

Dole bill passes, and I hope it will—I think the amendment of the Democratic majority leader will fail—I hope we go forward with this not in a spirit of, “Well, the Republicans have won” and cheer.

I want to close with what I said at the start. There is no guarantee that if we pass this bill, as the Republicans are talking about, there is no guarantee we will solve the problem. There is a guarantee that if we continue as we have been going, we will not solve the problem. We have not solved the problem and there is no hope we will solve the problem continuing on the line of Federal regulation and control as we have gone.

My guess is that many States will experiment with this and will find their experiments fail. Many others will experiment with it in a different fashion and find they succeed. And then some of the successes will be taken to other States and found it does not work in that State yet does work in other States. The States are going to become labs over the next 5 years and, by and large, most of them are going to hit upon what will work in their State with the limited amount of money that we give them, and they will be much quicker to jettison programs that do not work than we are.

The last thing we have put in this bill—and I see the Senator from Missouri is in the chair and it was his suggestion—we have put in this bill, to the extent that it is constitutional, that it is permissible for this money to be given to religious organizations to carry out social welfare purposes.

There is nothing wrong with that. Just because Catholic Charities is Catholic should not mean that it is incapable of administering to the poor. Just because the Salvation Army may have a cross on the wall does not mean that it cannot run a good sheltered workshop. It will run a better sheltered workshop than anything the Government might run.

As I say, we cannot by law make something constitutional that is unconstitutional. I know the fear and the argument: Not only are they going to minister to the needs of the poor, they are going to try to proselytize them, make them Catholics or make them whatever.

Mr. President, I think that risk is worth it. I think the risk is worth it. If a person goes to a Salvation Army sheltered workshop or a meals program run by a charity that happens to have a menorah in the hallway, I am not sure that is going to be so offensive to what we are trying to achieve that it should be prohibited. I will leave it to the courts—and there will be suits—to decide whether or not it is constitutional.

I will say this to my good friend from New York, he and I now almost 20 years ago, not quite, introduced bills to allow tuition tax credits. In the interim, Wisconsin has tried it and now I see the courts have declared it par-

tially unconstitutional. But it is working. These inner-city kids are getting a good education. We simply wanted to say to the parents—by and large, it liberates the poor. It does not liberate the rich. They are going to private schools anyway and they are going to parochial schools. It was a modest credit.

We say a parent can put their child in a religious school and they can deduct part of their cost off of their income tax. For 18 years he and I have tried to get that. We have been unsuccessful so far.

Every now and then, he will send me a clipping when another inner-city Catholic school has closed or perhaps the whole diocese has closed, I do not know, and say, “They didn’t listen to us, they didn’t listen to us.”

It was touching when we had hearings on this to have some of the poorest women come and testify. These were single mothers working for the Federal Government, often in relatively modest positions, making in those days, the late seventies, \$15,000, \$16,000 a year, putting their children in private school, paying for it themselves, religious schools, not even of their religion because they wanted an alternative to public school.

This bill is going to try to permit all of that, not because we want to intrude religion on people, but because we do not want to preclude religion having the opportunity to serve people.

Mr. President, over the next 4 or 5 days, we will debate the philosophy of this bill. I suppose we will debate lots of itsy-bitsy details. But the philosophy is infinitely more important than itsy-bitsy details.

This bill, if adopted, is a watershed, is a turning point from the concept that the Federal Government is be all and know all. I hope we are daring enough to take the step. I do not promise it will work, but I do promise that with what we are trying now, we will continue to fail.

I thank the Chair and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

Mr. DOLE. Since there are no other Senators seeking recognition on welfare reform, was leader’s time reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it was.

SALUTE TO SENATOR PELL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, nearly 35 years ago, the voters of Rhode Island decided to send CLAIBORNE PELL to the U.S. Senate. And in the years that followed, they have made the same decision in five separate elections.

Yesterday, Senator PELL announced that this term will be his final one in the Senate.

While there are still 16 months left in Senator PELL’s term, I did want to take a minute to pay tribute to this dedicated public servant.

As all of my colleagues know, Senator PELL has devoted his years in the Senate to many issues of great importance: To foreign relations, where he has served as chairman and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; to bettering the environment; and, of course, to education, where Pell grants to college students have become a household word. I listened to the Senator from New York comment on that yesterday.

Mr. President, the State motto of Rhode Island is just one word—the word “Hope.”

And from serving in the Coast Guard during World War II, to representing our country in the Foreign Service for 7 years, to serving here in the Senate for three and a half decades, CLAIBORNE PELL has never given up hope on America.

I join with all Senators in wishing Senator PELL all the best as he writes the final chapters in a very distinguished Senate career.

TRIBUTE TO CAL RIPKEN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, my mother had a phrase she used to repeat. “Can’t never could do anything,” she told us. I have tried to live by those words throughout my life, and I want to pay tribute today to someone else who doesn’t know how to say “can’t.”

For over half a century, baseball experts have said that one record that could never be broken was the great Lou Gehrig’s record of playing in 2,130 consecutive games.

As all baseball fans know, that record was tied last night, and will be broken tonight by Baltimore Orioles shortstop Cal Ripken, Jr.

In every game played by the Orioles since May 30, 1982, Cal Ripken has taken the field and done his job with dedication and with excellence.

No doubt about it, as a baseball player, Cal Ripken is a superstar. But more importantly, he is also a superstar as a human being, a husband, a father, and a role model.

Make no mistake about it, like most professional athletes, Cal Ripken is very well paid. But you cannot watch him play without thinking that he would still be out there, trying as hard as he can, if he was not paid at all.

And Cal’s commitment to baseball does not end on the field. As a goodwill ambassador for a game that desperately needs one, he freely gives his time to countless charities, and throughout this season, Cal has stayed in the stadium for hours after games, signing autographs for every fan who wanted one.

I know that all Members of the Senate join with me in tipping our hats to

Cal. May he have as many years on the field as our "iron man," Senator STROM THURMOND, has had in the Senate. He could run that record way up there.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I mention as an aside and not part of the statement that my colleague from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, is calling me every 5 minutes, 10 minutes. We are going to try to arrange so that the people who want to be at that game can catch the 5:30 train.

There are Members of the Senate and others who want to attend that game, so we are trying to work out some agreement for the Democratic leader where either we could have debate on welfare reform for those who would be watching it on television, or maybe take up a nomination that has been pending for some time and some of my colleagues on the other side would like to take up. I thank the managers.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will 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.

RECESS

Mr. DOLE. Under a previous order, we had agreed to stand in recess between the hours of 1 o'clock and 2 o'clock so that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle might have an opportunity to discuss welfare reform. I am advised there are no speakers and no speakers asking for recognition between now and 1 o'clock. Rather than sit in a quorum call, I suggest we now recess until 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:00 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:27 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GRAMS).

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, it is with enthusiasm I rise to support the Democratic alternative on welfare reform. I support it with enthusiasm because it is firm on work, provides a safety net for children, brings men back into the picture in terms of child support and child rearing, and at the same time provides State flexibility and administrative simplification.

Mr. President, I am the Senate's only professionally trained social worker.

Before elected to public office, my life's work was moving people from welfare to work, one step at a time, each step leading to the next step, practicing the principles of tough love.

This is the eighth version of welfare reform that I have been through as a foster care worker, as a child abuse and neglect worker, a city councilwoman, Congresswoman, and now U.S. Senator. Each of those previous efforts in times have failed both under Democratic Presidents and under Republican Presidents. It failed for two reasons. One, each reform effort was based on old economic realities, and, second, reform did not provide tools for the people to move from welfare to work, to help them get off welfare and stay off welfare.

I believe that welfare should be not a way of life but a way to a better life. Everyone agrees that today's welfare system is a mess. The people who are on welfare say it is a mess. The people who pay for welfare say it is a mess. It is time we fix the system.

Middle-class Americans want the poor to work as hard at getting off welfare as they themselves do at staying middle class. The American people want real reform that promotes work, two-parent families, and personal responsibility.

That is what the Democratic alternative is all about. We give help to those who practice self-help. Democrats have been the party of sweat equity and have a real plan for work. Republicans have a plan that only talks about work and can not really achieve it.

Democrats have produced a welfare plan that is about real work, and we call it Work First because it does put work first. But it does not make children second class. Under our plan, from the day someone comes into a welfare office, they must focus on getting a job and keeping a job and being able to raise their family.

How do we do this? Well, first, we abolish AFDC. We create a temporary employment assistance program. We change the culture of welfare offices from eligibility workers to being empowerment workers. Instead of only fussbudgeting over eligibility rules, social workers now become empowerment workers to sit down with welfare applicants to do a job readiness assessment on what it takes to move them to a job, stay on a job, and ensure that their children's education and health needs are being met.

Everyone must sign a parent empowerment contract within 2 weeks of entering the welfare system. It is an individualized plan to get a job. The failure of individuals to sign that contract means they cannot get benefits. Everyone must undertake an immediate and intensive job search once they have signed that contract. We believe the best job training is on the job. Your first job leads you to the next job. Each time you climb a little bit further

out of poverty and at the same time we reward that effort.

Yes, this is a tough plan with tough requirements. It expects responsibility from welfare recipients. Everyone must do something for benefits. If you do not sign the contract, you lose the benefits. If you refuse to accept a job that is offered, you lose the benefits. If, after 2 years of assistance, you do not have a job in the private sector, then one must be provided for you in the public sector.

No adult can get benefits for more than 5 years in their adult lifetime, but if you are a minor, you are able to stay in school and receive benefits.

So, yes, we Democrats are very tough on work. Everyone must work. Assistance is time limited and everyone must do something for benefits. If you do not abide by the contract, then you lose your benefits.

What else do we do? We provide a safety net for children. We not only want you to be job ready and work force ready, we want you to be a responsible parent. We want you to be able to ensure that as part of getting your benefits, your children are in school and that they are receiving health care.

Once you do go to work, we will not abandon you. We want to make sure that a dollar's worth of work is worth a dollar's worth of welfare, and while you are working at a minimum wage, trying to better yourself, we will provide a safety net for child care for your children, nutritional benefits will continue, and so will health care. We want to be sure that while you are trying to help yourself, we are helping your children grow into responsible adults.

I do not mind telling people that they must work because I do not mind telling them that they will not only have the tools to go to work, but that there will be a safety net for children.

This is what the Republican bill does not do. It does not look at the day-to-day lives of real people and ask what is needed to get that person into a job.

People are telling to go to work are not going to be in high-paid, high-technology jobs. We know that that mother who wants to sign a contract that requires her to work will be on the edge when it comes to paying the bills.

She does not have a mother or an aunt or a next door neighbor to watch her kids. She needs help with child care to move into the work force.

The Republican bill does not provide enough money to pay for real child care. Suppose that mother lives in suburban Maryland or Baltimore city or the rural parts of my State? She does the right thing; she gets about an entry-level, minimum-wage job.

She is going to make about \$9,000 a year, but will have no benefits. She might take home, after Social Security taxes, \$175 a week. But if her child care costs her \$125 a week, that leaves her \$50 a week for rent, food, and clothing.

So that means, under the Republican welfare bill, it is like jumping off of a