

this economy that is locked up in capital assets that people will not sell because they do not want to pay 28 to 39 percent in a capital gains tax. Once we unleash that—if we could just unleash 10 percent of that money, can you imagine what a stimulation and stimulus that would be to our economy?

Taxpayers are very sensitive to capital gains reductions. This is especially true for the most affluent Americans. As a result, Americans will realize many gains as soon as the rate changes. This will raise tax revenue, probably by an amount far above joint tax estimates.

Joint tax estimates are among the most conservative estimates you can have. I will not go into the details on this, but we can say in the last 30 years, every time capital gains rates have gone up, revenues to the Federal Government have gone down from selling capital assets. Every time capital gains rates have been dropped, or lowered, revenues to the Government have gone up. It just makes sense, especially when you realize there is \$8 trillion locked up in capital assets that they will not sell, they will not trade, they will not move because of the high rate of taxation that we have today.

Let us lower that capital gains rate and benefit all Americans, but especially—especially—the middle class and those earning under \$50,000 a year who will benefit greatly from it, and get some sense into this system so we push the better aspects of our system. Let us get rid of some of this demeaning rhetoric that literally cuts into the—really cuts against what are the real facts with regard to capital gains and capital gains rate reductions.

I am very strongly for a capital gains rate reduction because I think it will benefit virtually everybody in our society, the poor as well, because there will be more jobs and more economic opportunity than before the rates are cut.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to yield 5 minutes?

Mr. HATCH. I will be happy to yield 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I just want to put in the RECORD some of the comments from some of the leading church and legislative and active groups that have been focusing on the welfare debate. I will include all of the statements in the RECORD. But I would like to refer at this time to individual sentences and comments that summarize their position.

One was from the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA. It said:

The religious community is a major provider of center-based child care. Throughout the nation, millions of children are cared for every day in church-housed child care. Our churches have long waiting lists of parents seeking quality care for their children. We are not able to accommodate the demand because the resources to expand the supply are so scarce. We know this problem first hand, because the desperate parents are in our congregations, as are the overworked providers of child care services. Their facilities are in our buildings, and our congregations are enriched by the lively presence of their children.

We believe that it is not responsible public policy to require parents to work without providing adequately for their children's safety and nurture while the parents are at their jobs. If the government is going to insist that mothers of young children leave them to go into the workplace, then the government must make it possible for the parents to do so in the confidence that their children are in a safe, wholesome environment. To do otherwise puts our children at risk and almost guarantees that parents, preoccupied with concern for the well-being of their youngsters, will not perform to the best of their ability.

That is an excellent statement of the National Council of the Churches of Christ.

The National Conference of State Legislatures:

NCSL has been concerned about the lack of coordination of existing child care funding streams. We are interested in working with you to consolidate these funds. Child care is an essential component to support welfare recipients moving from welfare to work and is critical for low-income working families. Our experience suggests that a renewed commitment to work by welfare recipients will require additional child care funds above current levels.

That is the National Conference of State Legislatures; that is, Republicans and Democrats.

The American Public Welfare Association:

Current proposals in the Senate do not create a separate state block grant for all child care programs. APWA supports a separate child care block grant, in the form of an entitlement to states, not as a discretionary spending program subject to annual funding reductions. States will not be able to move clients from welfare to work without adequate and flexible funding to provide essential child care services.

Catholic Charities:

We are very concerned that the new work requirements and time limits for AFDC participation will leave children without adequate adult supervision while their parents are working or looking for work. The key to successful work programs is safe, affordable, quality day care for the children. The bill before the Senate does not guarantee or increase funding for day care to meet the increased need associated with the work requirements and time limits. Please, support amendments by Senators Hatch and Kennedy to guarantee adequate funding to keep children safe while their mothers try to earn enough to support them.

The Governor of Ohio:

I would like to see the child care and family nutrition block grants converted into capped state entitlements. In the House bill, funding for these block grants is discretionary. Key child care programs currently are individual entitlements. The need for

child care only will grow as welfare recipients move into the workforce.

The National Parent Teacher Association:

The potential for success of welfare reform depends on former recipients becoming employed an being able to meet basic needs for shelter, food, health care and child care. Subsidized child care for low income working parents is crucial.

Every single organization that has responsibility and which has studied this is and which are out on the front lines on the issue of welfare reform has understood the importance of providing child care, and the Dodd-Kennedy amendment provides it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these documents be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE USA—STATEMENT ON THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD CARE IN WELFARE REFORM

(By Mary Anderson Cooper, Associate Director, Washington Office, August 9, 1995)

As the Senate works to overhaul the nation's welfare system, we urge Senators to make the well-being of those who are impacted by that system their primary concern. As people of faith and religious commitment, we are called to stand with and seek justice for people who are poor. This is central to our religious traditions, sacred texts, and teachings. We are convinced, therefore, that welfare reform must not focus on eliminating programs but on eliminating poverty and the damage it inflicts on children (who are ⅓ of all welfare recipients), on their parents, and on the rest of society.

Further, we support the goal of helping families to leave welfare through employment, because we believe that those who are able to work have a right and a responsibility to do so. However, we also recognize that just finding a job will not necessarily mean either that a family should leave welfare or that its poverty will end. Since full-time jobs at minimum wage yield a family income that is below the poverty line, and since such jobs often do not provide health care benefits, employed people trying to leave welfare may still need some government subsidy in order to become self-supporting.

Key among the kinds of help such people need is child care. The Children's Defense Fund tells us that one in four mothers in their twenties who were out of the labor force in 1986 said they were not working because of child care problems (high cost, lack of availability, poor quality or location, lack of transportation, etc.). Among poor women, 34% said they were not working because of child care problems.

The Government Accounting Office tells us that increasing the supply of child care would raise the work participation rates of poor women from 29 to 44 percent. For near-poor women, the rates would rise from 43 to 57 percent. Thus, increasing the supply of safe, quality, affordable child care would help some women escape poverty while helping others avoid falling into it in the first place.

The religious community is a major provider of center-based child care. Throughout the nation, millions of children are care for every day in church-housed child care. Our churches have long waiting lists of parents seeking quality care for their children. We

are not able to accommodate the demand because the resources to expand the supply are so scarce. We know this problem first hand, because the desperate parents are in our congregations, as are the overworked providers of child care services. Their facilities are in our buildings, and our congregations are enriched by the lively presence of their children.

We believe that it is not responsible public policy to require parents to work without providing adequately for their children's safety and nurture while the parents are at their jobs. If the government is going to insist that mothers of young children leave them to go into the workplace, then the government must make it possible for the parents to do so in the confidence that their children are in a safe, wholesome environment. To do otherwise puts our children at risk and almost guarantees that parents, preoccupied with concern for the well-being of their youngsters, will not perform to the best of their ability.

The issue of child care has been nearly absent from the congressional debate on welfare reform. Consequently, we are particularly grateful to Senator Daschle for making child care a key feature of his legislation. We commend him for raising the visibility of this issue and look forward to working with him to assure that adequate provisions for child care are included in any welfare bill that is approved by the Congress.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF
STATE LEGISLATURES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 1995.

Hon. BOB PACKWOOD,
U.S. Senate, Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR PACKWOOD: We are writing to thank you for your public commitment to state flexibility as a principle in your welfare reform legislation. The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) is especially pleased by your recognition of the critical role of state legislators in welfare reform and other programs that serve children and families. We appreciate your confidence in our ability to design programs that best serve the needs in our states and urge you to consider our views as you finalize your welfare reform legislation.

We are encouraged by your endorsement of providing more discretion to state decisionmakers and rejecting provisions that micromanage and limit state authority to determine eligibility. However, state legislators are concerned about several provisions under consideration that have the potential to limit state authority, shift major costs to the states and violate NCSL's policy on block grants. The balance of this letter specifies our concerns in six major areas. In summary, we urge you to reconsider the consolidation of open-ended entitlements for child protection services, work requirements in the cash assistance block grant, denial of benefits to legal immigrants, the absence of real protection for states to respond to economic change, the consolidation of child care funding, and timing to successfully implement revised programs.

I understand that you are still considering a block grant for child protection funds. State legislators believe that foster care maintenance and adoption assistance payments and administrative funding under Title IV-E must be maintained as an open-ended entitlement. Children in danger cannot be told that the government ran out of money to protect them. We must respond to those who turn to us as a last resort. The demand for these services has not been predicted well at the federal level. No one predicted the damage that HIV infection, crack cocaine and homelessness would do to chil-

dren's security within their families. No one anticipated the resulting increase in state and federal costs. Courts will decide to remove children from unsafe homes and states must respond to these decisions. We urge you to reject the child protection block grant.

We are disappointed with the prescriptive work and participation requirements in H.R. 4. State legislators are interested in creating our own programs, not running a uniform program with federally-determined program details and fewer funds. We oppose federal micromanagement in the definition or type or work, the role of training, minimum number of hours a recipient must work, and participation rates. These are precisely the decisions each state should make based on local needs. We do support measurement of outcomes and performance data to ensure that program goals are being met.

NCSL strongly opposes the denial of benefits to legal immigrants. The federal government has sole jurisdiction over immigration policy and must bear the responsibility to serve the immigrants it allows to enter states and localities. The denial of benefits will shift the costs to state budgets. Eliminating benefits to noncitizens or deeming for unreasonably long periods will not eliminate the need, and state and local budgets and taxpayers will bear the burden. Denial of services to legal immigrants by states appears to violate both state and federal constitutional provisions. We continue to support making affidavits of support legally binding.

NCSL supports the development of a contingency funds to assist states to respond to changes in population and the economy rather than a loan fund. The absence of adequate protections for states with population growth, economic changes and disasters is a barrier to state support of a cash assistance block grant. We believe that a loan fund is not sufficient assurance of federal assistance. The federal government must participate as a partner in a fund that has a mechanism for budget adjustment so that states are not overly burdened by increased demand for services.

NCSL has been concerned about the lack of coordination of existing child care funding streams. We are interested in working with you to consolidate these funds. Child care is an essential component to support welfare recipients moving from welfare to work and is critical for low-income working families. Our experience suggests that a renewed commitment to work by welfare recipients will require additional child care funds above current levels. A consolidated child care fund should stand alone.

Finally, state legislators will need adequate transition time to successfully implement revised income security and related programs. States will have to modify their laws to comport with new federal legislation, restructure their administrative bureaucracies and revise their FY96 and FY97 budgets that have been enacted on the basis of current law and federal spending guarantees. We urge inclusion of a provision giving states no less than one year of transition time and consideration for additional time for states that meet biennially.

We look forward to working with you throughout this process. Please contact Sheri Steisel or Michael Bird in NCSL's Washington Office to further discuss our views.

Sincerely,

JANE L. CAMPBELL,
President, NCSL, Assistant House Minority Leader, Ohio.

JAMES J. LACK,
President-elect, NCSL, Senator, New York.

AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION

(By Gerald H. Miller, President, and A. Sidney Johnson III, Executive Director)

SERIOUS SHORTFALL IN CHILD CARE FUNDING

By increasing the number of participants required to work and maintaining child care funds at the FY 94 level, current welfare reform proposals in the Senate would significantly hinder states' efforts to move welfare recipients into the workforce. There is clear congressional intent to require states to meet higher participation rates, which cannot be met if child care is unavailable. CBO estimates, presented in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, indicate that the child care needed to meet proposed participation rates, will cost approximately 5 times the current proposed allocation. Based on those estimates, states will face a serious child care funding crisis.

Current proposals in the Senate do not create a separate state block grant for all child care programs. APWA supports a separate child care block grant, in the form of an entitlement to states, not as a discretionary spending program subject to annual funding reductions. States will not be able to move clients from welfare to work without adequate and flexible funding to provide essential child care services.

ANALYSIS

The amount of money allocated for child care is not adequate given the work participation requirements in the bill. Welfare reform legislation, in outlining work provisions and requirements, should recognize and address both programatically and financially the distinct role of child care in clients' ability to obtain and retain employment. Child care is an essential component for successfully moving people to self-sufficiency. Moreover, no work program can succeed without a commitment to making quality child care available for recipients.

CATHOLIC CHARITIES, USA,
August 4, 1995.

DEAR SENATOR: As the Senate takes up welfare reform, we urge you to adopt provisions to strengthen families, protect children, and preserve the nation's commitment to fighting child poverty.

Across this country, 1,400 local agencies and institutions in the Catholic Charities network serve more than 10 million people annually. Last year alone, Catholic Charities USA helped more than 138,000 women, teenagers, and their families with crisis pregnancies. Because Catholic agencies run the full spectrum of services, from soup kitchens and shelters to transitional and permanent housing, they see families in all stages of problems as well as those who have escaped poverty and dependency.

This broad experience, along with our religious tradition which defends human life and human dignity, compels us to share our strong convictions about welfare reform.

The first principle in welfare reform must be, "Do no harm." Along with the U.S. Catholic Conference, the National Right-to-Life Committee, and other pro-life organizations, we have vigorously opposed child-exclusion provisions such as the "family cap" and denial of cash assistance for children born to teenage mothers or for whom paternity has not yet been legally established.

We are also convinced that the idea of rewarding states for reducing out-of-wedlock pregnancies is well-intentioned but dangerously light of the fact that the only state experiment in this regard, the New Jersey family cap, already has increased abortions without any significant reduction in births. The "illegitimacy ratio" may well encourage states to engage in similar experiments that

would result in more abortions and more suffering.

We also support Senator Kent Conrad's amendment, which not only would require teen mothers to live under adult supervision and continue their education, but also would provide resources for "second-chance homes" to make that requirement a reality.

The second principle should be to protect children. We are very concerned that the new work requirements and time limits for AFDC participation will leave children without adequate adult supervision while their parents are working or looking for work. The key to successful work programs is safe, affordable, quality day care for the children. The bill before the Senate does not guarantee or increase funding for day care to meet the increased need associated with the work requirements and time limits. Please, support amendments by Senators Hatch and Kennedy to guarantee adequate funding to keep children safe while their mothers try to earn enough to support them.

The third principle should be to maintain the national safety net for children. We oppose block granting Food Stamps, even as a state option, because the Food Stamp program is the only national program available to feed poor children of all ages with working parents as well as those on welfare. On the whole, the Food Stamp program works well, ensuring that children in even the poorest families do not suffer from malnutrition.

We are encouraged by the fact that Senator Dole's bill does not seek to cut or erode federal support for child protection in the child welfare system. Proposals to block grant these essential protections are ill-advised and dangerous to children who are already abused, neglected, abandoned, and totally at the mercy of state child welfare systems. Federal rules and guarantees are essential to the safety of children.

The fourth principle should be fairness to all citizens. Certain proposals before the Senate would create a new category of "second-class citizenship," making immigrants ineligible for most federal programs, even after they become naturalized Americans. We urge you to reject this and other proposals that would leave legal immigrants without the possibility of assistance when they are in genuine need.

The fifth principle should be to maintain the national commitment to fighting child poverty. In exchange for federal dollars and broad flexibility, states should be expected to maintain at least their current level of support for poor children and their families. We understand that Senator Breaux will offer such an amendment on the Senate floor. Please give it your support.

In our Catholic teaching, all children, but especially poor and unborn children, have a special claim to the protection of society and government. Please vote for proposals that keep the federal government on their side.

Sincerely,

FRED KAMMER, SJ,
President.

STATE OF OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
March 27, 1995.

Hon. BOB DOLE,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: As you know, the House of Representatives has completed its consideration of welfare reform legislation. While I strongly support the decision made by the House to convert welfare programs into block grants, I am concerned that the House bill fails to provide states with the flexibility needed to set our own priorities and conduct innovative experiments to pro-

mote responsibility and self-sufficiency. Many of my fellow Republican Governors share a number of my concerns.

I was disappointed with the allocation formula established through the Temporary Family Assistance Block Grant. It is the position of the National Governors' Association that any formula should allow states to use either a three-year average or 1994 spending levels in determining base year allocations. While the House formula includes this choice, it then applies a 2.4-percent reduction factor to each state's allocation. The reduction factor leaves Ohio with a base year allocation of \$700 million annually, which is lower than what we would have received using either formula without a reduction factor. Speaker Gingrich assured states he would support eliminating the reduction factor. We would like to work with you in the Senate to make this correction.

Although allowing each state to receive its most favorable allocation without a reduction factor requires funding for the block grant to be increased by approximately \$200 million nationally, it is important to remember that states are making a significant financial sacrifice in supporting capped block grants. If states are disadvantaged in determining base year allocations, it becomes even more difficult to make the increased investments in work programs necessary to move individuals off welfare.

The House bill also does not include sufficient protections for states in the event of an economic downturn. If Congress replaces open-ended individual entitlements with capped state entitlements, states are placed in an extremely vulnerable position should the welfare-eligible population increase significantly. The state and federal governments should be partners in meeting the needs of expanded caseloads in recessions. The House bill contains a \$1 billion rainy day fund designed to provide the states with short-term loans, repayable with interest in three years. A loan fund does not represent a partnership; instead it is a cost shift.

Ohio would be particularly disadvantaged in a recession due to aggressive steps already taken to reduce welfare caseloads. Today, 85,000 fewer Ohioans receive welfare than in 1992. States that have not been aggressive in reducing their welfare rolls will be better able to accommodate increased caseloads. Ohio's streamlined base makes it very difficult for us to absorb increased recessionary demands.

As part of our efforts to reduce welfare caseloads, Ohio has developed the strongest JOBS program in the nation. Ohio leads the nation with 33,911 recipients participating in JOBS. Only California comes close to matching Ohio's performance with 32,755 recipients enrolled in JOBS, and California has three times as many ADC recipients as Ohio. Our success with the JOBS program reflects a strong investment in training and education programs. Regardless of the extent of our investment, however, no work program can succeed without a commitment to making quality child care available for recipients. In Ohio, the state provides non-guaranteed day care to families with incomes up to 133 percent of the federal poverty level. The program currently has an average daily enrollment of 17,800. The State of Ohio is doing its part to provide child care to those in need. The federal government also must meet its responsibility.

I would like to see the child care and family nutrition block grants converted into capped state entitlements. In the House bill, funding for these block grants is discretionary. Key child care programs currently are individual entitlements. The need for child care only will grow as welfare recipients move into the workforce. My comfort

level with the House package would increase significantly if states were guaranteed to receive a specified level of funding for child care and for child nutrition services for the next five years. That guarantee can only come through a capped state entitlement.

Excessive prescriptiveness is a problem throughout the House legislation. The bill's work requirements are a perfect example. The federal government mandates how many hours per week a federally defined percentage of cash assistance recipients must participate in federally prescribed work activities. In a true block grant, states would be free to choose how best to allocate resources to meet goals developed jointly by the federal and state governments. The record-keeping requirements in the House bill also are extraordinarily prescriptive. States remain concerned that our computer systems lack the capability to provide the information required by the House.

A true block grant should also give states the ability to determine their own program eligibility standards. The House legislation includes a number of specific eligibility restrictions. For example, cash benefits will be denied to unwed minor mothers and their children. Additional children born to mothers on welfare will be denied benefits. Decisions like these should be left to the states. By federally mandating these restrictions, the House is interfering with successful state reforms. For example, in Ohio we have developed a program designed to encourage minor mothers to remain in school. The LEAP (Learning, Earning, and Parenting) program supplements or reduces a teen mother's ADC cash grant based on her school attendance to teach her that there is a real value to completing her education. LEAP has led to a significant decrease in the drop-out rate for this vulnerable population. If the House prohibition on cash benefits remains in place, the LEAP program will have to be discontinued.

As the Senate begins to consider welfare legislation, I would be grateful for your assistance in addressing my concerns. Like many other Governors, I strongly support the broad outline of the House proposal, but it is important that these issues be resolved successfully. As a Governor, it will be up to me to implement welfare reforms in my State. I would like to work with you to ensure that block grants give the states the flexibility we need to implement innovative reforms designed to meet the specific needs of our communities. Without this flexibility, I cannot support this welfare reform package.

While Ohio watches federal welfare reform developments with tremendous interest, we have been actively pursuing a statewide reform agenda. I have enclosed a summary of Ohio's history of welfare reform innovation for your information.

Thank you for your personal consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,

GEORGE V. VOINOVICH,
Governor.

NATIONAL PARENT TEACHER ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, AND THE COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS,

March 20, 1995.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations, representing parents, educators, principals, and state policymakers, support improvements to the welfare system. We believe such reforms must address the

fundamental quality child care needs of working as well as unemployed parents.

We have several concerns about the impact of H.R. 999 on the issues of access to and the quality of child care in this country:

The plan reduces funding even though programs already have long waiting lists of eligible families.

Welfare reform will increase the need for child care by requiring participation in training, education, or employment by mothers who currently take care of their children.

The potential for success of welfare reform depends on former recipients becoming employed and being able to meet basic needs for shelter, food, health care and child care. Subsidized child care for low income working parents is crucial.

Recent data show that quality in centers and daycare homes is low, especially for infants. Cutting funding for quality and eliminating standards would threaten to erode the quality of care even further.

We know that the quality of child care for all children has a significant impact on the ability of children to learn in the first few years of school. When children experience success in responsive, high quality programs, they learn essential skills and knowledge, and their parents learn to be confident partners with teachers and schools.

* * * * *

Mr. KENNEDY. Finally, Mr. President, I would just mention what we are really talking about in terms of child care. We have talked about figures. We talked about statistics. We talked about flow lines. We talked about entitlements. What we are talking about is really the issue of children being home alone. This is not a joke or a big screen comedy. It is a real life tragedy for American families pressed to the wall. Just listen to the horror stories from families that have been put in this awful position—and paying an unbelievable price.

Think about 6-year-old Jermaine James of Fairfax County and his 6-year-old friend Amanda, who were being cared for by his 8-year-old sister Tina. When a fire broke out in their apartment, Tina ran for help, inadvertently locking the younger children in the burning apartment. They died before the fire department could get to them. Sandra James and her husband needed two jobs to support their family and still could not afford child care. They tried to stagger their schedules but did not always succeed.

Think about 7-month-old Craig Pinner of San Francisco who drowned in the bathtub while his 9-year-old brother was trying to bathe him. His mother was working part time and participating in job training. She usually left the children with her family, but her car had broken down and she was no longer able to get them there. She was trying to find affordable child care but was unsuccessful.

Think about 4-year-old Anthony and 5-year-old Maurice Grant of Dade County. While home alone, they climbed into the clothes dryer to look at a magazine in a hiding place, pulled the door closed, and tumbled and burned to death. Their mother was waiting for child care assistance and

generally left the children with neighbors. But sometimes these arrangements fell through and she had to leave them home alone for just a few hours.

This did not happen in Hollywood—but in Virginia and Florida and California and elsewhere. We must do everything in our power to avoid putting families in this kind of a situation in the name of reform.

Mr. President, I will include in the RECORD, if my friend and colleague, Senator DODD, has not, the waiting lines that exist in the States at the present time.

The States face large unmet needs for child assistance, waiting lists, clothes, and the list goes on all the way—Alabama, 19,000 children; Alaska, 752 children; Arizona, 2,600 children; California, 250,000 children; Delaware, over 1,000 children; Florida, 19,000; Georgia, 21,000; Hawaii, 900 children are on the waiting list; Idaho, 1,000 children waiting; Indiana, 7,900 on the waiting lists; Kansas, 1,270 on the waiting list; Kentucky, 10,000 on the waiting list; Louisiana, 4,600; Maine 3,000; Maryland, 4,000; Massachusetts 4,000 statewide waiting for child care for working poor families; Michigan, 12,000 last year; Minnesota, 7,000; Missouri, 6,500; Montana, 200 children; Nevada, 7,000; and the list goes on; New Jersey, 24,000; New Mexico, 6,300; New York, 23,000; North Carolina, 13,000; Pennsylvania, 7,700; Rhode Island, 972. The list goes on and on with Wisconsin, 6,800; West Virginia, 13,000.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that under this particular bill, the Dole bill, without the Dodd amendment, we will be requiring the States to have over 1 million new slots. They are not doing it today. They do not have the resources today. They do not have the money under the Dole program today to do it. The Dodd amendment will provide them with the resources to be able to meet that obligation, that obligation that is there in the States today and that will be created by this bill. That is what this amendment is all about and why it should be supported.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me pick up on the last point that the Senator from Massachusetts raised. He may have made it before I walked onto the floor. He pointed out the waiting lists that exist in the States for child care slots today, before we pass a welfare reform bill. There is just tremendous demand today. What we are talking about—this bill, of course—is taking anywhere from 1 to 2 million people and moving them over the next 5 years from welfare to work.

If we do not provide additional resources, then there will be increased pressure on existing dollars that go to those who are getting the child care today. It is worthwhile to point out that the people who get child care

today under the child care development block grant, that Senator HATCH and I passed in 1990, are working poor. Those are people at work right now. That child care assistance makes it possible for them to stay in the work force and not slip into a public assistance category.

The fear that many of us have here, is that without some additional resources, as we move people who are on welfare today to work, the people out working today and staying at work, getting some of that assistance, those resources are going to have to be shifted in the State in order to accommodate the demands of this bill or face the penalties the bill imposes on the States if the States do not move the 25 to 50 percent of the welfare recipients on their rolls to work.

So you are going to have the almost bizarre effect of taking people who are doing what we are encouraging people to do, and that is stay at work, who are marginally making enough to stay off the welfare rolls and pushing those people back on the rolls as we accommodate the demands of the legislation to take people on the welfare rolls to work.

So it seems we ought not to be jeopardizing the small amount of funds we have today out there assisting those families presently at work.

Let me emphasize a couple of points here if I can. What we are talking about with this proposal is not an entitlement. This is a pool of resources. It does not entitle anyone to it. It merely makes the funds available to the States.

So there are those who have said they do not believe in an entitlement for child care. We might otherwise disagree about that, but this amendment does not create an entitlement. It merely says to Ohio, Connecticut, Massachusetts, divide it up based on the block grant and what it takes to make it work. Here are some additional resources to make it possible for you to meet the demand, the mandate, of the Federal law.

The mandate of the bill we are about to pass says to Ohio and Connecticut, you must move the following percentages of your welfare rolls to work. And what we are saying is rather than ask Ohio and Connecticut to pay a penalty because they did not meet that criteria because they could not come up with the resources to pay for the child care, here as a result of our mandate are some resources on the most critical issue facing any State with its welfare recipients: How do you take a parent that has infant children and no place to put them and get them to go to work?

Sixty percent of all welfare recipients have children age 5 and under, Mr. President. So it is unrealistic to assume those children are going to find some setting in the neighborhood or with a grandparent. Ideally that would be the best case, but realistically that

is not going to happen in enough instances. So it is finding and affording child care that's the issue. The child care settings may vary—church-based programs, community-based programs. There is a wide variety of things the States have done creatively in the child-care setting area. I do not have any difficulty with that kind of flexibility at all. But here are resources.

In the absence of that, we are told that we are looking at an additional cost, above the amount set aside from the block grant, which is the \$5 billion over 5 years. In fiscal year 2000, in the State of Ohio, the additional amount is \$190 million, in the State of Pennsylvania—I see my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania here—\$171 million; for Connecticut, \$48 million; Massachusetts, \$89 million. These are the numbers the States, it is estimated, will have to come up with. They can cut spending. It does not mean necessarily a mandate to raise taxes. But that is the pool they will have to come up with to provide for the child-care needs of the population that moves to work.

If we are mandating that—and we are; we are mandating work—why not provide the States with some help to do it? That is all we are saying here, a pool of money over 5 years, \$6 billion.

Now, it is a lot of money. I know that. But if we all appreciate keeping our mind on the goal of getting people to work, then we ought to be trying to do this in a bipartisan way.

Mr. President, I am not exaggerating. If we get this amendment adopted or something like it—and I think on the issue of the formulas, which is, I think, a minor point—and a few other areas, you could pass this bill 95 to 5. We could have overwhelming, strong support coming out of here for a welfare reform bill, because I think all of us share the common goal of getting people from welfare to work.

Whether that is cost savings or an investment, the value of it, I think all of us appreciate, to the family, the neighborhood, the community, is tremendously enhanced. And if child care is one of the major obstacles to moving an individual to work, because they do not know where to put that child, then trying to find the way for them to do it, assist the States in that process ought not to be an ideological battle here. We have enough battles on that stuff. This ought not to be one.

So I am urging in these next 40 minutes or so that are remaining that people take a good look at what this is. Understand, it is no entitlement, not a guarantee to anybody, merely assistance to these States to be able to achieve the goal as laid out in the majority leader's bill, and that is to get people to work.

People will tell you even with adequate child care, it is going to be hard. You talk about some pretty heavy numbers to move from welfare to work, and given the economy and downsizing and a lot of other things happening, good jobs, and so forth, are not expand-

ing in our economy. We ought to be talking about that, I hope, one of these days, but nonetheless under the best of circumstances, it is going to be hard.

It seems to me we ought to be trying at least to make it possible to move those people to work and not have the kind of burden on the States that is laid out here with the particular costs associated with child care. And as I said in response to the point that was being made by the Senator from Massachusetts, we have already got people really trying hard to stay off the welfare rolls and stay at work. It would be a tragedy, in a way, to then have some of these people taking some of the resources they get, plowing them into this area and moving some of these people at work and trying to stay off welfare back on those rolls.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Utah, who was here, who allocated me about 5 or 10 minutes of his time to make this point. I am grateful to him for that.

At this point, I will yield the floor. We may have some additional Members who show up on this issue. But I urge my colleagues in these next remaining minutes here, this is a chance for us, Mr. President, to really put together a bipartisan bill on welfare reform. I honestly believe that if we could adopt this amendment, and a few other things, we would be looking at an overwhelming vote in favor of this welfare reform package.

That is how this body and this Congress ought to be functioning. People want us to come together. They do not want to see bickering and partisan battling. They would like us to find common ground. Here is a way for us to do it on an issue that most people really want to see us focus our attention on. Here is a chance to achieve that goal in the next 45 or 50 minutes. It means doing the right thing. It is truly doing the right thing in terms of welfare reform and eliminating a major obstacle that people face here of moving from the rolls of public assistance to the independence and self-reliance of work and helping them out with their kids. And those children's needs, as I said a moment ago, Mr. President, ought not to be the subject of a partisan debate here. We ought to be able to find the means by which we can assist the families to eliminate at least that question in their mind, assist the States as they move into this process in a way in which we can do it. Resource allocation is simple enough to accommodate.

I again urge my colleagues to take a good look at this and come to this floor, hopefully in the next 50 minutes, and cast a vote in favor of what I think would build a strong, strong vote of support in favor of the majority leader's welfare reform bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair of the time remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 50 minutes

remaining. The Senator from Connecticut has 1 minute 42 seconds.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wanted to congratulate the Senator from Connecticut for his very persuasive case on behalf of the need for child care and making workfare or welfare to work.

I do not think anyone on this side of the aisle disagrees with the basic premise of his amendment, which is if we are going to have people go to work, then we are going to be in some need of child care for working women, single mothers. The question is, How much money are you willing to put up? What will be the impact?

Again, we go back to the start of a lot of these programs, the welfare programs back in the 1960's when they really mushroomed, and a lot of these programs were very well intentioned, but what happened? What were the consequences of these—I am careful not to use the word entitlement because I know the Senator from Connecticut says this is not an entitlement. I agree. It is not an entitlement. But there is enough money in his bill to fill all the day-care slots that are anticipated to be needed.

Well, it is not an entitlement, but it takes care of everyone who needs the service. So while you know it is sort of taking away with one hand, saying it is not an entitlement, it is giving with the other by giving all the money necessary anticipated to have the need. You can say it is not an entitlement, but it is, in fact, almost a guarantee of child care.

So, what are the consequences of this guarantee? And we talked about this in some dialog on Friday. And you know, I have some concerns about people on welfare getting a guarantee of sorts of child care where if someone who is a working mother gets no guarantee at all of having any kind of child-care support. In fact, as the Senator from Connecticut pointed out on numerous occasions, accurately, there is a shortage of day-care slots available for working mothers in this country.

So to suggest we should provide some sort of quasi-guarantee for those on welfare and not for those who are working mothers, I think, sets up a bad precedent, No. 1; and with the law of unintended consequence you may encourage welfare dependency, at least initially, in some cases.

There are several other points I want to make. One is the money. I know we sort of gloss over that around here. Mr. President, \$6 billion is not a whole lot of money, at least if you sit on the Senate floor most days you would think \$6 billion is not a lot of money. But it is a lot of money, and it is given the fact that if you look at what is being proposed in the Republican bill that we are now amending.

The Republican bill over the next 7 years will allow welfare to grow at 70 percent over the next 7 years—70 percent. Welfare programs will grow from

the year 1995 to the year 2002, 70 percent. There will be an increase of 70 percent in these programs. And what we are saying now is that is not enough. We need another \$6 billion more. Just so you understand, you say, well, how much was it going to grow if we did not cut it back, because this bill does have some reduction? Well, it would have grown at 77 percent. So we are taking a program that was supposed to grow over the next 7 years and grow by 77 percent; cut it back to 70 percent. There are those on the other side saying, that is too tough. We need to add another \$6 billion more back to this fund of money.

If you are serious about day care, if you really think child care is that important, well then, I would suggest that you confine it to the 70-percent growth that is going to be experienced over the next 7 years, \$6 billion to offset the money you want to spend, not another quasi-guarantee or almost entitlement for child care.

I just think you have to pass the straight-face test around here. If you really are serious about solving problems—I think we all are. We want to solve the problem of child care in this bill. And I think we have done some things with the Snowe amendment that goes a long way in doing so. So it is now in the Dole modified bill. I think we made a major step forward.

If you are serious about providing and funding more dollars, do not say we need to spend more. That is how we got to where we are today. This bill has to fit into a reconciliation package which, by the way, it does not right now. It does not right now. It is over what, I think, the Budget Committee wants to see in reductions in welfare. We are going to have to get more.

When we go to conference this bill is going to come back with less money, I suspect. The House bill was substantially under this bill. So it will be under this. The House bill had a 5-year timeframe when they passed the bill. And on their 5-year timeframe they had welfare expenditures growing at 42 percent.

Now, that is at a slower rate than our 70 percent over 7 years. So you are going to see we are already going to have to pull back funds. And to suggest that we should come to the floor and we can get a compromise spending more money, that is how we got there and how we got to what the welfare system is. We have always done that, come to the floor and said, "OK. We will compromise and spend more." And everybody will be happy and pass a bill 96 to 1, passing a bill 96 to 1 that perpetuates the same thing—maybe makes everybody feel good, but it does not solve the problem. It does not solve the problem.

So what we are suggesting here is that you know, we are, and I think, continuing in a dialog. I know Senator HATCH has an amendment on day care that I think is a serious amendment. And we are trying to find some ground

to make all of our Members, not just on the Democratic side, but I know myself and others, I know Senator JEFFORDS is going to speak here. We are concerned about the child care aspects of this.

I know Senator JEFFORDS supported the Snowe amendment which is now in the leader's bill. I know he would like to go further. And I know there are other Members who would like to go further. But we have to understand we have budget constraints.

This is not a stingy bill that we are dealing with. Welfare spending will grow by 70 percent over the next 7 years. That is not stingy. That is not uncaring. And to suggest that we can solve the problem and get everybody happy by spending another \$6 billion—I suggest if we got that in there there would be another \$6 billion to spend in another program.

I would also add that Republican Governors, almost every one of them—I know the majority leader has come here and said I think 29 of the 30 Republican Governors in the country have come out and supported the Dole substitute. They comprise roughly 80 percent of the welfare recipients. The Governors of those States have within those States 80 percent of the Nation's welfare recipients. And what they have almost unanimously said to us is "You give us the money you allocated under this bill and we can do the job. We can, in fact, put people to work."

You would think from the comments of some on the other side that we are going to require every mother who has a child under 5 to go to work. I would remind the Senators who are debating this amendment that when this bill goes into effect, the initial participation rates are only 30 percent. That means only 30 percent of all the welfare caseload has to be in a work program. It only goes up to a maximum of 50 percent. So the State always has discretion to take mothers with young children and not require them to work. In fact, many Governors have already told me that is exactly what they would do in most cases because of the cost, and because of the difficulty with day care.

But we provide that flexibility in the law. We already provide that. We already say they can adjust. And the Governors say they can do it. And if you look at some of the plans that have been tried under the 1988 act—I mentioned on several occasions the Riverside, CA, example, where what we have seen is a 14-percent reduction in food stamps, a 20-some reduction—I do not have numbers in front of me—20-some percent reduction that goes out on AFDC, aid to families with dependent children, and a 25-percent reduction in caseload.

Now, that saves money. Why? Why do they save money? They require people to go to work. So you can save money to provide some of that work. And it was a successful program at a time when Riverside, CA, was experiencing a 9 percent-unemployment rate. So it is

not that there are no jobs. There are no jobs. Well, there are jobs, if we do some things like the Dole bill does which allow you to fill some vacancies in cities and counties and local governments, State governments which you cannot under current law. If there is a vacancy in the State government or local government, you want to fill it with a welfare recipient, you can do it. You are not allowed to hire somebody who is a welfare recipient for an open position. Why? That is to protect the union membership at the State and local level. They do not want people on welfare to get some of those jobs. I think that is a crime. That would change under the Dole bill.

So I mean we are doing a lot of things that will encourage—will create more job opportunities which will cause savings as we have seen in examples in the past, where if you have a work requirement, the welfare rolls will go down. Ask Governor Thompson, Governor Engler, and ask others who have tried it. The caseload will go down. People will get to work because of the requirement that is there. And they will save money. And that money can be used to provide for support services for those who have to remain in the program and go to the work program. That is the whole basis behind what we are suggesting here.

I would suggest that what we have provided for again with the Governors, Republican Governors lining up behind this bill, is adequate to fund this program, to fund the child-care programs that are necessary. We have the flexibility of the States with the 50-percent work participation requirement to exempt certain difficult-to-place mothers with young children. I mean there is a lot of flexibility in this program to be able to deal with the problems. I think what we now have to do is make the fiscally responsible vote. Welfare has gotten itself in the problem it has because we have been reluctant in the face of harming children or these horrible things that are going to occur, if we do not provide all the money for everything, all these entitlements. If we do not provide all these entitlements children are going to suffer.

All I would suggest is we provided entitlements for 25 and 30 years. Children are suffering at historic levels. So if it was just money and entitlements there would be no suffering today. There are plenty of entitlements and plenty of suffering to go with it. So let me suggest that maybe what we need is instead of guaranteeing everybody child care, why do we not require work and say that we have to look to families and to other kinds of networks of support to look for child care, just like we have done in this country historically?

One of my real concerns—and this gets to be more of a philosophical concern, if we—as I know the Senator from Connecticut will say we are not guaranteeing, but we darn near are guaranteeing it—if you provide all the money for all the slots, if you do that, you run

into the problem where the Government day-care option is the first resort; that getting Government support for that day care slot is now the first choice, not the last resort. The system as it works today works well. I know there are shortages of day care, but it works well in targeting the mothers who need day care the most. It works well in that you have to go through a very rigorous qualification procedure to be able to qualify for Government-assisted day care. That would probably not be the case if we fully funded all these day care slots.

Mr. DODD. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. DODD. I note the point about the entitlement issue. I think my colleague from Pennsylvania mentioned over the next 7 years there would be a 70-percent increase. I believe it is flat. I do not think there is a penny more. This is \$48 billion. It is for 7 years. There is no inflation factor built in. I think I am correct on that, but I stand corrected if I am wrong.

Mr. SANTORUM. The Senator is right, the AFDC dollars remain flat. When I talk about the 70-percent increase, I talk about all the means-tested entitlement programs included in this bill.

Mr. DODD. As far as the AFDC—

Mr. SANTORUM. The AFDC program is block granted at a flat level, the Senator is right. But, obviously, there are a lot of other support services and means-tested programs that will continue to grow.

The point I tried to make is that with respect to AFDC, you have the flexibility within that program the Governors desire, saying, in fact, they can save money and have money, because of the savings, available to support the work program.

In addition, you have a 50-percent work participation requirement which would give the States the flexibility to exclude a lot of the people that you mentioned who have young children or maybe multiple young children, from having to go to work and the work requirement. We do provide a lot of flexibility there. We think that flexibility goes a long way in solving the problem.

I am hopeful we can look at the past to see what the future holds. Looking at the past and seeing all the entitlements we put in place and seeing all the money that we spent trying to make sure nobody is harmed, what we have done is make sure that nobody has been helped. What we have not done is challenge people to do more, to move forward.

I believe this program, with the work requirement and the participation standards we have and the flexibility given to States, will do just that: challenge people to go out and work and find ways to provide for themselves and their families. I think, in the long run, that will be the best for everyone concerned.

At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we all are having a hard time with this amendment and with this bill. We all want to see welfare reform. We all want to see child care provided, and, thus, I rise in support of this amendment because I think it will help us move in that direction.

We all agree that we want to see more welfare recipients in the work force. We all agree that the welfare cycle must be broken. I believe giving kids a good start through safe and healthy surroundings is essential to breaking the welfare cycle.

In order to become productive, self-sufficient members of society, kids need quality care from the very beginning of their lives, either from their parents, in the child care setting or elsewhere. And a quality education must be provided from the beginning of their lives. What we are talking about, though, are the resources that will be available and should be available.

We are all tied up with the problems of the deficit and the need to reduce the deficit. But there are things we must consider when we go about providing resources, that if we do not make resources available for those things that will break the cycle, for those things which will allow our young children to have the possibility of breaking out of the cycle, sort of give the parents of the children the ability to provide the child care necessary, then one important segment of breaking that cycle will not come about.

Let us take a look at the macro picture that we must have and what we have to deal with so that we can recognize what the savings are from improving the education of our society and, most importantly, from the beginning of life, in child care to be sure these young children have the opportunity to have the surroundings that will allow them to learn.

This chart gives us an idea of what we are losing now because we have serious educational problems in our country. One-half of a trillion dollars in GDP is lost per year because we fail to educate our people. The cost to our economy is more than \$125 billion, in addition to lost revenues; \$208 billion is lost from the result of the problems of welfare. So when we are talking about \$1 billion a year or more to try and get enough money available for child care, to give to the children, weigh that against what is lost.

In addition to that, I will have an amendment that says, hey, we have a demand here, an important demand that says every person in training must have a GED, must have a high school equivalent education. There is not money for that either. So what we are going to be doing is either creating a huge mandate upon the States that is unfunded or going forward with expectations which will not be fulfilled.

Let us take a look at the relationship of education to productivity, what is

happening to those who do not have a good education.

The only people who have increased their income over the past few years are professionals. This is over the last 20 years. In the last 20 years, the only people who have increased their standard of living is at the level of master's, doctorates, and professionals. Others have either stayed at the bachelor level or gone down. Then take a look at the comparison of what is earned by those who do not finish high school: \$12,800 per family. That is incredibly low and is going down in the sense of percentage of income.

How do we break out of this? How do we provide those resources? It is stupid to cut back on those things which is going to increase your deficit. If we do not provide the amount of money that is necessary for child care, there is no chance that we are going to raise this level up, until you get to the area where you have a high enough standard of living to survive.

So what this amendment tries to do is to say, "Look, we are going to make sure that our children will have an opportunity to have the kind of income that will bring them out of the welfare cycle, to place them in a position where they can earn what is necessary, to get us out of the position of losing all this money we do with the welfare situation."

So when we talk in terms of \$1 billion a year over the term of this, as compared to the \$208 billion we are losing by the problems we have with welfare, it means we are just being, really, penny wise and pound foolish, and we must not do that.

I recognize that my time has expired. May I have an additional 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. JEFFORDS. So as we go forward with this welfare reform, let us keep in mind some things. I do not think there is a person here or the House who does not want welfare reform, including the White House. The question is, how do we reach a consensus?

That is not going to be easy, there is no question about it. We have some people at the extremes of the process from no welfare to all welfare. But what we have to do is to try and reach that middle ground. We have to make some areas where we can have a consensus, and certainly one of those ought to be the provision of child care.

There is not anyone in this body who does not believe there ought to be adequate child care. This amendment is the only thing which will bring us close to that. So, if we are going to have consensus on the issue of child care and if we really want to do what we are supposed to do here, and that is to break through the cycle of welfare, if we are going to give the children of those in the most desperate economic situations in this country the ability for them to have the education which is necessary, all the studies show if they

do not get the early preschool education, they start out at a big disadvantage.

Let me just end up by saying one of my most unusual experiences when I came to the Senate was I had a group of CEO's come into my office when I was first elected to the Senate. John Akers was the head of the group, the Business Roundtable. I expected them all to say, "We need to get capital gains tax relief," blah, blah, blah. What happened? The first thing they said was, "We need to fully fund Head Start. We need to make sure there is preschool education for every one of our kids if we are ever going to get our society in a position where we can be economically sound." Just recently, this IBM president said at the NGA, "This Nation is in a crisis, and if we do not start the educational process we need, this Nation is not going to be the Nation it is today in the next century." I leave those words with you.

Here is an opportunity to make sure the young kids will have the opportunity to get out of the welfare cycle.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am proud to be one of the co-sponsors of the Kennedy-Dodd child-care amendment to the Republican welfare reform bill. No issue more clearly defines the differences in this welfare debate than child care. Both sides have said that the goal of welfare must be to move people to work, but Democrats have maintained that it is not just about moving them to work, it is about keeping them on the job.

We want to provide welfare recipients with the tools to stay on the job. What the facts prove time and time again is that the most necessary tool is child care for children. Child care is the No. 1 barrier keeping mothers out of the work force, and one in four mothers between the ages of 21 and 29 are not working today because of child care. Among welfare mothers, 34 percent are not working because of either inability to find reliable child care or inability to afford child care.

No single parent can look for or keep a job without child care, and single parents make up 88 percent of the AFDC caseload. Without child care, we will have no success in moving people to work and keeping them there.

But child care is costly, and the average middle-class family spends 9 percent of its income on child care. However, the average poor family spends almost 25 percent of its income on child care.

The Republican plan will leave four million children under the age of six home alone. Today, almost 650,000 of them receive child care with assistance that would be eliminated under the Dole plan. In fact, the plan would repeal the child care guarantee passed by the Senate in 1988.

If the States implement the proposed welfare reform plan, the need for child care will increase by more than 200 percent by the year 2000. States will need

over \$4 billion more a year. In Maryland, the unfunded mandate will amount to more than \$1 million a week that Maryland taxpayers will pay to cover child care costs.

This child care policy proves that the Republican bill does not look at the day-to-day lives of real people. Welfare recipients who we send to work will not have high-paying jobs, and will not be able to afford child care.

Suppose a mother lives in suburban Maryland and decides to do the right thing. She gets an entry-level, minimum-wage job in the food service industry. With this job, she is making almost \$9,000 a year, but gets no benefits. After taxes and Social Security, this mother takes home \$175 a week, but her child care costs her \$125 a week. How is she going to pay for rent, food, clothing, and transportation costs with only \$50 left over a week?

Our Democratic Work First plan recognizes that child care is the vital link between leaving welfare and going to work. Our plan consolidates four current programs into one expanded child care block grant, eliminating duplicate paperwork and reporting requirements, and reducing bureaucratic structure.

This block grant will help provide child care for welfare recipients, those transitioning from welfare to work, and the working poor. Under our plan, a family of four making less than \$15,000 a year will be eligible for child care.

On the other hand, the Republican plan forces States into an impossible position. Either the State does not provide child care and welfare reform fails, or they do provide child care by raising taxes and cutting other State programs.

States also can divert aid from the working poor to pay for welfare, but in doing so send a perverse incentive—if you go on welfare, you get help; if you go to work every day and barely make ends meet, you never get a break.

Welfare reform is about ending the cycle and the culture of poverty. Ending the cycle of poverty is an economic challenge, but Democrats are providing the tools to overcome this challenge. The Republicans have no plan.

Ending the culture of poverty is about personal responsibility. Democrats have proposed a tough plan based on tough love. It is a hand up, not a hand out. But Republicans have proposed a punitive plan based on tough luck. It aims for the mother, but hits the child.

This debate should be about ending welfare as a way of life, and making it a step to a better life. That means real work requirements, with the tools to get the job done. If we are to have a bipartisan framework for welfare reform, we must address the work challenge in a way that is real, and deals with people's day-to-day needs.

We must adopt the Kennedy-Dodd amendment and fix the Dole home alone child care policy.

THE NEED FOR CHILD CARE IN WELFARE REFORM

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I think we can all agree on the fundamental goal of welfare reform. We must create a program that moves recipients from welfare to work to economic self-sufficiency as quickly as possible. We must help replace their welfare checks with paychecks.

One obvious way to transform a system which encourages dependency is to eliminate its inherent disincentives. How? Fundamentally, you must make support services—the cornerstone of long-term success in the workplace—more available to low-income people who want to work. The linchpin of successfully transitioning people from welfare to work is child care. And the bill before us today is woefully deficient in providing funding for child care services. In fact, the Dole bill does not guarantee that one cent of the block grant will be spent on child care.

That is why I strongly support the Dodd-Kennedy amendment. It recognizes that no welfare reform proposal can be successful without providing child-care services. And it is willing to invest in those services to ensure a successful outcome.

Most working families feel the pinch of child-care costs. Low-income families, which are often headed by single parents, feel the greatest pinch, spending a quarter of their income for child care. In North Dakota, it costs a family about \$3,400 a year for child care. If a family is just scraping by at poverty level wages—\$14,763 for a family of four—that's an awfully big chunk of your income going to pay for child care.

This situation is all too prevalent in our society. There are too many working poor families, and too many mothers trying to move from welfare to work who are forced back onto the welfare rolls because their child care is too expensive or unreliable.

While the Dole bill does contain child-care provisions, it falls far short of what is needed to help these families achieve true self-sufficiency and economic independence. It fails to guarantee child-care assistance to recipients who are moving to work, and most importantly, it fails to provide additional funding to meet the work requirements contained in the bill—it provides less than half of current child-care spending and doesn't even begin to address the increased need for child care created by the bill's work requirements. In short, it just doesn't put its money where its mouth is, and it is a recipe for disaster.

The ability to secure affordable child care is a decisive factor in determining whether low-income mothers can get off and stay off welfare. If we want to move parents with children off of the welfare rolls and into work, we must pass a welfare reform bill that will ensure that the 10 million children on AFDC will be cared for while their parents look for jobs and begin employment.

The Dodd-Kennedy amendment achieves that goal. To help welfare recipients get and keep a job, this amendment creates a direct spending grant to States with the funding levels set at HHS cost estimates of \$11 billion over 5 years so that the child-care needs created by the Dole work requirements are met. This grant is fully paid for—by earmarking \$5 billion from the title 1 block grant and by cuts in corporate welfare.

The amendment guarantees that no child will be left home alone while their parents are working, looking for work, or participating in an education or training program. And it ensures that families aren't punished for failing to participate in job training or work programs if child care is unavailable.

It also requires States to maintain current spending on child care—without requiring them to match additional child-care spending.

Perhaps most importantly, the Dodd-Kennedy amendment means that critical child-care services for low-income families will continue to be provided under the child care and development block grant.

Parents who are able to work must be given the tools to do so. A critical component of getting families off welfare—and keeping them off—is ensuring safe, adequate and affordable care for their children. The Dodd-Kennedy amendment does just that, and I hope that my colleagues will support it.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am proud to be a co-sponsor of the Dodd-Kennedy child-care amendment to the Republican leader's welfare bill. This amendment backs up the work requirements in this bill with the child care assistance necessary to meet them.

Caring for our children is not an issue that affects only the poor—all working parents need child care. As we debate the issue of how we are going to change the dynamic of the welfare system, it is absolutely crucial that we do all we can to protect children.

We are trying to agree on the best way to get welfare parents, generally single mothers, into jobs and how to keep them there. A single mother should not be forced to choose between properly caring for her children and going to work. And if parents are not working, they cannot support their families. If my wife and I wanted to see a movie, but were unable to find a babysitter for our three children when they were young, then we did not see the movie. How can we expect parents to work when there is no one to care for their children? We need to be realistic in our effort to reform the welfare system.

Welfare reform is not only about adults—it is about children who live in poor families. These children are poor at no fault of their own and the U.S. Congress is punishing them by forcing their mothers out the door, leaving them home without a parent or babysitter.

If we are going to break the cycle of poverty and change the future of poor people in this country, children need to be at the top of our list of priorities. We need to guarantee that children will be cared for in healthy, safe, supportive environments that help them to develop and build their self-confidence. If we do this, if we help children get good child care, we can help parents keep their jobs, and then and only then, will their children learn the importance of working.

Watching their parents come home from work at night will allow children to see the self-confidence that results from bringing home a pay check and being self-supportive. If Congress denies low-income families the child care assistance they need to work, then kids will be left home alone. Do we want television to take over as the caregiver while parents are at work?

If we can give children some structure, a place where they can learn the skills and values they need to stay interested in school, perhaps they will work their way out of poverty and we can start breaking the demoralizing cycle of poverty that has affected millions of Americans.

Anyone who has ever sought child care knows that it can be difficult, stressful, and time consuming. For many families, child care is unavailable and unaffordable and those that lack the economic resources, the time, and information, have fewer options. In many small towns in Vermont, neighbors, friends, and family rely on each other to help out with each other's children. There is usually someone around who can watch the children for a few hours. But not every family lives in that kind of supportive environment. We all need to share the responsibility in meeting the needs of the children of this country. Children growing up in secure, supportive environments benefits us all.

The Republican leader's bill will make child care even more unaffordable for low-income families. As it is, working poor families spend 33 percent of their income on child care. In sharp contrast, middle-class families spend only 6 percent of their income on child care. A single mother of two living on welfare can probably expect to earn about \$5 an hour once she is able to find a job. Child care will cost about \$3 an hour or more for her two children which leaves her \$2 an hour, at most, to live on and support her family—\$2 an hour is not even enough to support one person.

In addition to child care, a single mother must then pay for transportation to work, clothes for herself and her children, rent, food, and medical costs depending on how much assistance she receives from food stamps and Medicaid. Nobody could cover those expenses on \$2 an hour. Nobody. Welfare is the price our country pays to keep families, single mothers and their children, together. If this Congress fails to require States to guarantee child care,

the consequences for many of these families, women and their children, will be tragic.

We must also remember that single mother's did not have their children alone. I certainly hope that strong child support enforcement will decrease the need for Federal assistance, and move single mothers and their families toward self-sufficiency. These efforts alone, however, may not be enough for some families.

Child-care assistance for low-income working parents and those working their way off of welfare is essential. I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the pending amendment and commend Senators DODD and KENNEDY for addressing one of the most critical issues related to welfare reform.

Child care is the linchpin for achieving comprehensive welfare reform because parents must know that their children are supervised and safe in order to go to work. That is just common sense.

But the Dole amendment falls short here. First, it repeals the guarantee that child care must be provided in order for States to take welfare recipients out of the home and put them into the workplace.

Second, the Dole proposal mandates that parents work, but does not provide any additional support for child care. In fact, the plan repeals all existing child-care funding specifically for this purpose.

Mr. President, we all agree that welfare recipients must be required to work. However, if quality, affordable child care is not available parents will be faced with the unacceptable alternative of leaving children at home alone or in unsafe situations. That is really no choice at all.

I have often spoken about the success of the Iowa Family Investment Program. After 22 months, the Iowa welfare reform program is showing good results. More people are working, the caseload is declining and the cost of cash assistance is going down.

These results happened because the State has been investing in education, training, transportation, and, of course, child care.

I often meet with welfare recipients, caseworkers, and other in Iowa regarding welfare reform. The most common concern I hear is the need for child care and the need to provide more resources for this purpose. We must make sure that resources are available for child care or welfare reform will fail. This is a most fundamental issue.

The average annual cost per participant in Iowa's PROMISE JOBS program is \$1,920, including \$987 for child care. It is clear that child care is a critical part of moving welfare recipients into the work force.

Mr. President, I commend Senators DODD and KENNEDY for addressing the important issue of child care and welfare reform and urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HOLLINGS be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises Senators that the Senator from Massachusetts has only 1 minute and 42 seconds, and the Senator from Pennsylvania has 14 minutes and 52 seconds. Therefore, there is insufficient time for the elapse of a quorum call.

Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield time?

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I yield such time as I may consume. I want to go over this amendment again and discuss it specifically for Members who may be torn, as I think many are, in wanting to support work and see the potential need for day care.

Focusing on what the amendment does, we have heard a lot of discussion from the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Massachusetts of the concern for mothers with preschool children, that we cannot allow mothers who have children 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 years of age—and I have three children all under the age of 5 and I am keenly aware of the need for care for young children.

However, this amendment does not just pertain to young children. This provides funding so that every welfare parent with children under 12 years of age—12 and under, under 13—you can have an 11-year-old or 12-year-old and you still get a funded day care slot. That is what the amendment says. This is not just focused on children under 5.

We talk about being concerned for them. This is a much more expansive program. It is not just part-time child care, it is a full-time child care program. It is 12 and under, full time, not just for single moms, not just for single moms or dads who have children, but for married mothers and fathers who may be on welfare and have children. This is for two-parent households as well as single-parent households. That is what the amendment says.

You could have a situation where you have a 12-year-old child at home with two parents, and under this bill, you would get a full-time day care slot paid for by the Federal Government. Would that not be nice if every American who was working, the Government would pay your full-time child care, and you could not even have to work under this bill.

So you do not have to work. You can be married, have a 12-year-old at home,

do not work, and the Government will pay your child care full time. That is what this amendment does.

Now, you hear a lot of compassion on the other side about the single mom with the 2-year-old, but you do not hear that this is another well-intended bill that focuses on the hard problem. And then when you realize this is a brandnew big-time expansive program, day care for everybody on welfare, whether you are married or not, whether you are working or not.

I do not think that is what is being sold here on the Senate floor. I think we have to look very carefully at what is in this amendment and how much money it costs—\$6 billion, fully funded day care slots for all children of married and unmarried parents, single and married parents, up to 12 years of age. Not the preschool kids, but up to 12 years of age.

I think this is a real Pandora's box we have opened. This is not the amendment that is being talked about. This is a very broad, expansive program.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is the Senator familiar with how many parents are waiting for child care in the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. SANTORUM. I think the number is around 9,000.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, 7,779 children now are on the child care waiting list in Pennsylvania, many are single parents, waiting to get off welfare or stay off welfare.

I am wondering, does the Senator believe that for those who want to work and can work, that there ought to at least be some help and assistance, either full or part time, as was included in the bill passed in 1988 and providing at help and assistance for hundreds of thousands of families?

Mr. SANTORUM. If I can reclaim my time, I say the answer is yes. I think we do that in this bill. In the Dole modified bill, we believe there are ample dollars available. Within the AFDC block grant, there will be money available for child care.

You have the additional child care block grant, which is appropriated at \$1 billion for this year and as necessary for future years. We will have this debate every year, Senator.

We are going to have a debate on the floor of the Senate over how much money we will provide in the appropriations process for people on welfare who need day care assistance. I may be back here with you, joining with you in having started this program in place and having seen the needs and heard from the Governors that we may need to appropriate more money in the years ahead. There is nothing that prohibits us from doing that.

But to lock in—you do not call it an entitlement, but it might as well be one—to lock in a program of \$6 billion right now, not just again for young

kids, for children under the age of 5, but for children up to the age of 12, for parents who are single and married, I think that just goes too far.

I hope that my colleagues will look at the expansiveness of this amendment, the cost of this amendment, and I think the unfairness of this amendment when juxtaposed to the working family in America.

We are telling the working family in America that, if you want to raise children, fine. But you are on your own. But if you go on welfare, even if you are married, we are going to provide a full-time government day-care slot for you. I think that goes too far.

I hope we will reject this amendment, that we will continue to work—as I know the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] has talked about, and I know the Senator from Vermont and others who are looking at this issue will—we will continue to work to see what we can do to make sure that people are not disqualified from working because of the unavailability of day care. That is what the Snowe amendment—

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SANTORUM. If I can finish—that is what the Senator's amendment does. It focuses in on the problem areas. It says, if you cannot find day care, and if you can show that day care is unavailable, whether it is just too costly, given the amount of money you receive on welfare, or it is not proximate to where you live, or whatever the case may be—and there is a laundry list of things that you can use to show the unavailability of day care—under the Snowe amendment that is included in the Dole package now, if you can show that day care is unavailable, you are exempted from the work requirements.

That is a very important measure. Because what that does is it says to the State—which, I remind you, has to have, when this program is finally phased in, half of the people in the program in the work program. Those people who cannot find day care remain in the denominator but not in the numerator. So they are part of the base of 100 percent, but they do not go toward the 50 percent you need for work participation. If you have a sufficient lack of day care, that is going to have a big effect on your ability to meet your 50 percent work participation standards.

We believe that will be adequate impetus, in fact more than adequate impetus, to get the States to provide day-care services that are necessary to get younger mothers, in particular, into the workplace. We think that kind of flexibility and dynamics are better than creating out of the box a fully funded entitlement—or guarantee, it is not an entitlement—guarantee that you are going to have day care if you are on welfare: You get day care if you have children under age 13 whether you are married or not, whether you are working or not. I just think that is too big of a loophole, too big of a grant.

And I think it is an unwise move by the U.S. Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is that what the Senator understands the Dodd amendment will do, provide day care for all children? The Senator just said that. Is that what the Senator understands it to do? You said it. Of course—

Mr. SANTORUM. If I can reclaim my time, I will be happy to answer the question. It says on page 4 of the amendment, eligible children are—

For purposes of this section, the term "eligible child" means an individual, who is less than 13 years of age and resides with a parent or parents who are working pursuant to a work requirement contained in section 404 of the Act.

So I think it is clear that those who are eligible are under 13 years of age, can be with a single parent or parents, which I assume means married.

Mr. KENNEDY. And what percent in the Dole proposal would be included under that requirement? What percent in the Dole proposal will not be so included?

As the Senator knows, half of those will be required to work in order for the States not to be penalized. They are going to have to find their child care outside of these requirements.

The Senator understands that?

Mr. SANTORUM. Right.

Mr. KENNEDY. When the Senator says this amendment is effectively saying to every parent that all children will receive child care, that is not a fair characterization of the amendment. I mean, I think that is what we ought to do—but that is one fact that the Senator is wrong on. And second, how does the Senator understand the discretionary block grant? Who is eligible for that?

Mr. SANTORUM. My understanding, if I can respond to the first point, is that the Senator from Connecticut has repeatedly said the formula was calculated based on fully funding every welfare parent who is required to work with children under 12. That includes single parents and married parents. So there will be parents who will not have to work because only one of them will be required to work that will, in fact, get day care. I think that is a little much.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator knows, the Dole proposal requires that half of all families on welfare participate in the work program. HHS estimates that half of these families will find their own child care. The Dodd amendment is focused on those families that will need child care assistance in order to move from welfare to work.

So it is not all of those. It is those that they believe—50 percent of the adults that otherwise would need the child care under this proposal.

Let me just ask the Senator—

Mr. SANTORUM. If I can reclaim my time, the 50 percent participation standard means that 50 percent of the people in the welfare program are going to be required to be in a work program. The other 50 percent are not

required to be in a work program and therefore the need for day care, I would assume—there would be no need for day care because they would not be in a work program.

So, what the Dodd amendment does is provide funding for those who have to work. That is my understanding.

Mr. KENNEDY. First of all, I am a strong supporter of the need for child care to move people off of welfare into work. But second, how does the Senator understand the block grant program? Who is eligible for the discretionary block grant program?

Mr. SANTORUM. Under the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. KENNEDY. No, just under the existing program, the \$1 billion that is existing under the discretionary program. Who is eligible for that?

Mr. SANTORUM. Before I answer that question, how much time is there remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 2 minutes 20 seconds. The Senator from Massachusetts has 1 minute 24 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think we have another 15 minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. I will put a unanimous consent in, and then I will be happy to respond.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the vote on or in relation to the Dodd amendment occur at 5:15 p.m. today, notwithstanding the previous order, with the time between now and 5:15 equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. My understanding is, under the current proposal, that money is a block grant to the States with the States' discretion to provide those funds.

Mr. KENNEDY. The existing discretionary block grant program, who is participating in that program today? The program originally created by Senators DODD and HATCH.

Mr. SANTORUM. I do not know the answer to that.

Mr. KENNEDY. See, this is part of the problem, Mr. President, using these characterizations loosely. That program is targeted to low-income working families. It provides \$1 billion and 700,000 families struggling to make ends meet and stay off welfare. It has been supported by Republicans and Democrats alike. The idea, under these proposals, is to assist those who are making the minimum wage, who still receive the \$13,000 for the family and still cannot afford the child care they need to get by.

The Senator mentioned earlier that he is concerned about trying to provide some help and assistance to working poor families. I hope then he opposes diverting these essential resources away from working poor families as is encouraged by the Dole bill.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, if I can reclaim my time, I just think, within the existing AFDC block grant, there are funds available, that are cur-

rently available under the AFDC program, for child care. Those funds would continue to be available if the State should so desire to create a program to provide assistance for people on welfare in addition to the block grant funding. So what we do is provide State flexibility to be able to use those funds as the State sees fit, which is in keeping with what this side of the aisle was trying to do, which is for the States to be able to design, we believe, better programs than a Washington-based program.

Again, I think throughout this dialog we found that, in fact, this program is an expansive, new—I will not use the term "entitlement" because there is not an entitlement in the law—but it fully funds every slot that is necessary. I know that is not an entitlement because you cannot go in there and go to court and say I am entitled to this money. But the money is there. Anyone who has a child under the age of 13, one or two parents, will be able to get fully funded government day care, a full-time day-care slot.

Again, it is the option of first resort, not last resort. If you look at the money the Senator from Massachusetts was just talking about, the block grant funding, and he talks about how many working families are waiting for this assistance, it is not the option of first resort. You have to look at family and neighbors and friends. That, I would think, would still be—it is harder. But I think we have done enough to say that families are not important in this country or that fathers are not important in this country, to continue to provide money to replace existing social networks and just say the Government will do it. You do not need the father's money. You do not need a father around anymore. We will pay the father's money. That is what AFDC is for and all these other programs. You do not need grandparents or cousins. We will have a fully funded Government day care slot for you. We do not need family support. What does that mean? That is not necessary. We will continue to isolate you from your surroundings. I think that is harmful. I think guaranteeing something up front is harmful in the long run. It may sound good, but it will continue to destroy the fabric and culture of our society where we used to be interdependent. And because the Government is now coming in and doing everything for you, you have become this island unto yourself.

I think it is a very sad state in our communities. And we will only add to that with this program.

I hope we do not accept this amendment.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time remains? I see the leader on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The Senator from Massachusetts has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. May I have 3 minutes?

Mr. President, I have listened to my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania. I listened to him describe the Dodd amendment. I have difficulty understanding his interpretation. There are 60 percent of welfare mothers today who have children 5 years of age or younger. Under the most recent modification, they would not be sanctioned for failure to participate in the work program. It is clearly better for parents to stay home than to leave their children home alone, but what about the great number of those individuals who want to work, would like to work, could work, will work, and are just looking for the opportunity and the child care they need to enable them to work. The Senator from Pennsylvania says, "Well, we are not going to be punitive to them." Well he is right, the most recent modification is better than the original bill, but it is not enough.

The final point that I want to mention again is what the National Council of Churches says with regard to this. I have read it. They believe we need increased access to child care. The National Conference of State Legislatures, bipartisan, believes that we need additional child care. The American Public Welfare Association thinks we need additional child care. The Catholic Charities talk about it. They think we need additional child care, and the list goes on. The National Parent-Teachers Association agrees.

These are groups that are operating programs for children every single day, talking with parents and listening to their concerns. They are on the frontlines, and this is what their conclusion is.

Our amendment will promote work and protect children. It will improve the lives and the livelihoods of millions of American families. That is why I think the amendment is needed.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I will use my leadership time for whatever time I may consume to speak in behalf of the Dodd amendment.

Mr. President, let me begin by thanking the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his excellent comments and for the leadership that he has shown on this issue throughout this debate, and certainly the Senator from Connecticut, the senior Senator, Senator DODD, for his work in bringing us to this point this afternoon. His leadership and the effort that he has invested in this issue for many years is illustrative of the contribution that he has made on a number of issues relating to children. And this is perhaps the most important contribution of all.

As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has indicated, you simply cannot have welfare reform if you do not address the issue of child care adequately. There can be no doubt that it is the linchpin between welfare and work. Why? Because 60 percent of AFDC families have children under 6. Why? Because, in many cases, those same families cannot find adequate day

care, cannot afford day care even if they can find it, and have great anxiety about leaving their children unattended.

I do not care whether it is one parent or two parents. If we want them to go out and work, if we want them to go out and get the skills necessary so they can work—time after time they have told us, and time after time virtually every social organization has indicated—you have to find a way to take care of their children. That is what this amendment does. It says in a meaningful way we are going to create a partnership. We are not going to tell you who to take your children to. We are not going to create some new governmental system to do it. We are simply going to give you the means by which you can find the best way to take care of your children.

This will affect every single welfare family. You have to have a child to be on welfare, period. You do not meet the definition if you do not have a child.

Child care enables mothers to go to work, to have the confidence to leave their home. Parents cannot accept their responsibilities as parents if they leave their children at home alone without any supervision, without any care, without any knowledge of what is going to happen to their children, especially at those early ages.

Let me address another point that was raised in this most recent colloquy. It is not just the child who is under the age of 4 or 5 and not yet ready to go to school that we ought to be concerned about. What happens to those children who are going to school, who come back in the mid to late afternoon to a home without a parent, without anybody to take care of them through the end of the day? What happens to them? What kind of supervision, what kind of care, what kind of nutrition, what kind of attention are they going to get? This amendment addresses that concern. It is not just a concern for those who are under the age of 6 and not able to go to school. We have to be equally as concerned with those children who come home in the afternoon and have no supervision, especially in those early ages.

Families below poverty spend almost 30 percent of their income on child care, Mr. President. Nonpoor families only spend about 7 percent of their income on child care. There is no secret why low-income families are not capable of addressing the need for child care in their own families.

Child care costs in the District of Columbia can run as high as \$150 to \$175 per week. The average monthly benefit for an AFDC recipient is less than \$400. So we are asking many parents today to spend more in 1 month on child care alone than they receive in AFDC. Obviously, Mr. President, it is an incredible impediment for many people.

So what happens is that most people today are relegated to finding other ways of ensuring that their children are cared for. They depend on relatives

who may or may not be reliable or informal arrangements that may or may not work on a daily basis. A job requires reliable child care, and often that is very hard to find.

So in many cases, Mr. President, parents are simply forced to make do. And all too often, unfortunately, they do not make do. All too often they are forced to rely on low-quality care.

We believe that quality child care is too important to child development to leave those children home alone or to make a way somehow on a day-to-day basis with relatives or families or people in the neighborhood to care for their children. Studies show that the first 3 years of life in some ways are the most critical of all. Quality care can clearly change the lives of children today. Quality care can truly give kids a head start. Quality care can relieve parental stress and give people the confidence they need to walk out of that door and go to their job, go on and achieve meaningful job skills, and do so with the knowledge that they can be a productive, cohesive, and successful family when the work is done.

Mr. President, that is all we are asking. Let us give families an opportunity to be families. Let us give them the opportunity to be strong families. Strength is defined in part by how strong the children are, by how nourished, how educated, how guided, how attended, and how cared for they are.

The Republican plan, frankly, is nonexistent in this regard. It is nice to have all the nice sounding rhetoric, but the fact is you have nothing if you do not put resources next to it. There are no resources in the Dole bill. It is estimated that the Dole bill in its current form is underfunded by almost \$11 billion in the area of child care.

So there is no assurance that the children of single mothers will be adequately cared for. As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has said over and over, the Home Alone bill is not what this piece of legislation ought to be.

The modification made by the majority leader last week does not address this concern. In fact, it only exacerbates the problem. As the Senator from Pennsylvania has alluded to, the bill prohibits States from sanctioning mothers with children under 6. That may be good in some cases. But that is not the real issue. That does not help mothers become self-sufficient. It is a de facto exemption from the work requirement.

We do not want to exempt mothers, and we do not want to exempt States that do not provide the resources. We want States to provide the resources so that mothers will have the tools and the opportunities they are going to need.

Mr. President, the Dole bill in its current form will exempt 60 percent of those who are eligible for welfare today. Why? Because 60 percent of AFDC mothers have children under 6.

As the Dole bill is written, it will exempt any mother among that 60 percent that cannot find or afford child care.

States already had to pay for day care. It was an unfunded mandate, but they were required to pay it or exempt mothers and take a 5-percent cut in the block grant. The likelihood now is even greater that the bill has virtually no value in terms of putting people to work or providing child care.

So that is why this amendment is so important. This amendment says a number of things. First of all, it says we cannot expect parents to walk out that door, achieve the desired goals of this bill—that people either acquire skills or acquire a job—if they have to leave their children at home alone.

Second, it provides the resources necessary to make this happen. We ensure, not only that States are going to establish the mechanisms by which to provide those services, but that States are going to have the resources to see that that happens.

Third, the Dodd-Kennedy amendment is tough on work but not on kids. We require able-bodied adults to work or to prepare for work. We ensure that when they do, we are going to enter into a partnership with them to see that their children are cared for. We guarantee that child care assistance is provided, and we do so not by exempting the mothers with children who cannot find day care, but by helping them find the child care they need to allow them to work in the first place.

It is very clear. The adoption of this amendment is the linchpin to welfare reform. We are not going to get it without child care. We are not going to get it without the level of resources required to provide meaningful child care. We are not going to get it simply by exempting mothers who have no other recourse but to stay at home because child care is not available.

There has been a lot of rhetoric in this debate. The most important thing we can do to change rhetoric to real action is to pass this amendment, to provide the resources, to provide the mechanisms, and, most importantly, to provide mothers the confidence that they can be a family when they come home from work at night. This investment in children is as important to kids as it is to mothers, as it is to the system itself. It deserves our support, and I hope Republicans will join us in the passage of it as we take up the vote momentarily.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, what time is remaining on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania controls 5 minutes, 45 seconds.

Mr. SANTORUM. Their time has expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes and seven seconds on the minority side.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield back all of his time? Is that correct?

Mr. DODD. The Democratic leader just spoke. Does anybody on that side wish to be heard on this?

Mr. SANTORUM. I would like to recognize the Senator from Washington for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I just want to say that the abstractions with which we deal with issues like this here are very different from the reality on the streets.

On my way back here from Seattle today, I read a long and fascinating article in the New York Times about the cultural differences among various kinds of gangs in the city of Los Angeles. The reporter reports on the particular ethos of black gangs, of Asian gangs, and of Hispanic gangs. In Los Angeles, the Spanish gangs account for most of the street murders, in the number of hundreds every year, but they do have a strong sense of family. And the principal part of the story is about a 15-year-old gang member with a 17-year-old girlfriend who has a 1-year-old child by this gang member.

If I may, I will share the last two paragraphs of that story with you, Mr. President.

"He's always staying home now," Tanya said hopefully. "He doesn't want to miss nothing. He's saying, 'Can't you just leave the baby with me. I'll watch the baby and you go to school.'"

Dreamer is still only school age—

He is 15.

Tanya acknowledged, but the young family expects to be financially secure. Her mother receives Federal assistance to care for her through Aid to Families with Dependent Children. And now, Tanya said, she will also receive AFDC assistance to care for her own daughter, who is named Josefina.

So here we are subsidizing gangs and gang warfare in Los Angeles. That is why we need to pass this bill. That is why we need to deal with reality.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I just want to remind Members what this amendment does. This is not an amendment targeted at preschool children, to provide single mothers support for preschool children. Children aged 12 and under are eligible for a full-time guaranteed day care slot under this proposal, under the Dodd amendment including two-parent families. Not just single mothers but two-parent families also qualify for a full-time day care slot. It also has a 100-percent maintenance-of-effort provision in this bill on the States.

This is a throwback to some of the ideas that we were debating for the past 2 decades. This is not in a new direction. This is not the direction we should take if we are going to reform the welfare system and get people back to work and get back to self-sufficiency.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the Dodd amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, very briefly, first of all, just in response to my friend from Pennsylvania, we say with regard to children that they should not be penalized if there are two parents. In fact, we ought to be encouraging that. And second, for after-school programs, it does not mean all-day child care, people in school. Obviously, it does not apply in those cases.

However, let me get back to the central point, Mr. President, if I can, in conclusion. We all want to see people move from welfare to work, and assist in that process. Every survey that has been done over the last decade has indicated that one of the major obstacles of people moving from welfare to work is the absence of child care.

Sixty percent of all AFDC recipients have children age 5 and under. If we are truly committed to moving people from welfare to work and we want to assist States in that process, we must provide adequate funds for child care. Because this bill mandates a 25-percent work requirement in 2 years, and 50 percent by the year 2000—we set that as a mandate in this bill—we should assist States in making that happen. All this amendment does is provide the assistance in a pool of money.

It is not an entitlement. It does not guarantee anybody anything. Merely on a proportional basis based on the block grant, it says to the States, "Here is a pool of money to assist you in providing those families that you are moving from welfare to work with child care."

Everyone knows that any effort to go from welfare to work, with infant children, that does not provide for child care will fail. And all of us do not want to see that happen.

So, Mr. President, I urge that we come together. This is an authorization—authorization. Money will have to be appropriated. If the numbers are less, then appropriate to less. But let us not try to divide over this issue that has united us in the past. Let us see if we cannot here find some common ground.

I happen to believe, Mr. President, we would pass welfare reform 95-5 if we would adopt the Dodd amendment on child care. We could end the acrimony. We could have a good welfare reform bill. We could assist our States. And we could move people from welfare to work. Let us not miss this opportunity, for once, to come together in this Congress on an issue this critical and this important to the American public.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I move to table the Dodd amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on the motion to table.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would vote "yea."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 406 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Abraham	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Packwood
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Chafee	Hatfield	Santorum
Coats	Helms	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Dole	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Faircloth	McCain	

NAYS—48

Akaka	Feingold	Leahy
Baucus	Feinstein	Levin
Biden	Ford	Lieberman
Bingaman	Glenn	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Harkin	Moynihan
Breaux	Heflin	Murray
Bryan	Hollings	Nunn
Bumpers	Inouye	Pell
Byrd	Jeffords	Pryor
Campbell	Johnston	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Robb
Daschle	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kohl	Simon
Exon	Lautenberg	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—2

Gramm	Simpson
-------	---------

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 2560) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SANTORUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas, Mrs. KASSEBAUM.

There are 4 minutes of debate, evenly divided.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, may we have order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Kansas, [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2522

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, first, I would like to ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I will reiterate why I believe this amendment is important.

Mr. President, I, too, feel strongly about the importance of child care. In order to make our welfare reform effort successful, I could not support the measure that we just voted on because I felt it was an amount of money that could not be sustained and was not offset in a way that I felt would be successful.

The rationale for my amendment is briefly three parts. It creates a unified system of child care at the State level, with one State plan. It is not an effort to, in any way, intrude on the infringement of one committee over another. It is my idea that a consolidation of these efforts is important, and it provides one set of regulations, rather than a two-track system. So it does not transfer jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee child care program to the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. But it does set up a single system through which child care is handled. It prevents families from experiencing disruptions in their child care since their eligibility is no longer tied to specific program requirements, that is, AFDC. Instead, eligibility is based on a family's income, through a sliding fee scale that the State determines. As parents earn more, they make a greater contribution for child care assistance.

I feel it is very important that low-income families can be able to move off of welfare rolls and yet still be able to maintain some support for child care. It preserves the limited funding for child care for low-income working families, many of whom rely on this assistance to stay off of the welfare rolls. For example, for a family of two earning minimum wage, average yearly child care costs consume 47 percent of the household gross income. That is a significant amount, Mr. President. I believe families do need some support because it is the children that we do have to protect in this process.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAIRCLOTH). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 407 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Abraham	Exon	Leahy
Akaka	Feingold	Levin
Baucus	Feinstein	Lieberman
Bennett	Ford	Lugar
Biden	Frist	Mikulski
Bingaman	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Boxer	Graham	Murray
Bradley	Grams	Nunn
Breaux	Harkin	Pell
Bryan	Hatch	Pressler
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pryor
Burns	Heflin	Reid
Byrd	Helms	Robb
Campbell	Hollings	Rockefeller
Chafee	Hutchison	Santorum
Coats	Inouye	Sarbanes
Cochran	Jeffords	Shelby
Cohen	Johnston	Simon
Conrad	Kassebaum	Snowe
Craig	Kempthorne	Specter
Daschle	Kennedy	Stevens
DeWine	Kerrey	Warner
Dodd	Kerry	Wellstone
Domenici	Kohl	
Dorgan	Lautenberg	

NAYS—22

Ashcroft	Inhofe	Packwood
Brown	Kyl	Roth
Coverdell	Lott	Smith
D'Amato	Mack	Thomas
Dole	McCain	Thompson
Faircloth	McConnell	Thurmond
Grassley	Moynihan	
Gregg	Nickles	

NOT VOTING—2

Gramm	Simpson
-------	---------

So the amendment (No. 2522) was agreed to.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2523

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question—the Senate will please be in order.

The question is on the amendment No. 2523, offered by Senator HELMS. There are 4 minutes evenly divided. Who yields the time?

The distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I do not believe I can talk over the various discussions going on.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order. The Senator is right. He is entitled to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. FORD. The Chair can call names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, instead of making remarks, I have prepared a sheet that is on every Senator's desk that explains, or refutes in one or two cases, suggestions about what this amendment does or does not do.

Let me go down the list. First, the question and then the answer.

How much of the taxpayers' money will this amendment save?

CBO says it will save \$5.68 billion over 7 years.

What are the work requirements under the Helms amendment? And by the way it is cosponsored by the distinguished occupant of the chair, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. GRAMS of Minnesota, and Mr. SHELBY of Alabama. What are the work requirements under the Helms amendment?

Food stamp recipients must work a total of 40 hours over a 4-week period before receiving benefits.

Question. Are temporarily unemployed people denied food stamps?

No, community service will count as work.

Are work requirements in the Helms amendment stronger than in the Dole amendment? And, incidentally Senator DOLE supports the Helms amendment.

Yes. The Dole amendment allows recipients to receive food stamps for a full year and requires only 6 months of work to qualify.

Will pregnant women be denied food stamps?

No, there are millions of pregnant women who went to work this morning. But if and when they are unable to work they can and will get food stamps when qualified.

Will retired people be denied food stamps?

Of course not. Citizens over 55 are exempt from the work requirements.

How many individuals does the Helms amendment target?

It targets the 2.5 million able-bodied individuals who refuse to work.

Exempted by this amendment are children under 18, parents with children, parents with disabled dependents, mentally or physically unfit, and all who are over 55.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to speak in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, the dilemma with the Helms amendment is very simple. That is in many communities throughout the country there are not volunteer programs. There are not work programs that people could take up. In some cases, there are not jobs.

Frankly, the problem is the amendment affects able-bodied people who are temporarily laid off, as people sometimes are in this country, during recessions or during closing of factories or economic change. It does not really give a very good opportunity for those people to qualify for food stamps.

USDA estimates 700,000 people would be affected. By and large, these are people, often with long work records, who temporarily have bad luck.

In my judgment, the amendment has the merit of trying to tighten up the

food stamp situation but it does so at the expense of able-bodied Americans who should not be penalized.

I encourage the Senate to defeat the amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is true that this amendment by itself would save money. But you could also say that if we had an amendment that totally did away with the food stamp program that would save even more money.

Basically what this says is you could be somebody who has worked in the plant for 15 years, you paid your taxes, you are an upright citizen who paid for the programs and everything else, and if that factory, the largest employer in the area, should suddenly close, and you cannot find a job within 30 or 31 days later and if you are looking for food stamps you are not going to get them because you have not worked in the last 30 days. This is far too punitive. It is going to make it extremely difficult, as the senior Senator from Indiana said, for those who have been employed who because of a disaster or a plant closing or something else are out of a job. It goes much too far.

FOOD STAMP WORK AMENDMENT

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senators HELMS and FAIRCLOTH to offer this amendment to the welfare reform bill. This amendment is based on the simple notion that recipients of public assistance should give something in return for their benefits. To not require work for welfare, is to promote irresponsibility, which is ultimately harmful to the recipient.

This amendment is straightforward. It states that those recipients of food assistance, who are able-bodied, do not have any dependents, and are between the ages of 18 and 55, must work for an average of 40 hours per month in order to receive their food assistance.

Some critics might point out that the Dole amendment already has work requirements for Food Stamp recipients. However, those work requirements do not begin until 6 months after the person begins receiving food assistance. Workfare programs should resemble the private sector to the greatest extent possible, and I do not know of any business which pays its employees for 6 months before the employee ever begins working. Our work requirement is structured identically to private sector employment: wages—or benefits in this case—are paid after the service is rendered. This will promote personal responsibility and self-sufficiency.

Finally, one of the main benefits of work requirements is that they are a humane way of screening people off of welfare who do not belong on the rolls. Many people receiving benefits which are now free, will opt to pursue other options they currently have in the private sector if they are faced with even a minimal work requirement. If they have no such options, they will be able to continue to receive benefits in ex-

change for community service. However, CBO has estimated that this work requirement will save taxpayers \$5.5 billion over 7 years, due to a decrease in the food stamp rolls of more than 1 million individuals. This will free up money to be used on people who are in genuine need, who have small children, and who have no employment options in the private sector.

Again, this amendment does not affect anyone with small children, or anyone who is disabled or elderly. It is carefully targeted at those who are the most likely to be able to move into the private sector.

Mr. President, this is a responsible amendment, and one I hope my colleagues will support.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak out against the amendment offered by the senior Senator from North Carolina.

Let me be clear. I am for reform of the Food Stamp Program. I am willing to toughen up work requirements. I am for elimination of fraud. That is why Democrats included reforms in our welfare reform.

We include increased civil and criminal forfeiture for grocers who violate the Food Stamp Act. We require stores to reapply for the Food Stamp Program so that we make sure that fraud is not taking place. We disqualify grocers who have already been disqualified from the WIC Program. We encourage States to use the electronic benefits transfer program and we allow them to require a picture ID. We require able-bodied people who are between 18 to 50 to work after a period.

The fight here is over food, not fraud. This amendment would say to workers in my State and States across this country that if you are a victim of a plant closing, you won't get any food stamps unless you go out and work. This amendment is tough on new mothers. Under this amendment, if you are about to have your first child and for some reason you lose your job, you are cut off from food stamps unless you work. Cut off at the most critical time in life for good nutrition. This amendment doesn't recognize that some areas are hit by high unemployment. This proposal fails to realize that we do have recessions.

In a time when we denounce mandates to the States, this is exactly what the proposal does—it mandates further costs. This amendment offers no funding to help these workers find work or create jobs. It is assumed that State and local governments can do this on their own. State and local governments will have to enforce these new Food Stamp requirements at the very time they are reinventing their welfare program.

Mr. President, I am for welfare reform including the Food Stamp Program. I am not for denying help to those who truly need it and that is what this amendment does. I urge my

colleagues to vote this amendment down so we can get on to real reform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LÖTT. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 66, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 408 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Abraham	Gregg	Nickles
Brown	Helms	Pressler
Coats	Hutchison	Roth
Coverdell	Inhofe	Santorum
Craig	Kempthorne	Shelby
Dole	Kyl	Smith
Faircloth	Lott	Stevens
Frist	Mack	Thompson
Gorton	McCain	Thurmond
Grams	McConnell	Warner
Grassley	Murkowski	

NAYS—66

Akaka	Dodd	Lautenberg
Ashcroft	Domenici	Leahy
Baucus	Dorgan	Levin
Bennett	Exon	Lieberman
Biden	Feingold	Lugar
Bingaman	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bond	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Glenn	Moynihan
Bradley	Graham	Murray
Breaux	Harkin	Nunn
Bryan	Hatch	Packwood
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pell
Burns	Heflin	Pryor
Byrd	Hollings	Reid
Campbell	Inouye	Robb
Chafee	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Cochran	Johnston	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kassebaum	Simon
Conrad	Kennedy	Snowe
D'Amato	Kerrey	Specter
Daschle	Kerry	Thomas
DeWine	Kohl	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—2

Gramm	Simpson
-------	---------

So the amendment (No. 2523) was rejected.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I will ask unanimous consent as to how we may proceed. It has been worked out and cleared by the Democrats. There will be no more votes tonight.

Unfortunately, we could not get anybody to offer an amendment, but we do have an agreement the Senator from California and the Senator from North Dakota will offer amendments and votes will occur tomorrow.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand

in recess until 9 a.m. Tuesday, September 12, 1995, and the Senate immediately resume consideration of H.R. 4, the welfare bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that at 9 a.m. there be 10 minutes for debate on the pending Conrad amendment No. 2529, to be followed immediately by a vote on or in relation to the Conrad amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. I further ask that following disposition of the Conrad amendment, there be 4 minutes equally divided in the usual form on the Feinstein amendment No. 2469, to be followed immediately by a vote on or in relation to the Feinstein amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. I further ask that following disposition of the Feinstein amendment, Senator BREAUX be recognized to offer his amendment concerning maintenance of effort; that the time prior to 12:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form and a vote occur on or in relation to the Breaux amendment at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate to my colleagues on both sides, I think there are a couple hundred amendments pending. We did not dispose of very many today. It is my understanding there are about 19 cleared on this side. And we hope we might be able to dispose of those this evening if they can be cleared on the other side. They are both Democratic and Republican amendments, and not controversial, as I understand it.

I have not seen the amendments myself. But I think we have indicated—at least I have indicated, and I think the Democratic leader, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE, agrees—we ought to complete action on this bill Thursday, that on Friday take up the State, Commerce, Justice appropriations bill, and either complete action on that Friday—the chairman would like it Friday or Saturday, that bill, because we do need to complete action on the remaining appropriations bills and go to conference and send them down to the President before October 1.

And so there is a lot of pressure on us to get the work done. We still have the six appropriations bills to do. Two or three will take some time. A couple of them may go rather quickly. So I would suggest that we have got a lot of work to do in a rather short time.

I know that some of my colleagues will have problems in the first week in October because of religious holidays. And we want to accommodate everybody, try to accommodate everybody, as we should. But hopefully we will have the appropriations bills done, so it will be easier to accommodate those who have particular concerns in that area.

So I would urge my colleagues to cooperate with the managers on each side so we can complete action on this bill on Thursday evening.

I will be sending a cloture motion to the desk. In fact, I will do it right now.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. DOLE. I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I have three pending amendments that I would be prepared to take up after the Breaux amendment has been disposed of, and if it is appropriate, if you would amend your unanimous-consent request to take up the three Moseley-Braun amendments thereafter.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Did you want 1 hour?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. An hour would be sufficient.

Mr. DOLE. For each one?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. One hour for all three.

Mr. DOLE. I think now that we have two Democratic amendments pending, our hope would be that we take up the Ashcroft amendment, the Shelby amendment, and then the amendments of the Senator from Illinois, if that is satisfactory.

I do not know how much time they are going to take. So we would be on your amendments by about 4:30.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Is there time on the Ashcroft amendment?

Mr. DOLE. One hour on Ashcroft; 1 hour on Shelby; and 1 hour on yours, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Why do we not ask for that now?

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would request, immediately after disposition of the amendments from the Senator from Illinois, an amendment offered by Senator BUMPERS and myself be the next Democratic amendment. And we have agreed to a time agreement of 2 hours equally divided.

Mr. DOLE. I want to first make certain we satisfy the Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. If I may, I would like an hour on my side on my three amendments. And if that would mean an hour—that would be 2 hours total on the three amendments that I have.

Mr. DOLE. OK. Let me just make this consent request, that following the disposition of the Breaux amendment—the vote will occur at 2:15—then we consider the Ashcroft amendment, 1 hour equally divided in reference to food stamps; followed by a Shelby amendment in reference to food stamps, 1 hour equally divided; followed by three amendments by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, 2 hours equally divided; followed by—

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. If the Senator from Florida would be understanding, I do not know that we could get a time agreement at this point. But in the sequence, he would come after the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would modify my request for unanimous consent just to be in sequence after the Senator from Illinois and settle at a later date the question of time.

Mr. DOLE. I think the only point I would make—I am not certain we could do that. We do not want to get to one amendment at 5 o'clock tomorrow and be on it for the rest of the day.

If I could get consent, before I move to the Graham amendment, on the previous three amendments, Ashcroft, Shelby—no time agreements.

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President. And I say to my friend, the majority leader, there are some that are very involved, and the floor manager here understands that very well. We have not been able to check about the time limits on food stamps.

If we could do sequence, then work out the time agreements after that, I think that would be best. But as far as agreeing to a time as it relates to these amendments, it would be very difficult for us to do it at this time unless we could get all of those Senators that are involved and interested in the particular amendments that are going to be brought forward.

We are talking about basically six amendments here, and one of them you cannot give a time agreement on; one you have the time agreement for an hour on the three; but then that does not include time in opposition, so 2 hours. I would be put in a very untenable position to having to object.

I see the minority leader is here, the Democratic leader is here now.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOLE. That is OK.

Mr. President, I will just modify my request.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Again, I must say we still have a couple hundred amendments pending. I do not want to get carried away that we are making progress if we take up four amendments, five.

Mr. FORD. They are major, though.

Mr. DOLE. I would ask the following sequence: Following disposition of the Breaux amendment, Senator ASHCROFT be recognized to offer an amendment on food stamps; following disposition of that amendment, we hope to get a time agreement, and that the Senator from Alabama, Senator SHELBY, be recognized to offer an amendment on food stamps; following disposition of that amendment, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, be recognized to offer three amendments with a 2-hour time agreement, 1

hour on each side; followed by the Graham-Bumpers amendment on formulas, as I understand it.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. That is right.

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object. Might I ask the majority leader a question?

Mr. Majority Leader, there is no time agreement yet as to when this bill has to be disposed of, is there?

Mr. DOLE. No. But it is my hope, and I hope the hope of the Democratic leader, that we finish it Thursday. Otherwise, I think we will go the reconciliation route. We could be here on this for the next 3 weeks, and we have six appropriations bills to pass. We have got some people pressing for a recess in October. And we want to try to accommodate people, but sometimes we have to accommodate the work at hand. And there is a lot of work at hand.

For 49 hours we have been on this bill. It is a very important bill. But this will take us into tomorrow evening, even this agreement—one, two, five, six, seven, eight, nine amendments, which will get us to sometime tomorrow evening. That would still only leave 200 left. That may be progress; not in my book.

I will send a cloture motion to the desk.

First, I will yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I share the view just expressed by the majority leader. I think we have made some progress. We have a long way to go. I know that some of the amendments that have been offered are duplicative amendments, so there is probably a much shorter list than 200.

I think we can make a real good-faith effort tomorrow and see if we cannot accommodate both sides in not having votes on all of these. I think if we can work with the managers and accept some of these amendments, it would be very helpful as well.

There are two other amendments, at least I will just put our colleagues on notice, on the Democratic side. I would like the Lieberman amendment and the Kennedy amendment having to do with work as our next two amendments, regardless of whether they are part of the unanimous-consent agreement or not. I think it would be helpful for Democrats on our side at least to know what the sequencing will be.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. This is the amendment to strike the training aspects of the welfare proposal; basically, the Kassebaum training programs that deal with dislocated workers, the workers that would be covered under NAFTA, GATT, defense downsizing, corporate restructuring, environmental considerations, an amendment that

would be used to strike those provisions from the Dole bill.

Mr. DOLE. Any time agreements?

Mr. KENNEDY. We would be glad to work out a reasonable time, and I will be glad to talk with others who are the cosponsors and Senator KASSEBAUM and make a recommendation to the leaders tomorrow and try to get that in prior to the time of the cloture vote.

Mr. DOLE. I will just say for my colleagues, we have two Republican amendments, and then we have three amendments from Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN and then the amendment of Senators GRAHAM and BUMPERS. I assume following that there would be a Republican amendment, and then we can accommodate.

Mr. DASCHLE. The next two Democratic amendments following those would be the two I just mentioned.

Mr. DOLE. I also want to say, as I indicated earlier, since the leader is on the floor, there are a number of amendments that have been cleared on this side, and if they can be cleared on the other side—I think there are a total of 19—that would be a sign of progress, too. As I understand, they are amendments from Republicans and Democrats. They are not controversial. They probably would not have been cleared. That would be a sign we are making progress, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the majority leader's request?

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if the Senator will add Senator DOMENICI's amendment on family cap to the sequencing when he is finished.

Mr. DOLE. Following the Graham-Bumpers amendment, how much time?

Mr. DOMENICI. At least an hour on my side; maybe an hour on the other side.

Mr. DOLE. They may want to check that. I can seek agreement but not give a time agreement. I ask unanimous consent that Senator DOMENICI be sequenced in after Graham-Bumpers, but we cannot get an agreement on time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Dole substitute amendment to H.R. 4, the welfare reform bill.

Bob Packwood, Hank Brown, Bob Dole, Paul D. Coverdell, Conrad Burns, Don Nickles, Trent Lott, Bill Roth, Rick Santorum, Ted Stevens, Pete V. Domenici, Robert F. Bennett, Mike