

lenders, guarantors, secondary markets, and other program participants could threaten the very stability and the very viability of the entire loan program. Adverse changes could well threaten student access to the loans they need and must have.

Further, I believe we should keep the agreement we reached in conference 2 years ago with respect to the direct student loan program. More than anything else, that agreement has worked to the benefit of students, and it is aid to students that should be our main concern.

Mr. President, I wish to make it as clear as I can that enough is enough. It is time we left the loan program alone. It is time we considered changes solely on their merits and not because they appear to save sufficient money to meet our meticulous reconciliation instructions. It is time we understood, once and for all, that the best way to reduce the deficit which hangs over us is through a strong economy supported by a well educated and well trained work force.

I favor bringing the deficit down. We all do. But I do not favor doing that on the backs of those who need our help the most—the elderly, the poor, the middle-income wage earner, and I think, most importantly, the students upon whom we must all eventually depend to keep our Nation strong and vibrant. In particular, I do not favor making cuts in the loan program or other valuable programs just to pay for a tax cut.

To my mind, the time has come for us to say no to the instructions given the Labor Committee. It is time to say no to cuts in the student loan program. It is time we took students out of harm's way.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 4 p.m., under the same provisions of the previous unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REPEATING A MISBEGOTTEN AND SHAMEFUL ERA

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as we contemplate the compromise by which we can agree to end the entitlement under the Social Security Act, title IV-A for States to receive a share of the costs for providing for dependent children, I would like to share simply for the RECORD a portion of a letter from Irwin Garfinkel, Alfred Kahn, and Sheila Kamerman of the Columbia University School of Social Work who are so concerned with what we may be doing here, and they write:

As we are sure you know, a similar madness pervaded the nation at the close of the 19th century. Then, of course, relief policy was—aside from Civil War veterans and their survivors—strictly a state, and in practice, mostly a local responsibility. As a consequence of the severe cutback in relief—

And here I interpolate that the Charity Organization Society managed to get hold of the effective control of local private agencies in many parts of the country.

as a consequence of the severe cutback in relief, we began sending large numbers of children of single mothers to orphanages. The children were referred to as half-orphans. In reaction, 40 states established mothers pensions, the forerunner of ADC. Though we take some comfort from the reaction, our hope—that 100 years later the Nation might be spared another such misbegotten and shameful era before regaining its senses—grow dim.

I will just repeat that:

... our hope—that 100 years later the Nation might be spared another such misbegotten and shameful era before regaining its senses—grow dim.

I will say, Mr. President, that what happened in 1935 was that the State mothers' pensions were increasingly difficult for the State governments to maintain, and so they were taken over under the title IV-A, Aid to Dependent Children, which was just children at that time.

In 1939, the mother was entitled to a benefit, and it became aid to families with dependent children, the program we are evidently intent upon abolishing and repeating "a misbegotten and shameful era."

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

A MISSED OPPORTUNITY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I think earlier today we missed an opportunity. It seemingly went by unnoticed

when an amendment was offered that addressed a very sensitive area and an essential element of welfare reform, and that is a recognition that it has become a snowballing effect that a family that has welfare problems, or is on the welfare rolls, quite often the next generation comes down and is also afflicted with this same problem.

This was in the amendment offered by Senator FAIRCLOTH, No. 2609. I regret that it only received 17 votes on the floor of the Senate, and yet, I do recognize it is a very sensitive issue to deal with.

We have become and found ourselves in a situation in this country where it is a welfare trap and snares not only current recipients, but their children as well. Young women who grow up in welfare families are more than twice as likely to receive welfare themselves as their counterparts whose parents received no welfare.

I have three very short cases I will identify. These happen to come from the State of Oklahoma. They will only be identified by the individual's first names.

There is Marie, a 43-year-old, has nine kids by five different fathers. The mother was on welfare for 30 years. Marie's own daughters are unwed teen mothers on welfare.

Denise, 29 years old, had her first child at 16. She now has an additional four daughters, all born under the welfare system. Both her sisters are unwed welfare mothers with eight children.

Jacqueline, 37 years old, a mother at 15. She was born to a welfare family of 12 children. Her unwed daughter had four illegitimate children by the time she was 20.

Out-of-wedlock births and single parenthood are quickly becoming a normal lifestyle in this country. I am not sure that the Faircloth amendment was worded quite properly, but at least it did address a very serious problem that we are going to have to, sooner or later, address in this body.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ABANDONING A COMMITMENT

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, early today—well, at 10 o'clock this morning—we were to have commenced a series of votes that had been agreed on yesterday. There was, necessarily, a delay as Members on the other side were at a meeting with their House counterparts on, I believe, Medicare. We had a half an hour in which to talk about whatever came to mind.

I took the occasion to read a passage from the first page of the New York

Times which described the White House as "exceedingly eager to support a law that promises to change the welfare system," which is to say abolish title IV-A, Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

It went on to say the White House was "sending increasingly friendly signals about the bill."

This is a bill which three professors at the Columbia School of Social Work, including the revered Alfred Kahn, said would recreate the turn-of-the-century era in which the children of single mothers were referred to as "half orphans" and sent to orphanages.

In reaction, 40 States established mothers' pensions, the forerunner of aid to dependent children. The 1935 legislation created aid to dependent children. In 1939 the mother was entitled to a benefit, hence family with dependent children.

They said, "It is our hope that 100 years later the Nation might be spared another such misbegotten and shameful era."

Mr. President, I spoke this morning not only about the New York Times this morning but rather of yesterday's statement, a statement by Rahm Emanuel, a White House spokesman, who said as the bill headed toward a vote on final passage, Rahm Emanuel, a White House spokesman said it was "moving in the right direction." "Moving in the right direction," is moving in the direction of the misbegotten and shameful era which took place at the turn of the century from which we gradually recovered our senses.

I have since been in touch with the White House. I have talked to persons there and asked, can it be that this is the disposition of the White House? I am told that, yes, Mr. Emanuel, who I believe was the fundraiser for the 1992 Presidential campaign of Mr. Clinton and then was political director in the White House, that he is in charge of this matter now and that it is his view that the Democratic Party should abandon its commitment 60 years in place—a commitment Republican Presidents have been just as firm in—to a Federal provision of aid to dependent children.

Mr. President, Rahm Emanuel is of that view, and obviously he is, he does not disguise it. I wonder about what other political advice he is giving in the White House.

I will not speculate. I will state my alarm. No one can foresee the future. I do not. Yet we have seen something like this happen before. I can say again, when Irwin Garfinkel, Alfred Kahn, and Sheila Kamerman refer to the possibility that "100 years later the Nation might be spared another such misbegotten and shameful era before regaining senses," they say that hope grows dim.

If this is the advice the President is getting, that hope is dim, indeed. I say this with great reluctance, Mr. President, but something of great importance, in my view, is at stake. I yield the floor.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of time for morning business be extended until 4:30 under the previous unanimous consent request.

Mr. DODD. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire as to how much longer that will go? Are we going to have some sense of—

Mr. SANTORUM. My understanding is the two leaders are meeting. In fact, I believe they may be meeting as we speak, and we are trying to find an agreement on the legislation before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a period for the transaction of morning business be extended until 5 p.m. under the same rules governing the previous unanimous consent agreement.

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

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. DODD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the call for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry.

Are we in morning business, as I understand it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

CHILD CARE

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I will take advantage of this time while we are waiting here. Let me explain. People are wondering what is going on—I have a podium in front of me and papers in front of me. I am prepared at some point to offer an amendment on child care. We had one vote already several days ago and made an effort here to try to come to some accommodation, a compromise position on child care. That may still happen. I was

hopeful that the arrangement put together would work—and it may still work.

I am prepared to offer the amendment. I have been here on the floor now for virtually the last 2½, 3 days, trying to find a compromise. I am trying hard to find a welfare reform package I can vote for. I mean that very sincerely and deeply. I think the President would like to have a bill he could sign. And largely what happens, I suppose, in the next couple of hours might determine whether or not we will have a bipartisan bill.

My own view, Madam President—I will not take a lot of time here because people have heard this debate on numerous occasions in days past, weeks past, months past. Senator HATCH of Utah and I offered, back some 6 or 7 years ago, the child care and development block grant bill, which became the law of the land in 1990. Five years ago, we provided child care assistance to people in the country, particularly to the working poor families to keep them off welfare and allow them to work. It allowed them to get some child care assistance—it does not take care of everybody—it provides some help to some people. There are long waiting lists in many States for this assistance. In fact, I recall now—having recited these statistics so many times, I can almost call them State by State.

As the presiding officer is from the great State of Texas, I think the waiting list in Texas is about 20,000 people. In the State of Georgia, it is 41,000 people. The numbers are in that range. And the 36 States that keep data on child care slots—not every State keeps waiting lists—but 36 States tell us that they have long lists. There is a tremendous need and demand out there.

Again, I think the central point of the Dole welfare reform bill is, of course, to get people from welfare to work. And again I think most people accept the fact that 60 percent of the people on welfare have children under the age of 5. Of the 14 million people on welfare, 5 million are adults, 9 million or 10 million are children. So what we are talking about here is a simple enough notion; that is, to provide some sort of a safe setting for children as we move their parent or parents into the work force.

To do that requires resources. We are told by the Department of Health and Human Services that to fill the 165-percent increase in demand that would occur as a result of the bill that the majority leader has presented to us, it would require some \$6 billion over 5 years to accommodate that demand.

I offered an amendment in that amount a few days ago. It failed by a single vote here. Then, over the last 2½ days, in consultations with interested parties here—and I will not go into names of people—we were able to work out a compromise, a bipartisan compromise, on the issue. The compromise