that legal residents are serving this country and fighting for Americans and deserve fairness and equality.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I hope that the debate is not as confusing to folks who are watching this as to those of us who are sitting here and listening.

I want to first commend the gentleman from Virginia for his effort to try to deal with this issue. I do not believe he goes far enough, but I do want to recognize that my friend and colleague from Virginia has made some efforts; and he has always, I know, in committee made efforts to try to be reasonable, and quite honestly I believe is someone who has his heart in the right place. So I want to make sure I mention that.

The issue for many of us is that the proposal that I believe the gentleman from Virginia is bringing up that conferees from the Republican side of the aisle brought to the conference for discussion while it did do a good job when it came to children, it did not do a good job for the parents of those children; and as a result, many of the conferees on the Democratic side had to oppose the proposal by the gentleman.

If the gentleman would be willing to put forth his proposal with regard to his children and the disabled and with refugees and then we work out the disagreement with regard to adults, I think we could go somewhere because I think all of us want to take care of kids. None of us want to see a child go to school malnourished, because we know from our own experience, forget about the research. From our own experience as parents, what happens if a child goes to school hungry?

So we can get somewhere, and I believe there is a fix here; but I would hope that we would not undermine the ability to help families who are working. We are not talking about families on welfare, families who are working to make sure they sustain their families at the basic level.

We are not talking about giving these folks a chance to go buy the lollipops and the Popsicle and all the

extra stuff. We are talking about basic food stuffs. Remember that the people we are talking about are for the most part working American families that have not yet become citizens, but have been here for quite some time; and the study shows most of them work longer hours than do most native-born Americans.

Unfortunately, because they work in jobs for the most part that pay \$7.50 an hour or less, about 42 percent of those work in those kind of jobs, they have a hard time. They are working. They do not get benefits. They have no health care. They are the people that are mowing our lawns, caring for our seniors, for our grandparents. They are the people who are caring for our kids; and because those are professions, those are occupations which we have not yet in this country come to recognize as valuable, believe it or not, caring for our kids, the people who care for our kids we pay them less than \$7.50 an hour, they suffer especially during recessions.

All we are saying, let us not do it to folks who are trying to do it the right way, not by applying for welfare: working, working long hours, working two jobs. Let us help them make sure that their kids are fed decently. Let us make sure we do not make them have to miss a rent payment to feed their kids, and we could do that without causing others to suffer.

I believe this is something we can work out. We should support this motion to recommit by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) for his kind words, and we are trying to work this out. I would say to him, however, that this motion to instruct conferees is not well geared toward accomplishing that because it only deals with the section of the Senate bill that covers the 5 years and above. It does not take care of children, refugees, and disabled individuals who have been here a shorter period of time; and so that, I think, is why this is counterproductive.

The President has also shown considerable leadership on this issue. He would like to provide assistance for noncitizens who have been here for 5 years or more as lawful, permanent residents of the United States; but the fact of the matter is that when we do that we have got to have some guidelines. We have got to have some standards of what kind of work history they need to have shown before they get it and how long these benefits are going to be available to them.

That is all we ask is to work that out, but supporting this motion to instruct the conferees moves us in the opposite direction, does not move us toward that.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority whip.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr.

BACA) for yielding me the time and for his leadership on this very, very important issue to this Congress and to this country.

Mr. Speaker, every day our country is blessed by the coming to our great country of many, many immigrants. We are constantly, as a society, reinvigorated by their courage, by their determination, by their family values, by their commitment to community and to a brighter future in America.

Every day from the day they arrive and throughout the contributions they make to our country it is a blessing to us. Indeed, I think just about every person in this House and in this room certainly at this time is a product of those aspirations and dreams.

Then it is sad to see how those immigrants to our country before they become citizens, but while they are legal immigrants, are not valued by our country. Many of them work, and I have good news for our colleague. The gentleman from California's (Mr. BACA) motion to instruct does allow children to be eligible for food stamps regardless of when they enter the country.

So the concern that the gentleman raised that the gentleman from California's (Mr. BACA) motion does not address children and their needs is incorrect, and I know that that will be good news to him; and his amendment and his motion to instruct does address work and does have a worker requirement in it, and it does allow refugees to be eligible for food stamps without a time limit. So the concerns that he raised, saying that his motion did not address it, I am happy to inform my colleague that he does because he is asking us to agree to the Senate language.

This is really unfortunate because it is the third incident in less than 2 months where the Republicans have brought to the floor amendments or motions which are unfriendly to newcomers to our country. We saw this first during the campaign finance reform bill where one Republican Member even referred to legal permanent residents in the United States who were not citizens as potential enemies of the State.

We saw it in the debate on 245(i), which is a very important correction in our immigration bill where we only won that vote by one vote, and some Republicans did vote for it, but many voted against it and voted with the Republicans who wanted to squelch that important initiative to the immigrant community.

What we are talking about today is really about fairness, fairness to our newcomers as our ancestors had anticipated and hoped for fairness when they came here.

□ 1700

We talk about family values. Nowhere are those family values stronger than the immigrant community. We talk about living the American dream and aspiring for a better life. Those

people bring courage to our country. They are a constant source of invigoration to our society, and I hope that my colleagues will support the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA). A family of four with two wage earners making the minimum wage are still eligible for Food Stamps because the minimum wage is so low.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this motion which I support. I would just suggest that there are two things that are pretty much universal in our country that ought to support this motion. One thing that is universal is the presence of hunger in all parts of the country. The reason that I have come to the floor to share the story that I represent, in a sense, a very upscale area. There are a lot of software millionaires in my district. I represent Microsoft Corporation. But even at the height of the economic boom in the year 2000, the food banks in my area of Washington were experiencing an increase of people coming into the food bank from anywhere from 12 to 50 percent depending on what time of the year.

I think that story is an untold story across America. Even in the midst of great prosperity, we have had individuals, because we have a wage structure in this country that does not sufficiently honor work for a lot of folks, that they are still hungry.

The second thing that I think is universal in this country, or ought to be, is respect for everyone that works at every wage level. I represent a lot of people who work in software countries, many of whom are legal immigrants, who are fairly well compensated, and their work is absolutely fundamental to the American economy. But I hope Members will agree with me that people who are working in our nursing homes caring for our parents, the people who are cooking our food in our restaurants, the people who are working in the hospitals helping clean the ER rooms after surgery of our relatives, those people deserve the same level of dignity and the same level of respect and legal protection as other folks who are here legally in this country working over 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit those two universalities of this country, which are pockets of hunger, and respect for all levels of dignity of work, ought to merit that we pass this motion and do it proudly, and turn our back to the sad statement that some people have been making lately in this Chamber that legal residents somehow are unAmerican.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with much of what the gentleman from Washington

(Mr. INSLEE) said, but the problem is when he refers to lawful citizens working over 5 years, what the gentleman is asking us to support has no such work requirement in it. I think it is certainly negotiable within the conference, within the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture that are meeting to work this out, that we could come up with a work history requirement that would be acceptable for both sides. But the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) does not have that in the language that he refers to in the Senate bill. For that reason, I have to oppose this motion.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thought there was a work requirement of 16 quarters?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is an either/or work requirement. Someone can be here 5 years and never work a day, or be here for 16 quarters of work and qualify, not both. That is the crux of the matter. There has got to be a work history requirement for an able-bodied adult, and there is no such requirement in the motion.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman in favor of the 5 years if the 16-quarter requirement is there?

Mr. GOODLATTE. We certainly could work that out. The proposal we put forward was 20 quarters.

Mrs. CLAYTON. But there was also a time line? It was only for 3.5 years?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, we limit it to 2 years, I believe, in the offer.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, would the gentleman be willing to remove the time lines and give legal residents the same right?

Mr. GOODLATTE. No, because an individual, after they have been here for 5 years is a lawful, permanent resident, and they are entitled to apply for United States citizenship. And if there is a need to have benefits extended for a longer period of time, they have that option.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I both know it takes a long time and is very expensive for people to become legal citizens, and tying food and hunger to citizenship is very difficult.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, that is why we allowed 2 years. That is a very long time to apply for citizenship. Almost all of the people who apply get their citizenship within 2 years.

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "yes" on this motion. There have been some intimation here that this is a political debate. This is not a political debate. It is about people putting food on their table for their family and their children.

Last week in conference, House Republicans blocked a proposal to restore Food Stamps to legal immigrants. It is a proposal that has the support of House Democrats, the Senate, and the Bush administration. It benefits over 350,000 people. It helps keep people from starving until they can put food on their table on their own, and it provides a safety net for those less fortunate and need assistance.

House Republicans sought to block it, and block it they did. This is a responsible proposal, and it is simply the right thing to do. Legal immigrants who work hard, live by the rules, pay taxes, even serve in our Armed Forces deserve access to Food Stamps. Equal treatment, fair treatment, we should be promoting these values. But instead of supporting policies that embody these values, Republican House leaders prefer to dole out subsidies to corporate farms.

In this debate, that is their priority. In this debate, this is what they decided to do. It is bad policy and it is wrong to send people a message that responsibility is a value that we are going to ignore. Legal immigrants have not had access to Food Stamps in the past 5 years. In the past 5 years, children have gone hungry as a result. This Congress should not end until we have taken action to restore Food Stamps to legal immigrants. We should reward the value of hard work. We should reward immigrant families who strengthen our economy and our cultural life. Let us restore Food Stamps. Let us get the job done this year. Vote "yes" on the Baca motion.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Missouri, what has transpired in the conference regarding the farm bill has been inaccurately portrayed. The Senate tendered to the House a proposal that had nothing in it for the children, the refugees, and the disabled individuals that the minority leader referred to.

We tendered an offer which provided Food Stamps for noncitizens who have been here from day 1 if they are disabled, they are children or if they are refugees.

The difference of opinion between the House and the Senate conferees in terms of our proposals are that for those people who are adults, they are able-bodied, they are able to work and between the ages of 18 and 60, they ought to have some work history and be able to show that they were contributing, tax-paying members of our society; but they do not require that in the proposal that the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) has set forth. That is why I am opposed to this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from California earlier suggested that if we did not pass this motion, that this would be a signal to people coming into the country that we were denying them the American dream.

We have gone from suggesting that some help may be needed for families here who are not employed sufficiently, to saying that essentially welfare is the American dream. That this is what we should hold out, this is the carrot that we should hold out to people, because part of the American dream is access to welfare.

We have heard continual references to the degradation that would be the result of nonpassage of this motion and continuing the process of restricting Food Stamps to people who are not citizens for a period of time. But listen to what degradation, in fact, occurs. This is all documented. The reports from which I quote are reports that are available to anyone in this body. Again, they are empirical information. It is not something that we just make up or theorize about with regard to the effects of especially Food Stamps.

“The traditional welfare system comprised of programs such as AFDC, Food Stamps and public housing dramatically undermined work ethic, reduced employment and generated long-term dependence. For example, the Seattle-Denver Income Maintenance Experiment, a massive controlled experiment on effects of welfare conducted in the early 1980s, showed that for each additional dollar of welfare aid led, on average, to a reduction of employment and earnings of 80 cents. These anti-employment effects should apply to cash as well as noncash aid.”

Mr. Speaker, this is what we are trying to avoid. I suggest, and I must say that I would go further than the gentleman from California, I do not believe that Food Stamps are an improvement on one's condition. I do not think it is a good thing. I would be opposing an expansion for any group; but I guarantee, it is not a good thing for the people that we are identifying here. As all empirical evidence suggests, welfare, especially the old AFDC program and Food Stamps, are degrading.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, first I commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for his contribution, standing up for welfare reform. This was a tremendous triumph, a bipartisan triumph, a law signed into effect by President Clinton, that was pushed by the Republican Congress, supported by a great many Democrats, and he is simply, and I agree with him, trying to avoid unnecessary erosion of an important principle, and that is we should be giving people a hand up rather than a hand out.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the motion to instruct conferees, the Repub-

lican offer in the conference is to give people a hand up and to help those people who are most in need: Children, the disabled and refugees. We also make Food Stamps available for others if they have a work history, and we make it available to them for a limited period of time.

What the gentleman from California is asking the House to accept in terms of what the Senate put forward does absolutely nothing for children who have been in this country for less than 5 years.

□ 1715

Secondly, it does not impose a work requirement that is not independent of the 5-year standard. In other words, what he is asking us to say is you can either have worked or been here 5 years, one or the other. You do not have to have both. That is not the position of the President of the United States, that is not the position of the House conferees, and it should not be what this House adopts as we take these negotiations forward.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to instruct conferees and let the negotiations go forward in a good-faith way to come up with something that is fair to those people who are truly in need but does not give a blank check to people who have not contributed to our society and, therefore, have no work history to justify receiving these benefits.

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, I thank the gentleman from Virginia in reference to the debate, but I think he has not really read the bill and does not have his facts together. The bill itself and the instructions do have a work requirement. Apparently he opposes the President's proposal that actually states this, and it does have a work requirement. And no individual is eligible unless they have demonstrated that they have worked. So a lot of false statements have been made here. And these people have contributed to our society. They have. These are legal, permanent individuals who have contributed to our society, who have worked, are working citizens, are taxpayers who have contributed. These are individuals who are veterans and children who deserve assistance.

This is about meeting our needs. This is about allowing legal immigrants who are in the United States for 5 years or more to have the opportunity to apply for food stamps if they are low income. This is the President's proposal. It allows children eligible for food stamps regardless of when they enter the United States. So we talk about not offering to children, yes, we are offering to children. Yes, we are providing assistance to them.

And then it does cover the work requirement, too, as well. This restores the disabled opportunities to apply for

food stamps, regardless of the date that they entered. I believe that we have the responsibility to all of us in America to provide assistance for many of our children. We want to make sure that our children are not starving and that our children have an opportunity to go to school on a full stomach. This is the right course. We should support the restoration of the 5-year plan, the plan submitted by the Senate that basically tells us what we should be doing in complying, in helping and assisting many individuals throughout our country.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Baca Motion to Instruct the Farm Bill Conferees to adopt the Senate provisions that provide eligibility for food stamps to lawfully present, hard-working immigrant families in their time of need.

Legal immigrants are individuals who have played by the rules. They work hard and pay taxes that support the food-stamp program to which they may be denied access if Mr. BACA's motion does not pass.

The fact is that many legal permanent residents lose their jobs because they work in industries hit hardest in times of economic downturn and as a result, lack the finances to buy food for their families.

When you consider that more than one in five low income children belong to legal immigrant families, it is even more unconscionable that in their time of need, they will be denied the most basic of safety-net programs.

As the world's wealthiest nation, it is inexcusable that a high rate of hunger exists among low-income legal permanent resident families living in this country.

We must not allow this tragic situation to continue. No one in this country, especially innocent children, should go hungry.

Therefore, Congress should follow the President's lead and expand access to the food stamp program for these hard-working, legal residents and their children.

Support the Motion to Instruct.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion by the gentleman from California, Mr. BACA. Each day in this country, thousands of children go hungry because their families are ineligible for food stamps. Many of these children are American citizens and many are legal permanent residents.

No matter their status, or the status of their parents, there is no excuse for denying children access to food.

No doubt many Members on the other side of the aisle will oppose this motion. They want to make it impossible for hard working, tax-paying U.S. residents to feed their families just because they are not yet full citizens. We are not talking about people who have come to this country illegally or people who refuse to work.

Legal permanent residents, like our parents and grandparents, have followed the rules and come to America to work for a better life for their families. They serve in our military and in their communities and continue to make this country a vibrant, diverse nation that is the envy of the world.

Despite support by the Administration for benefit restoration, House Republicans continue to stall the Farm Bill conference by opposing help for minorities and the poorest among us. This is wrong, it is unfair and it is

not in keeping with the spirit and ideals this nation was founded upon.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to 15 United States Code 1024(a), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. HILL of Indiana.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 586 agreed to earlier today.

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

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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

IN MEMORY OF SCOTT BILLINGSLEY

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to deliver a tribute to M. Scott Billingsley, legislative director for Colorado's Sixth Congressional District from December 15, 2001, to March 25, the day of his death.

First and foremost, I am honored today to share with you Scott's dedication to his career, his fellow man and his country. Mr. Speaker, my staff and I were given the great privilege of working with Scott for the last few months of his life. When Scott became my legislative director this past December, he instantly gained my respect and, more importantly, generated a sense of enthusiasm in his office which empowered my staff to reach their personal best and to strive to work toward perfection. Scott's infectious personality and poise drew people close to him. We instantly enjoyed getting to know him and were eager to learn from him.

Scott possessed a rare gift that allowed him to do his job thoroughly, in a way that nurtured the work ethic of his peers while at the same time enabled him to act as a mentor.

Mr. Speaker, we were blessed to have Scott in our lives. Scott will always be remembered as a person who lived life to the fullest, with a passion for knowledge and a sincere desire to make a difference in the lives of those around him and the people of Colorado's Sixth Congressional District.

The news of his sudden death saddened all of us beyond words. His presence is irreplaceable, his character exceptional.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit Scott's eulogy delivered by both his father and fiancée for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is important to let history know that Mr. Billingsley was a man who dedicated his life to improve the livelihood of his fellow citizens and America.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a verse from the Bible. In the short time we were blessed with Scott in our lives, we believe he would say these words to help ease the hearts of all those who knew and loved him. The scripture is from Numbers 6:24-26:

"The Lord bless thee and keep thee. The Lord make his face to shine down upon thee and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace."

While losing Scott was tragic, his spirit remains with all of us.

EULOGY BY SCOTT'S FATHER, DR. MICHAEL L. BILLINGSLEY

(MARCH 30, 2002, GRACE EPISCOPAL CHURCH, COLORADO SPRINGS)

To the Family and Friends of Michael Scott Billingsley:

This is the most difficult thing that a father ever has to do, but I must say a few words about our son. Most of you have known and loved Scott for some or all of his 32 years, and I know you are devastated by this loss. His mother and I, his sister, and our family are crushed beyond words, and I don't know if we will ever completely recover from this. Scott and Rebecca have always been our life and our joy. I have no words to express the pain his passing has caused.

We are comforted, however, by our firm belief, that only Scott's physical presence is gone. His spirit is everlasting, and is bound up in that mysterious force, that binds us all together, the Holy Spirit of God.

I will let others recount Scott's accomplishments and attributes. We all know that he achieved much in his short time with us. He was a gifted and talented young man, and contributed a great deal to the lives of all who knew him well.

I would like to focus for a moment on his spirit, the enduring essence of his being. Scott's spirit is fiercely independent. From the beginning, he asserted his uniquely individual style, never egotistical, but always assertive, and firm in his convictions. From his earliest use of words and phrases, Scott was an able debater and advocate. When Rebecca was only 2 years old, and Scott 5, she refused to talk, though able, because she had only to point at something she wanted, and Scott would instantly become her legal counsel, explaining in full sentences what Rebecca really meant to say. I don't remember a time, when he was at a loss for words. Blessed with a keen intellect, and once convinced of the merits of his position, he was a formidable partisan for his issue. His assertiveness was, more often than not, balanced with sincere sense of fairness, and respect for his opponent. His friends will tell you that he was always up to a debate on nearly any issue, and was even occasionally willing to consider other reasonable and well thought out points of view; that is, if he couldn't readily destroy their argument.

Scott's is a loyal spirit. His bonding to kindred souls, regardless of differences of opinion, was remarkable. Some of his best friends were often his polar opposites on world and political views. His spirit was able to transcend those differences and inspire comradeship in many of the "loyal opposition," as he might describe them. Finding and bonding with the essential goodness in others was one of his great strengths. Often through humor and wit, Scott could bridge strong differences in opinion and diffuse anger and confrontation. Scott's sense of humor was treasured by our family. He was always able to bring laughter to even the most contentious family matters. As many of you know, he could incite hysterical laughter in his sister with a mere gesture or an off-hand remark.

The real center of Scott's spirit is love. A great deal of this attribute certainly came from the unending love and nurturing of his mother, his wonderful relationship with his sister, his grandparents, his aunts and uncles, and his cousins. He was fortunate to have many long-lasting close friendships from high school, college, law school, and from his work experiences in Washington. My personal relationship with him was almost perfect. We agreed on almost every philosophical principal. Our last game, a week ago, was a tie. We didn't even have a