

a delaying tactic. I think that is all it is, quite frankly.

I said a moment ago our OSA fleet has been studied to death. As chairman of the Department of Defense Commission on Roles and Missions, Mr. White concluded that the fleet of airplanes was too big and that it should be cut down to size. Well, this is where the rubber meets the road. Mr. White is the top dog over in the Pentagon now. He occupies a very top position. Mr. White is now in a position to give some direction and guidance, and his recommendations in the roles and missions report tells me that he already knows what that direction should be.

So what is he waiting for? The time has come to stop studying the issue. More study is a waste of time and, most important, a waste of money. The Department of Defense, under Mr. White's direction, should develop a plan to downsize this fleet of aircraft. How many of these airplanes are really needed? How should the fleet be managed? How should the Department dispose of the unneeded airplanes? Those are the questions that must be addressed.

I do not see my amendment as the magic solution, by the way. My amendment was merely a starting point. I am not convinced that my proposed number, whatever I might pick, whether it be 20 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, or 50 percent, might be the right number. But I do not think we can settle for ignoring the recommendations of Colin Powell, the recommendations of General McPeak, the recommendations of the roles and missions report under Mr. White's directive. I do not believe we can ignore the General Accounting Office that there are more airplanes than are needed. Only 9 percent of these planes were used in the Persian Gulf war. It is time to downsize the fleet. I think that we ought to take a first step this year during the debate on the defense authorization bill to make a downpayment on the recommendations that have been made by Colin Powell, General McPeak, and by Mr. John White. I want to see us start down the road in that direction, the direction proposed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, White, and I want that first step to be meaningful and to be significant.

I yield the floor, and 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. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, few debates have had greater importance

than the one we have begun this week. A number of us have been working now for many months in preparation for this debate. I want to thank Members on both sides of the aisle for the work that has been done thus far, and let me in particular commend the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN, for his leadership and the continued effort he has made to bring us to this point.

I also feel the need to, again, reiterate my gratitude to Senators BREAUX and MIKULSKI for the leadership they have given our caucus on the issue of welfare reform; Senators DODD and KENNEDY for all of the help they have given us with regard to the need to consider children as we deal with this issue; and Senators MOSELEY-BRAUN and CONRAD on the Finance Committee for their efforts.

Let me also cite the tremendous cooperation and support that we have been given from the administration, Democratic Governors, and local officials. For many months now, all of them, and many more within our caucus, have come forth to give us their best ideas and to produce what we hope will be one of the best work products that we have had since this Congress has begun.

Mr. President, the result of that effort has been a remarkable degree of unity within our caucus about the need for welfare reform and about the way we bring it about. We support a new concept which we call Work First, a concept which incorporates many very critical principles that we as Democrats feel strongly about, that we as Democrats can unite on and reach out to our Republican colleagues and hope that, working together, we can achieve meaningful welfare reform on a bipartisan basis this year.

First and foremost, as we consider those principles, Mr. President, our belief is that the emphasis needs to be put on work; that we end welfare as we know it; that we abolish the old infrastructure; that we create the incentives and the opportunities that must be created if, indeed, we are going to put work first.

So we begin by requiring that all able-bodied people go to work, get jobs, obtain the skills, do what is necessary to ensure that they break their dependency on welfare. We recognize that in order to do that, we have to provide tools that do not exist today. So as we abolish the AFDC Program and the old JOBS Program, we recognize that new tools must be put in place if indeed we are going to give people opportunities and the real hope that they can break that cycle of dependency, that they can go out with confidence and get the jobs that they need to get.

We also recognize that even though it may not be a part of welfare reform, it is very difficult to tell anybody today that they are to go out and get a minimum-wage job, work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, and still be below the national poverty level. That is unacceptable.

If we are going to make work pay, we have to provide not only the economic incentives, but the opportunities and the confidence necessary so that indeed we can break the cycle of poverty, as well as the cycle of dependency. Breaking the cycle of poverty, hopefully this year, will mean an increase in the minimum wage, to ensure that men and women can work 40 hours or more a week and not be condemned to poverty in spite of their best efforts.

The second principle, Mr. President, is a recognition that there are impediments to ending welfare as we know it and to getting those jobs that exist today. We must address those impediments if indeed we are going to get the job done. Our belief is that the two most critical impediments are the fear of losing their health insurance and the lack of adequate child care.

First, they fear that once they get a job, especially if it is a minimum-wage job, they will lose their health insurance, they will have no protection for themselves or their children, because Medicaid will no longer be provided.

They also know that they have a Hobson's choice of getting a job or staying on welfare and taking care of their children. They do not want to be in a position of saying, I want to get that job, I want to go out into the private sector and obtain a good, meaningful, good-paying job—but I do not want to leave my children at home unattended. What am I going to do with my kids? How many families would be willing to leave their young children at home while they went out to get a minimum-wage job, which is, in part, what we are asking people to do today. That, too, is unacceptable. We cannot ask a young parent to do that. We have to find a way to ensure that their legitimate concerns are addressed in terms of health care, as well as in terms of child care.

So what we do in our Work First plan is extend Medicaid for another year to give people the opportunity to create the financial means to buy their health insurance. We do the same thing with child care. We tell them, look, we are going to care for your children, we are going to find a way, working with the States, to create the infrastructure necessary to see that your children are cared for. We are not going to effectively force you to leave them at home. We are not going to make you leave them unattended. We recognize how many problems are created at home when there is no adult supervision. That is the second principle—recognizing the impediments to work today and dealing with them.

The third principle is to ensure the safety net for children continues. Children should not be required to pay for the problems created by their parents. If we are going to break the cycle of dependency, it ought to be the goal of every Senator to strengthen the child, to give them the care, the direction, the nutrition, the protection that they need so that they never find themselves on welfare in the first place. Creating that mechanism of ensuring that children are protected has to be a fundamental principle of welfare reform, regardless of what else we do with their parents looking for work.

A fourth principle is to recognize today that we actually penalize husbands for staying at home and staying

married. We actually penalize them for living at home and playing the role of father. Today, if a welfare recipient is married, that person is ineligible for the full benefits created through the welfare system. That is wrong. So we eliminate the penalty for married welfare recipients. We say we want to encourage families to stay together. We want the mother and father in that house together. We want to do everything we can to preserve the family unit.

We require tough child enforcement mechanisms and expand job placement and training for absent fathers. We have had the opportunity to consult with scores of people from around the country, and the word we get time and time again from virtually every expert is that if indeed you really want to stop welfare dependency, if you want to break out of the problems we have today, you have to find ways to keep the family together. We want to do that. We do that by eliminating the penalty for married welfare recipients, strengthening child support enforcement, encouraging absent fathers to stay home and to get the job skills they need, without penalizing them.

Fifth, Mr. President, we recognize, as so many people have alluded to today, that if we are going to do this, we recognize the big differences between and among States. Ohio and South Dakota are dramatically different in many respects. South Dakota's largest city is about 125,000 people. We have only 10 communities with more than a thousand people, and 300 communities with fewer than a hundred people. We recognize that welfare in South Dakota is vastly different from welfare in other parts of the country. So we must give States the flexibility and the opportunities to create new mechanisms that adapt to the problems, needs, and concerns of people within each State. We recognize that the current system is too constrained, is too prescriptive, is too dictatorial in coming up with ways to allow States the opportunity and the freedom and flexibility to do what they know, in many cases, has to be done to combat the problems in the welfare system.

Next, we want to combat teen pregnancy. Here, too, there is no secret, magical, one-size-fits-all solution. We realize, as Senator MOYNIHAN and others have spoken about many times, we have no way of knowing for sure what we can do to break the cycle of illegitimacy, to ensure that teen parents will not continue in the practices and the direction they often take at an early age. We want to stop children from having children. We want to create whatever mechanisms are necessary to ensure that children are children first and parents second. To do that, we require that teen mothers, if unfortunately they become pregnant, stay in school and stay at home; and that, in those cases where home is not the appropriate place, they be given second-chance home opportunities, living in an environment that is loving, caring, protective, and reassuring. Second-chance homes can do that.

We believe very strongly that whether it is at home or whether it is in a new home, teen mothers cannot be put by themselves, cannot be forced to take all of the responsibilities that comes with rearing a child, with little

or no resources, and expected to rear that child properly. That does not work.

So once a child has a child, and that child has a child, and that cycle goes on and on, it is no wonder we have the incredible delinquency problems and the problems with childhood abuse and the many serious problems that come with it.

Finally, we recognize that there are many loopholes in the Food Stamp and SSI Programs that we believe have to be addressed. We clamp down on waste and abuse and recognize there are ways not only to save money but to administer these programs much more effectively. So we believe that, through all of these principles, we can enact a substantial degree of reform and bring about a change in welfare to the degree that it has never been brought about before. We are optimistic that in working with these principles, we can do a great deal to change the direction of welfare as we know it in this country.

I believe that, in many cases, the Work First plan stands in contrast to the bill offered by many of our Republican colleagues. The latest version of the Republican bill is a significant improvement over the Finance Committee draft that passed a couple of months ago. But I would cite among the many differences between Work First and the current Republican plan four fundamental differences that I think have to be addressed.

The first has to do with work. We both recognize that work has to be a priority. We both recognize that we have to put new emphasis and a new direction to the opportunities there are for work. The big difference, of course, comes in resources. Both of us have a requirement that, by the year 2000, 50 percent of those people on welfare will be required to work. Fifty percent.

I am told today that about 10 percent of those people on welfare ultimately get jobs. So we are asking for a 5-fold increase in our success rate in the next 5 years. A 5-fold increase, from 10 percent to 50 percent. I am not talking about "participation." I am talking about actual work.

Today we judge our success largely by participation. That is, if you come into the office and you demonstrate you are looking for a job, you can qualify for all the welfare benefits that may be provided.

We say participation is not good enough anymore. Now what we want to do is say you really have to have a job before we consider this case closed. You have to be out there working prior to the time we are willing to call this particular case a success.

The problem is that, to obtain that 5-fold increase in the next 5 years, I believe we will need resources to do it. It is not just going to happen. We are talking about providing skills. We are talking about education. We are talking about a new infrastructure which will make welfare offices employment offices.

If we are going to do that, the States and the Federal Government must work in partnership to ensure that we can accomplish all that we know we can accomplish in a very short period of time. A five-fold increase in real jobs is a major responsibility.

The difference between the Democratic bill and the Republican bill is that over the next 5 years, the Republican bill will cut \$70 billion in the assistance to be provided to the States to do just that.

What we are telling the States through the Republican bill is that we want you to get the job done, but we will cut \$70 billion in resources before you are given the chance to do it.

Mr. President, I do not see how that is possible. If, over the course of this debate, we can figure out how we can ask the States to accomplish five times what they are doing today with \$70 billion less in resources, that explanation, I think, is one the Governors will want to hear for themselves.

The second major difference between the Republican plan as it has been presented and the democratic Work First plan is our emphasis on children. There are about 14 million welfare recipients today. Mr. President, 9 million of the 14 million are children. We believe if those children are going to be cared for, if those children are going to get out of this incredible dependence they find themselves in as a result of being born into welfare families, then indeed we have to ensure that they are nourished, they are given the education, they are given the loving care they need and deserve. If they are given all those things we had when we were growing up—we had the encouragement, we had the nutrition, we had the education, we had the loving care—then maybe they will have a fighting chance. The reality is that these children are too often born into situations where none of that exists.

Mr. President, I think it is very critical if we want to ensure that those children have a chance, then it seems critical to me that we create and ensure that the safety net continues for those children, so they never have to face what their parents are facing.

Second, as I said a moment ago, it is so important that if we are honest and serious about telling mothers they have to get a job—telling young mothers and fathers, for that matter—it is not going to be enough to be dependent upon welfare in perpetuity, if that is going to happen, we have to realize that 60 percent of all AFDC families have at least one child under the age of 6. Mr. President, 60 percent of all AFDC families today have one child at least under the age of 6.

In a recent study, these families said that the biggest reason they cannot go out and get a job is because there is no one there to take care of that child. We do not want a bill that says we are going to have to leave them at home if indeed you want benefits at all. This ought not be what we call the home-alone bill. We do not want to see children left without protection and care.

The big difference here is how do we handle child care? In addition to the safety net, not punishing children, how do we ensure that those children are taken care of when the parents leave in the morning to go to work? No one can tell me that we will ever solve this problem if we do not resolve that one. Child care and welfare reform are inextricably linked. We cannot have one without the other. People need to understand that. It is too much to ignore. We must have some realization of the

essential connection between child care and welfare reform.

The third big difference, Mr. President, has to do with funding. I mentioned earlier that there is a \$70 billion reduction in the availability of funds. The Republican bill freezes funding at 1994 levels for the next 7 years. We are told that is a \$70 billion reduction. That is just the beginning. It is not just the amount of money but how that money is provided.

There is no needs determination in the Republican bill. That is, there is no system by which the more severe the situation, the greater the resources. It is all done on a formula. That formula is really based on a first-come-first-served theory.

A block grant is sent out based upon this formula. Whether or not it is enough, the money is there so long as it is available. If there are more people than there are funds, it will be up to the States to decide who gets it. There is no match requirement. States are not required in any way, shape or form to come up with a reciprocal amount of money—some supplemental amount, some pool of resources—that would enable them to benefit from the resources provided at the Federal level.

No needs determination, no match whatever. A formula that is determined in Washington, not based on severity, not based on the number of people on welfare, not based on the degree to which there are imaginative approaches being employed.

Mr. President, there is a very significant difference in the approach used by the Republican plan and the approach incorporated in the Work First plan.

Our view is that need ought to determine availability; that in some cases there is a greater need, regardless of population, for a lot of different reasons. We ought to take that into account prior to the time we arbitrarily make some formula decision that may or may not help some States.

Finally, there is also a big difference with regard to the availability of assistance for teenage pregnancy. The Republican bill makes assistance to be provided for curtailing teenage pregnancy simply an option to the States. They can do it or not. Regardless of their choice, there is no funding available to the States to do whatever it is they may do. Whatever they do, they are on their own. One can guess what choice most States will make under such circumstances.

There is encouragement to use second-chance homes. There is encouragement to require that teenagers be required to stay in school or at home,

but there is no funding. No availability of additional resources to see that might be something we should look at.

Mr. President, at least on those four principles, we have some fundamental philosophical differences that I think have to be addressed if, indeed, we are going to succeed in breaching the differences in arriving at a bipartisan bill some time this Congress.

Let me make two final points with regard to welfare reform. First of all, as we can see from the debate already today, and for that matter last Saturday, this ought to be a lively debate, a spirited debate, a debate in which very good points are raised—likely on both sides. I sincerely hope that Members of the Republican caucus will look at the Work First bill. I have every expectation they will consider even voting for it, at some point, given the significant new concepts incorporated in it.

I hope we can have a good debate but I hope we do not arbitrarily decide this thing can be resolved—this whole debate can be resolved—in a matter of a couple of days. I do not think it can be. This is one of the most consequential debates we will be taking up this year. It has broad ramifications. And if we do it right we may not have to visit this issue again for a long time to come, at least as it relates to our infrastructure. So I do not think we ought to be rushed into final passage. I do not think our success ought to be judged by how few days we actually take to resolve these differences and debate these points and come up with the best piece of legislation. So I sincerely hope we can have a good debate and not arbitrarily come to any conclusion as to how long a good debate may take.

Finally, let me say I hope it can be a bipartisan effort. I do not see it as necessarily a Democratic or a Republican issue, but it is going to be hard to be bipartisan if Republicans engage, once again as they did earlier this year, in negative political attacks when the debate has barely begun. It is wrong and deeply disappointing that Republicans would attack five Democratic Senators who have participated in the debate, who have made significant contributions to this effort, who may differ in some cases with Republicans on how we resolve these outstanding issues—but in good faith participate in the debate—and then be attacked politically simply because they may disagree. I would add that they have been attacked erroneously. Some of the attacks now being leveled against five of my colleagues in the Democratic caucus are wrong. They are outright fabrications. I hope the media take the

time to look into the claims and then check the facts, because if they do they will find that not only are these attacks wrong and shortsighted, but they simply do not represent the facts or the voting records of those who have been the subject of these unfortunate attacks in the last couple of days.

We can do this either way. I recall vividly some of the criticism Republicans had last year, for the partisan nature of some of the debate on health care. I recall how unfair they thought it was when some of the debate was politicized. On the other side, there was great concern about the Harry and Louise ads. We heard a lot about targeted ads in States and districts around the country. Both sides raised a lot of questions about whether or not that was the right way to debate an issue as important as health care was.

It was wrong then and it is wrong now. It is wrong now to politicize this debate at the very beginning of what I hope will be an opportunity for us to deal with this issue in a productive, meaningful way, coming to some resolution sometime this session of Congress to one of the most important and challenging issues of our day—welfare reform. I believe we can do it. I believe we can work together and, in spite of some of our deep differences philosophically, overcome those differences and come up with a plan that works a lot better than the one we have today.

That is not going to happen if we contaminate the debate with sharp political attacks against Members on either side. So I hope cooler heads will prevail, and I hope those responsible for those ads will have second thoughts and the good common sense to pull them before it is too late.

Mr. President, noting no other interest in debate, I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands in recess until 9 a.m., Tuesday, August 8, 1995.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:14 p.m., recessed until Tuesday, August 8, 1995, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 7, 1995:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

JOHN A. KNUBEL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE G. EDWARD DESEVE.