

out and said at 27 degrees ice crystals begin to form on the poultry flesh. They believed that 27 degrees was appropriate. Another group said it is 26 degrees. That group that said 26 degrees is—let me find it. I had it in the RECORD before. It is a technology group that said it is 26 degrees. So they went with the more, if you will, liberal number of 26 degrees.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield for a brief comment?

Mrs. BOXER. I believe, if you leave it up to the businesses to come up with what they think is right, we are not going to have a fair rule. With all due respect to my friend, if we kill this today, I believe we are killing this for a very long time.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield for another brief question?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Mr. BIDEN. The experts in the refrigeration industry also point out that there is no way you can get that ideal number within less than 2 degrees. The science of refrigeration is not precise enough that you can get it within 2 degrees. So although they give you an ideal number of 26, they say that is when crystal began to form, they also say, if I am not mistaken, there are not refrigeration units made that can guarantee you can keep it at exactly 27 as opposed to 26 or 25 or 25 as opposed to 23.

So I would ask my friend the following question. Assume the issue here were to say 26 degrees plus or minus 3 degrees. Would she be willing to go along with that? Or is she stuck on precisely 27 degrees? Because the Senator from Delaware would be willing to go along with 26 degrees plus or minus 3 degrees, mainly because there is not the science in refrigeration that you can put a product in the back of a truck, send it off to be sold in California or anywhere else and be assured that for the duration of that trip it will not fluctuate several degrees above or below.

I might add, the reason why the producers are split in my State, the producers who sell only on the east coast think this is a good idea. The producers that sell in California say: I cannot get my product across guaranteeing it is exactly a certain temperature—I cannot assert, and the technology cannot guarantee me when I put it in the truck, that I can keep it within the rule no matter what I tell you.

Mrs. BOXER. May I say to the Senator I am down to 3 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. I am sorry.

Mrs. BOXER. I have to say to my friend, this is exactly what I do not think we should get into: Will the Senator agree to 27 minus-plus. I believe if we start getting into that on the Senate floor, we are getting into minutia.

There is a science. Now, my friend may not believe it is accurate, but the other group that said it is 26 is the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The Agriculture Department said that flexible enforcement will be

absolutely a defining goal. And today we enforce the law when it gets down to zero degrees. So at some point you have to have a cutoff with flexible enforcement, because clearly my friend makes a good point. But I never supported 26 degrees or 25 or 27. What I supported was science dictating when a product ought to be marked "frozen."

I think if we do not act today, I say to my friend—and I think he means it that he wants to work on something—it will be a long, cold month, 2 months and years before we get back to this issue.

I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, how much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has 10 seconds, the Senator from California has 113 seconds. Who yields time?

Mr. BUMBERS. Mr. President, the Senator from California has generously yielded me 30 seconds, which may be kinder than I would be to her under the circumstances.

Mrs. BOXER. Thanks.

Mr. BUMBERS. I thank her very much. Mr. President, I want to make the point the Senator from Delaware was making. If the Agriculture Research Service has to have a plus or minus 3 degrees in highly controlled labs and highly controlled labs have to have a plus or minus 2 degrees, to ask for a plus or minus 3 degrees in this situation without devastating an industry seems to make eminent good sense. It seems to me if we can transport chickens 2,000 miles and still beat the California Poultry Federation's price, there may be something wrong with the California Poultry Federation.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, let me say to my friends, it is hard to know what to say to my friends at this point, because when we started this debate, we wondered if we could keep it together through the entire debate. I compliment all of us; we have kept it together.

Again, I am going to finish off where I started, and then you are going to have to hear it again for 2 more minutes before the vote.

If I told you that this desk is a chair, you would think I was kidding. And if I told you that winter was summer and summer was winter, and ice was hot and warm was cold, and freezers were toasters, you would send me to the nearest psychiatrist.

I have to say, everything stripped aside, because there is money in industry on one side and money in industry on the other side and we know that, the bottom line is what is fair and what is right and what is common sense and what is reality.

We can decide we are the scientists here, and we can decide at what degree it is frozen and what degree it is fresh.

I do not think that is our job. We have a fine, I believe, Department of Agriculture headed by a very fine man from Kansas who knows agriculture. He stepped in and oversaw this rule. We have a good rule. I hope we support it and defeat the committee amendment.

I yield the floor and thank my friends.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, USDA's own study, conducted by the Agricultural Research Service, demonstrated that consumers cannot detect any quality differences between poultry chilled to 26 degrees and poultry chilled to lower temperatures.

The Food Safety and Inspection Service based its rule on assertions generated through a well orchestrated public relations campaign by those who would benefit from this new rule.

In effect, the agency is saying that although it cannot control temperatures under ideal conditions in a laboratory, the poultry industry must not let their products reach a temperature just 1 degree under 26 or the products will be declared out of compliance and mislabeled.

I urge Senators to vote against the California Senators' motion to table.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:33 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. What is the pending business?

#### FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report H.R. 4.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dole modified amendment No. 2280, of a perfecting nature.

Gramm modified amendment No. 2615 (to Amendment No. 2280), to reduce the Federal welfare bureaucracy.

Dole/Daschle amendment No. 2683 (to Amendment No. 2280), to make certain modifications.

AMENDMENT NO. 2692 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

(Purpose: To provide a technical amendment)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for Mr. DOLE, proposes an amendment numbered 2692 to amendment No. 2280.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 12, between lines 22 and 23, in the matter inserted by amendment no. 2486 as modified—

(1) in subparagraph (G), strike “3 years” and insert “2 years”; and

(2) in subparagraph (G), strike “6 months” and insert “3 months”.

On page 69, line 18, in the matter inserted by amendment no. 2479, as modified—

(1) in section 413(a), strike “country” and insert “country”; and

(2) in section 413(b)(5), strike “eligible countries are defined as:” and insert “ELIGIBLE COUNTRY.—A county may participate in a demonstration project under this subsection if the county is—”.

On page 50, line 6, in the matter inserted by amendment no. 2528—

(1) in subsection (d)(3)(A), strike “1998” and insert “1996”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(3)(C), strike “1998, 1999, and 2000” and insert “1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002”; and

(3) in subsection (d)(3)(C), strike “as may be necessary” and insert “specified in subparagraph (B)(ii)”.

On page 77, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following new section:

**“SEC. 420. ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE.”**

Notwithstanding section 658T of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, the State agency specified in section 402(a)(6) shall determine eligibility for child care assistance provided under this part in accordance with criteria determined by the State.”.

On page 303, line 15, add “and” after the semicolon.

On page 304, line 22, strike “and” after the semicolon.

On page 305, line 16, insert “, not including direct service costs,” after “administrative costs”.

On page 305, line 18, strike the second period and insert “; and”.

On page 305, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

“(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(6) SERVICES FOR THE WORKING POOR.—The State plan shall describe the manner in which services will be provided to the working poor.”.

Beginning on page 305, strike line 19, and all that follows through line 6, on page 306, and insert the following:

(d) CLARIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE CHILD.—Section 658P(4)(B) of the Child care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858n(4)(B)) is amended by striking “75 percent” and inserting “100 percent”.

On page 738, line 10, strike “on” and insert “for”.

On page 753, line 8, strike “subsections (c) and (d)” and insert “subsection (e)”.

On page 753, lines 20 and 21, strike “or serious physical, sexual, or emotional harm, or” and insert “, serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse or exploitation, or an act or failure to act which”.

On page 776, line 1, strike “other” the second time such term appears.

On page 786, line 7, strike “, through 2000” and insert “and 1997”.

On page 22, line 12, strike “\$16,795,323,000” and insert “\$16,803,769,000”.

On page 99, line 20, strike “\$92,250,000” and insert “\$100,039,000”.

On page 100, line 9, strike “\$3,150,000” and insert “\$3,489,000”.

On page 100, line 22, strike “\$4,275,000” and insert “\$4,593,000”.

On page 99, strike lines 4 and 5 and insert the following:

(I) by inserting “(or paid, in the case of part A of title IV)” after “certified”; and

On page 27, strike lines 17 through 22, and insert the following:

“(B) RATE OF INTEREST.—The Secretary shall charge and collect interest on any loan made under subparagraph (A) at a rate equal to the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the period to maturity of the loan.

On page 54, line 25, add after “amount.” the following: “The Secretary may not forgive any outstanding loan amount nor interest owed thereon.”

On page 293, lines 8 and 9, strike “any benefit described in clause (1)(A)(ii) of subsection (d)” and insert “any benefit under a program described in subsection (d)(2)”.

On page 293, line 19 strike “subsection (d)(2)” and insert “subsection (d)(4)”.

On page 293, line 21, insert “the” before “enactment”.

On page 294, line 20, insert “under a program” after “benefit”.

On page 297, line 11, strike “Federal”.

On page 297, line 20, strike “and”.

Beginning on page 297, line 21, strike all through page 298, line 3, and insert the following:

(2) the term “poverty line” has the same meaning given such term in section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)).

On page 298, line 3, strike “involved.” and insert “involved; and”.

Line to be added at the appropriate place in Title XII of Dole’s Amendment to HR. 4:

“In making reductions in full-time equivalent positions, the Secretary is encouraged to reduce personnel in the Washington, DC area office (agency headquarters) before reducing field personnel.”

(1) In section 501(b)(1), strike “(IV), or (V)” and insert in lieu thereof “or (IV)”.

(2) In section 502(f)(1), strike “(IV, or (v))” and insert in lieu thereof “or (IV)”.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this amendment contains technical changes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered and agreed to, en bloc. It has been approved on the other side.

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

So the amendment (No. 2692) was agreed to.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 2683

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator DOLE, I send a modification to amendment No. 2683 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is so modified.

The modification is as follows:

Strike page 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: participate in work for more than an average of 20 hours per week during a month and may count such parent as being engaged in work for a month for purposes, of section 404(c)(1) if such parent participates in work for an average of 20 hours per week during such month.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide an entitlement to child care services to any child.

On page 17, line 22, insert before the period the following: “, and increased by an amount (if any) determined under subparagraph (D)”.

On page 18, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

“(D) AMOUNT ATTRIBUTABLE TO STATE PLAN AMENDMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A) and subject to the limitation in clause (ii), the amount determined under this subparagraph is an amount equal to the Federal payment under section 403(a)(5) to the State for emergency assistance in fiscal year 1995 under any State plan amendment made under section 402 during fiscal year 1994 (as such sections were in effect before the date of the enactment of the Work Opportunity Act of 1995).

“(ii) LIMITATION.—Amounts made available under clause (i) to all States shall not exceed \$800,000,000 for the 5-fiscal year period beginning in fiscal year 1996. If amounts available under this subparagraph are less than the total amount of emergency assistance payments referred to in clause (i), the amount payable to a State shall be equal to an amount which bears the same relationship to the total amount available under this clause as the State emergency assistance payment bears to the total amount of such payments.

“(iii) BUDGET SCORING.—Notwithstanding section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the baseline shall assume that no grant shall be made under this subparagraph after fiscal year 2000.

Strike page 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following: fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 such sums as are necessary for payment to the Fund in a total amount not to exceed \$1,000,000,000.

“(3) COMPUTATION OF GRANT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each eligible State in a fiscal year an amount equal to the Federal medical assistance percentage for such State for such fiscal year (as defined in section 1905(b)) of so much of the expenditures by the State in such year under the State program funded under this part as exceed the historic State expenditures for such State.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The total amount paid to a State under subparagraph (A) for any fiscal year shall not exceed an amount equal to 20 percent of the annual amount determined for such State under the State program funded under this part (without regard to this subsection) for such fiscal year.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments to H.R. 4 at the desk be withdrawn, other than the Gramm and Dole amendments. This has been agreed to, also.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 30 minutes for debate be postponed, to begin following the next two back-to-back roll-call votes.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2615

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2615.

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 Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is necessarily absent due to illness.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 441 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—49

Akaka	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
Cohen	Kassebaum	Robb
Conrad	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerry	Simon
Dorgan	Kohl	Wellstone
Exon	Lautenberg	
Feingold	Leahy	

NOT VOTING—1

Hatfield

So the amendment (No. 2615) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2683, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 2683, as modified.

Mr. DOLE. I 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 on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is absent due to illness.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 442 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Akaka	Feingold	Mack
Baucus	Feinstein	McCain
Bennett	Ford	McConnell
Biden	Frist	Mikulski
Bingaman	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Boxer	Graham	Murray
Bradley	Grassley	Nunn
Breaux	Gregg	Packwood
Brown	Harkin	Pell
Bryan	Hatch	Pressler
Bumpers	Heflin	Pryor
Burns	Hollings	Reid
Byrd	Hutchison	Robb
Campbell	Inouye	Rockefeller
Chafee	Jeffords	Roth
Cochran	Johnston	Santorum
Cohen	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kempthorne	Shelby
Coverdell	Kennedy	Simon
Craig	Kerrey	Simpson
D'Amato	Kerry	Snowe
Bond	Kohl	Specter
DeWine	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Lautenberg	Thomas
Dodd	Leahy	Thompson
Dole	Levin	Thurmond
Domenici	Lieberman	Warner
Dorgan	Lugar	Wellstone
Exon		

NAYS—12

Abraham	Gramm	Lott
Ashcroft	Grams	Moynihan
Coats	Helms	Nickles
Faircloth	Inhofe	Smith

NOT VOTING—1

Hatfield

So, the amendment (No. 2683), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, amendment 2280 is adopted.

So the amendment (No. 2280), as further modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 30 minutes for debate equally divided.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to thank the majority leader because this Senate is getting ready to take a major step to end welfare as we know it. The majority leader has put together a coalition that is bipartisan.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may we have order? The Senator is entitled to be heard. She is making a very important statement. And could we insist on order for the remaining half hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order.

The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to say that when we take this major step to end welfare as we know it, we will owe a great deal of the thanks to our majority leader for putting together this bipartisan coalition.

We are making an important policy change in America today. Welfare will

be a hand up but not a handout. Welfare will be there for a transition, for people in trouble, but it will not become a way of life.

There will be a 5-year lifetime limit on able-bodied people getting welfare, so that family that is working hard to do better, to educate their children will know that they are not paying a bill for someone who is able but not willing to work.

In our bill, block grants replace entitlements for seven AFDC programs. We will be saving \$60 billion in welfare costs, the most ever cut in welfare in our country's history.

What could have killed this bill was the inequity in block grants among the States. The States could have said, "Well, if I don't get this for my State, I'm walking away from welfare reform."

But many of us were able to get together and say each State is different. What we have done in the past is different, what we are going to do in the future is different and, therefore, we must accommodate each State.

Everyone has given so that we will have parity over the next 7 years. That is the hallmark of this bill: States rights, State flexibility to provide the programs that fit their needs.

In fact, it is the policy set by the Congress that States can become more efficient and responsive if Washington, DC, will just get out of the way. And today, Mr. President, Washington is going to get out of the way. Thank you.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the indomitable Senator from Illinois, [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the Senate is poised to take action on one of the most political issues facing this Congress. There is bipartisan agreement that welfare reform is needed, welfare is not a free ride, and work requirements should be placed on adult recipients as a condition of receipt. Certainly anybody who can work should work.

Welfare should have more than one goal, however. It should not only put people to work but it should also protect children. This bill, however, regrettably, does neither. It bears repeating. Of the 14 million-plus welfare recipients, two-thirds, or nearly 9.6 million people, are children; 60 percent of those children are under 6 years old. It is the 5 million preschool-age babies who will be the real objects of our decisionmaking today.

The most stunning error of this bill, in my opinion, is that it ignores entirely the plight of poor children. It dismantles the 60-year-old Federal safety net that has assured at least some assistance to them. This bill completely ignores the consequences to our national community of the abandonment of a safety net for poor children.

Earlier in this debate, I showed pictures from around the turn of the century, before we had a national Federal safety net. Those pictures showed young children sleeping on grates and picking through trash. Is that where we want to be when we enter the 21st century?

Mr. President, I am afraid this bill could make that shameful history a new reality. In my opinion, this bill takes a Pontius Pilate approach to Federal responsibility. As a national community, we are here washing our hands of responsibility for these poor children. This bill sends the problem to the States with high-flown rhetoric about State responsibility and innovation.

But what if—what if—a State proves unwilling to address the poverty of children in its midst? Are we to concede there is nothing that we as a national community should do? This bill makes certain that there is nothing that we can do.

And what if the States find, as Senator MOYNIHAN has shown, that incidents of child poverty in this country are localized in urban areas or in pockets of rural poverty? What if the States find that? Child poverty may not be a problem that is most effectively addressed by block grants to State governments. Who will speak for the children then?

It is said that this bill will end welfare as we know it. Had it ended welfare abuses, I would have been among the first to applaud it. Had it rationally addressed ending the poverty that is the first level qualifier for welfare, I would have enthusiastically supported it. But it does neither, and it will not end welfare as we know it but rather creates 50 welfare systems with the potential for real tragedy for children.

In my opinion, Mr. President, that is the fatal flaw of this legislation; that this is welfare as we knew it, back to the days of street urchins and friendless foundlings and homeless half-orphans. I, for one, am not prepared to take so giant a step backward or to be so generous with the suffering of those 5 million poor children under the age of 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOLE. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Kansas, Senator KASSEBAUM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, first, I would just like to respond to my colleague, whom I admire and whom I know feels deeply about children, about those who may not have a safety net protection. I would just like to say to Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN that I think one of the real strengths of this legislation is that we did strengthen child care, and child care is a very important requirement in order to have successful welfare reform.

I think this bill does strike a good balance, and I express my appreciation

to those on both sides of the aisle who have worked to shape an exceptionally strong welfare reform bill, particularly the majority leader, Senator DOLE, who has tried hard to balance the interests of many people on both sides of this aisle, to Senator SANTORUM who also has worked tirelessly among those on our side of the aisle and those on the other side of the aisle. I will say to Senator DODD, as well, who has cared a great deal about trying to meet the needs of children in this legislation, that I think we do have a good welfare reform bill and, most importantly, it is not welfare as an entitlement. That starts us on a new path and one that I think will be most successful.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I happily yield 3 minutes to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I have offered amendments that have been adopted—and so have other colleagues—that have mitigated some of the harshest effects of this piece of legislation. But an essential truth remains. For the first time in 60 years, we are eliminating a floor below which we never before allowed children to fall. Mr. President, for the first time in 60 years, we are saying that as a national commitment, as a national community, we will no longer take the responsibility to make sure that every child, even the poorest of children, at least has some minimal level of assistance, that children do not go hungry.

Mr. President, I ask myself the question: Will the passage of this legislation mean that there will be more impoverished children and more hungry children in America? The answer to that question is yes, and that is why I must vote no.

Mr. President, I ask myself the question: Is it true that the passage of this legislation will shut out hundreds of thousands of disabled children from essential services? The answer to that question is yes. That is why I will vote no.

Mr. President, I ask myself, as a Senator from Minnesota, the following question: In the context of all of the slash and burn—cuts in housing, cuts in Medicare, cuts in Medicaid, cuts in EITC, cuts in all these programs, with States then having to figure out where they are going to come up with the resources—I ask myself the question: Who is going to lose out? The answer is that it is going to be the children. They do not have a lobbyist. They do not have the PAC's. They are not the heavy hitters. They are the ones who are going to be left behind. And it is for that reason, Mr. President, that I will vote no.

We moved to a national standard in the early 1970's because we had children with distended bellies in our country. We had malnourishment and hunger in America. We said as a national community that we would not let that happen. Now we are turning the clock

back. For the first time in 60 years, we move away from that commitment.

This is a profound mistake for America.

Mr. President, I ask myself the question: Is it the Minnesota tradition—an almost unique tradition—to speak for children, to advocate for children, to vote for children, to vote for all of God's children? And the answer to that question is "yes." Therefore, as a Senator from Minnesota, I will vote "no."

The Dole bill will also affect the Hmong, approximately 30,000 of whom live in Minnesota and share with us their rich heritage and culture. Many in the Hmong community came to the United States to escape persecution after they aided the United States in the secret war of Laos.

Many of the Hmong now receive SSI and will be in danger of losing their benefits under the Dole bill. It is difficult—due to language barriers, lack of formal education and age—for the Hmong to become self sufficient. A large number of them depend on SSI benefits for their survival.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFFEE].

Mr. CHAFFEE. Mr. President, I want to express my support for the measure before us today. We have been working on this for many months. I am pleased we are finally able to approve a bill with bipartisan support. This bill is very conscious of the needs of children, a group I strongly believe should be cared for in any welfare program.

The measure before us contains additional money for child care and requires States to continue to maintain their financial effort for the life of the bill, for the 5 years. Senators BREUX and DODD were very helpful in those issues. Under this measure, States would also be prohibited from denying benefits to single custodial parents with young children who do not work because the parents do not have child care.

This provision is extremely important for the protection of these very young children. The last thing we want to have happen is for parents to be placed in the untenable position of having to choose between leaving their children unsupervised while they work or losing their entire cash benefit.

I would like to note that S. 1120, the bill before us, does not make any changes in the foster care and adoption assistance programs. It has long been my belief that the Federal entitlement for these programs should continue and we should not roll back the Federal protection parts of the foster care and adoption assistance. Those entitlements are continued in this legislation.

On the subject of children's SSI, the Senate bill retains the concept of cash assistance for poor, disabled children and does not go as far as the House in scaling back eligibility. I am pleased that the Senate chose to take a more balanced approach to this issue than

the House. Most of the children in this program are severely disabled. Were it not for SSI, they would not be able to remain at home with their families.

I would like to thank Senator DOMENICI for his contribution to this bill in two areas—particularly in providing for the maintenance of the effort by the States. Senator DOMENICI led that effort. I also thank him for his help in removing the mandatory family cap. Under the Domenici approach, which we adopted, the family cap remains an option for the States. There is no evidence that denying benefits to women who have additional children while on welfare has any impact on birth rates. Senator DOMENICI spoke forcefully on that.

Finally, I praise our majority leader, Senator DOLE. But for his extraordinary efforts to find a common ground, we would not be here today. That is no easy feat, given our differences when we started out.

I thank him for his able leadership and the fact that we were able to achieve a bipartisan bill today.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be able to yield 3 minutes to my esteemed colleague from New Jersey, Senator BRADLEY.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I will vote against this bill because I think it would wipe out protection for families with children but would do nothing to repair what is really wrong with welfare. We have made some improvements in this bill, eliminating the job training consolidation that never belonged in the welfare bill in the first place. We tightened and strengthened child support enforcement. But the fundamental structure is deeply flawed and can only lead to deeper poverty and more dependency.

All we are really changing in this bill is the one thing that is not wrong with welfare—the financial relationship between the Federal Government and the State bureaucracy. That is not the problem. In fact, block grants create a new problem because States that have increasing numbers of poor families, because of a bad economy or simple population growth, would not have enough funds to assist these poor people.

Federal politicians should not simply transfer pots of money to State politicians without any standards about what the money would be used for. We do not need to transfer money from one bureaucrat to another bureaucrat. We need commitment to individual poor children.

While this bill would abandon the commitment, the real problems of welfare would remain—the rules that penalize marriage and work, the indifferent local and county bureaucrats who treat people as numbers and do nothing to help people take care of themselves, the brutal job market, the deep cultural forces driving increases in divorce, illegitimacy, and teen pregnancy; all these problems would remain, and many would get worse.

All this bill does is require States to penalize the children who are born into and live in the midst of all of this turmoil.

With all the rhetoric about changing welfare, how did we wind up with a bill that does nothing to change what is wrong with welfare? The short answer is: politics.

Neither party was as serious about really changing welfare as it was about capturing the welfare issue from the other party. Democrats promised to end welfare as we know it by tinkering with the levers of government, mostly in a positive way, but not in a way that deeply changes the lives of people on welfare. Republicans promised to do even better—abandon the welfare state. They would toss aside the Federal responsibility for poor families and children altogether. They did not know how to deal with the reality of poverty and welfare, so they came up with the solution by handing the whole problem over to the States for them to solve. Block grants create an appearance of change, but no real change.

The debate in the last few days, during which we accepted every amendment that did not challenge the underlying political rhetoric, also indicates the problem. The legislation does not abandon the mythical welfare state. But it does abandon our society's commitment to protect poor children from abject poverty, hunger, abuse, neglect, and death. Meanwhile, it does nothing to fix the real problem.

I urge everyone to think twice before joining the rush to send this deeply flawed bill forward into a process where it will get even worse.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, as I have been saying ever since Congress began welfare reform debate, unless we address illegitimacy, which is a root cause of welfare dependency, we will not truly reform welfare.

Only by taking away the cash incentive to have children out of wedlock can we hope to slow the increase of out-of-wedlock births and ultimately end welfare.

Middle-class American families who want to have children have to plan, prepare, and save money because they understand the serious responsibility involved in bringing children into this world. It is unfair to ask the same people to send their hard-earned tax dollars to support the reckless, irresponsible behavior of women who have children out of wedlock and continue to have them, expecting the taxpayers to support them.

It is clear that our country must begin to address the crisis of illegitimacy. Today, one-third of all children are born out of wedlock. According to Senator MOYNIHAN, the illegitimacy rate will hit 50 percent by 2003, or sooner. The rise of illegitimacy and the col-

lapse of the family has had a devastating effect on children and society. Even President Clinton has declared that the collapse of the family is a major factor driving up America's crime rate.

Halting the rapid rise of illegitimacy must be the paramount goal of welfare reform. Unfortunately, the Senate has been unable to follow the example set earlier by the House and has not included provisions, like the family cap, ending the current cash incentives for teenage mothers to have children out of wedlock.

The bill before us is far better than the one we started with. It has strong work provisions, transfers flexibility to the States and, overall, is a good bill. Unfortunately, it fails in the one key area which I feel very strongly about. It does fail to address the crisis of illegitimacy.

It is a missed opportunity for the Senate to send out a loud and clear message that society does not condone the growth of out-of-wedlock child-bearing, and that the taxpayers will not continue the same open-ended subsidies for illegitimacy which has characterized welfare in the past.

I hope this bill returns from conference with strong provisions on illegitimacy. If it does, I will support it enthusiastically.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, there is a right way and a wrong way to reform welfare. Punishing children is the wrong way. Denying realistic job training and work opportunities is the wrong way. Leaving States holding the bag is the wrong way. Too many of our Republican colleagues want to reform welfare in the worst way, and that is exactly what this bill does.

After more than 60 years of maintaining a good-faith national commitment to protect all needy children, the Senate is on the brink of committing legislative child abuse. This measure is an assault on America's youngest and most vulnerable citizens. I urge my colleagues to join with me in doing the right and compassionate thing, and vote "no".

In 1935, President Roosevelt said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add to the abundance of those who have much. It is whether we provide enough to those who have little.

In passing the Social Security Act, Congress made a bold pledge to the elderly and to the children of our society that their well being would be ensured. It was a sign of what we stood for as a society.

With that legislation, Congress, made a historic promise—that no child would be left alone to face the cruel forces of poverty and hunger. Today, more than 60 years later, the Senate is breaking that promise. As an institution, we are turning our back on America's children.

If this legislation passes, whether needy children receive a helping hand

will depend on whether they are fortunate enough to be born in a State that has the resources and the will to provide that assistance. A minimal safety net for children will no longer be a part of what makes America America, but rather a gamble of geography.

This bill nullifies one of the fundamental roles of the Federal Government—to bring our country together as a nation. Instead it will encourage border wars as States across the country selfishly compete to assure that they do not become too generous to the needy and attract families from other States.

Granted, the child care and other modifications achieved in recent days have made this legislation less bad than it was. And that is no small achievement. But it is hardly a reason to support a measure that will devastate the lives of millions of American children to say it could be even worse—and probably will be after the Conference with the House.

This bill is not about moving American families from welfare to work. It is about cutting off assistance to millions of poor, hungry, homeless, and disabled children.

This bill is not about fiscal responsibility or deficit reduction. It is about misguided priorities—for which, as the columnist George Will has said, we will pay dearly as a society for years to come.

This bill is not about eliminating the barriers to employment that exist for people on welfare. It is about short-changing the job training and child care programs needed to give people a chance. It is about setting arbitrary time limits on assistance for families who cannot find jobs, and providing grossly inadequate resources to make genuine opportunity a reality.

This bill is not about giving States more flexibility. It is about Congress washing its hands of a difficult problem, by slashing Federal funding, and then turning the remains over to the States with little accountability or guidance and even less leadership.

This bill is not welfare reform—it is welfare fraud. We are all for work—but this plan will not work. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that only 10 to 15 States will be able to meet the bill's work requirements and the rest will simply throw up their hands.

These actions are in no way required by the current balanced budget environment. The Republican majority has already shown that it is willing to spend money when the cause is important enough to them. When the Republican majority wanted to preserve a \$1.5 billion tax loophole for American billionaires who renounce their U.S. citizenship, they found the money to preserve it. When the Republican majority wanted to increase defense spending \$6.5 billion more than the Defense Department requested for this year, they found the money to fund it. When the Republican majority wanted to give the wealthy a \$245 billion tax

break, they will find the money to fund it.

But now, when asked to reform welfare and create a genuine system to help America's 10 million children living in poverty, the Republican majority tells those children: "Sorry—check returned—insufficient funds."

For billionaires, the Republicans will move mountains. For poor children they will not lift a finger—and their record makes that clear. As President Kennedy said in his inaugural address: "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

Poor children in America are worse off than poor children in 15 of the 18 Western industrial nations. The annual incomes for the poorest 10 percent of Canadian families, including all benefits, is nearly twice that of families in the United States. The United States has the greatest gap between the rich and the poor—a gap that will surely grow in the years ahead because of this harsh legislation.

Despite these realities, the Republican majority wants to take \$60 billion over the next 7 years from programs supporting poor children and families, in order to help balance the budget and pay for their tax breaks for the wealthy. That is their priority.

When we tried to pay for increases in child care by closing the billionaires' loophole or ending other forms of corporate welfare, the Republicans said no—take it out of food stamps. They would rather harm poor children than offend fat cats who live on corporate welfare.

Some in the Republican majority say that this legislation will succeed—that faced with the prospect of benefits being cut off, welfare recipients will have no choice but to find work. Governor Engler of Michigan made that argument when eliminating Michigan's State-funded General Assistance Program. Unfortunately, things did not work out the way the Governor had said. Only one-fifth of the former welfare recipients found jobs—the majority became even more destitute.

And so it goes when social experiments go wrong. The Republican majority is asking us to put the lives of children in their hands as they prepare to push welfare recipients off the cliff in the hope that they will learn to fly. And what happens if they fail? Ten million children, who make up the majority of AFDC recipients, will pay the price, and as a society, so will we.

This is not just theory. We already know some of the havoc this legislation will cause. The administration estimates that the 5-year time limit in the bill will result in one-third of the children on AFDC becoming ineligible for assistance—4 million children. Yet when we proposed to give the States the option of providing vouchers to protect these children after the time limit, the Republicans said no. So much for States rights.

Of the parents who will be affected by the time limit, only one-third have a

high school degree. Yet recent studies show that three-quarters of the available jobs in low-income areas require a high school diploma. Sixty percent of those jobs require experience in a particular type of job. And there are already two to three jobseekers for every job vacancy.

This bill is not seriously designed to change those realities. There is no way this bill can create jobs for millions of low-income, low-skilled parents who will be looking for work at the same time in the same communities. It will not help schools do a better job of preparing young men and women for an increasingly demanding workplace. In fact, the Republican majority is busy cutting the very education and job training funds necessary to produce a skilled American work force in the years ahead.

Welfare reform cannot be accomplished on the cheap. Governor Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin, whose welfare expertise has been praised repeatedly by the Republican majority, was recently quoted in *Business Week* as saying that in order for welfare reform to be successful, "It will cost more up front to transform the welfare system than many expect." After his reforms in Wisconsin, administrative costs rose by 72 percent.

My Republican colleagues are correct when they say that this is an historic moment in the Senate. If this bill passes, today will go down in history as the day the Senate turned its back on needy children, on poor mothers struggling to make ends meet, on millions of fellow citizens who need our help the most. It will be remembered as the day the Senate broke a noble promise to the most vulnerable Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote "no"—for the children who are too young to vote and who cannot speak for themselves. This bad bill can be summed up in four simple words—"Let them eat cake."

I say to my colleagues—can you look into the eyes of a poor child in America and say, "This is the best hope for your future?" I cannot—and that is why I must vote "no".

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, it is with reluctance that I rise in support of the welfare legislation which the Senate is about to pass.

I have serious reservations about many aspects of the bill as it now stands, not the least of which is the ability of States to address the needs of poor children during periods of recession or economic downturns.

Having said that, I believe that the modifications adopted in the agreement between the Democratic and Republican Leaders begin to move this bill in the right direction. Compared to legislation passed by the House earlier this year, it is substantially more responsible and in that sense, more likely to succeed.

First, the bill provides for an additional \$3 billion for child care for those moving from welfare to work. We should expect those people on welfare



to go to work. But to do so, we must give them the tools to go to work. And child care is the most significant problem young mothers face as they try to move into the work force.

Second, the bill now requires States to maintain a safety net for poor children through the so-called maintenance-of-effort requirement. As a result, States must continue to spend at least 80 percent of their current welfare spending for the next 5 years. This will help ensure States go the extra mile to move people from welfare to work, rather than simply forcing recipients off of the rolls with no chance for employment.

Third, the bill does not include a job training block grant that could have siphoned off precious dollars used to help retrain victims of foreign competition, base and plant closings, or the negative effects of corporate downsizing.

Fourth, the bill creates a very modest contingency grant fund of \$1 billion which States could tap to deal with increased need due to the effects of a recession or population growth.

In addition to these provisions, the bill incorporates much of the Democratic Work First proposal, S. 1117, in several key areas.

Teen Pregnancy: The bill includes the tough stay-at-home and stay-in-school provisions of the Work First bill. It also makes \$150 million available as seed money for second chance homes, locally-based, supervised group homes for teen-age mothers which have been popularized by the Democratic Leadership Council.

Private sector work bonus: The bill also contains a bonus pool of funds that will be awarded, in part, on the basis of States' success at moving welfare recipients into private sector work.

Parent empowerment contract: The final bill has a requirement for a parent empowerment contract that welfare recipients would have to sign once they sign up for benefits. This contract obligates them to take charge of their own lives, commit to acting as responsible parents, and undertake an intensive job search—all designed to move them from welfare to work.

Work requirements: Finally, the bill includes provisions of the work first bill that tell States they should do everything they can to be moving welfare recipients into the work force as quickly as possible, with the expectation that the period for a transition from welfare to work should be approximately 6 months.

Having announced my support for this measure, albeit with some great reservations, I want the conferees on this bill to know that I will not support any conference report that moves in any significant and substantial way toward the punitive and harsh proposals in the House-passed welfare bill.

If the conference agreement contains a mandatory family cap, or arbitrarily cuts off benefits for young women, I will oppose it.

If it modifies the child care or maintenance of effort provisions now in the Senate bill, I will not support it.

If it has no means for States to cope with economic downturns, I will withdraw my endorsement.

If it moves to block grants for foster care and adoption assistance, for food stamps or child nutrition programs, this Senator will cast a "no" vote on that conference report.

I hope that the Senate framework will emerge from the conference committee so that we can have bipartisan welfare reform this year. But if not, this Senator will be on this floor later this year fighting to stop a bad bill from getting enacted.

#### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND WELFARE REFORM

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I would like to raise a subject which I believe will be a key problem for the States in implementing welfare reform under block grants—ensuring the States are able to make the necessary investments in information technology.

Most of our attention here on the floor has been with regard to very contentious social issues such as work requirements and unwed mothers. We have devoted little attention to the problems States will face in managing the vastly increasing responsibilities which this legislation will transfer to them. I am concerned that all our hard work to set the stage for new and successful human services programs will fall short of its goal if States are not equipped with the necessary information systems. If the States are unable to handle these enlarged responsibilities, pressure will rapidly build for the Federal Government, piece by piece, to become involved once again in managing these programs.

The unfortunate fact is that many States are far behind the rest of our society in computerizing and reinventing the delivery of their services. Among the State agencies, it is often the human service agencies which are the most in need of automation. While I endorse the concept of block grants and the latitude they provide to States, I believe the Federal Government must continue to provide specific assistance to States to automate.

Mr. SANTORUM. My colleague raises an excellent point. Many States at present are struggling to take advantage of the benefits which information technology can provide. Twenty-two States are currently under court order to improve their child welfare programs. One of the saddest examples is right here in the District of Columbia, where the foster care system was placed in receivership by the courts.

According to the court-appointed receivers, the system of foster care placement was failing some of the city's most needy children. One of the major problems was a lack of information available to the field, largely due to the lack of even basic computer support in the District's foster care system. This is symptomatic of problems

across our Nation, problems which can be overcome through effective use of information technology. Yet the States and the District face compelling alternative uses for the funds as caseloads increase.

Mr. COHEN. Congress over the years has sought to ensure that States have the proper tools to handle their responsibilities in human services programs. For example, the fiscal year 1993 Omnibus Reconciliation Act provided matching of State funds over a 3-year period to be spent on information systems for foster care and adoption assistance programs. Forty-six States and the District of Columbia have responded, and are on their way to improving their information technology systems in these critical areas.

Mr. SANTORUM. Increased automation will bring many efficiencies to human services programs. In numerous cases, State workers enter essentially the same information as many as 200 times in required paperwork. This wasteful duplication can be eliminated through automation. Further, investments in information technology yield substantial savings in welfare programs through elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse. In Rhode Island, for example, a \$10 million investment in technology saved over \$7.7 million in erroneous welfare benefit payments in the first year of operation. By now this investment has paid for itself many times over. The system allowed the State to handle a 40-percent increase in welfare cases, while reducing its program work force by 15 percent over a 4-year period.

Mr. COHEN. Unfortunately, without Federal help, many States will not be able to afford the up-front costs required to plan, develop, and install these systems, and train personnel on their use. This is why the Federal Government has always maintained a leadership role in this area. I strongly believe we must continue specific assistance to States in making information technology investments, even in a block grant environment. I call on the eventual conferees on this legislation to carefully consider this point, and work with the House to ensure the States have the resources to make the necessary investments.

Mr. SANTORUM. I join my colleague in making this request. I think some further consideration of the information technology needs of the States is vital for welfare reform to succeed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2683

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Dole modified amendment. Every Member of this body has come to the floor and declared that it is time to "end welfare as we know it." We have disagreed on the most appropriate ways to do that but I hope that there can be no disagreement that welfare reform will not succeed without a more generous provision for child care services.

Even under the current system of entitlement, there are more than 3,000

children of working parents already waiting to receive child care assistance in Maine. Some of these parents have transitioned off of welfare, others are at-risk of going on welfare. One child care center in Maine has just now started serving families who have been on a waiting list for more than 2 years.

This amendment will create a separate block grant for child care services. By creating this separate grant fund, we hope to assist States by providing them with a specific amount of child care funds. This is identical to the approach the House of Representatives elected to take in the Personal Responsibility Act. We have gone further to provide States with additional funds and to help ensure that child care funding does not disappear for welfare families and low-income families alike.

I am glad to see that the Governors have finally weighed in on this issue. Last week, I received a copy of a letter sent to both the majority and minority leadership from the National Governor's Association requesting supplemental funds for child care services. I would like to quote one sentence from the letter, signed by Governor Thompson from Wisconsin and Governor Miller from Nevada. The NGA states that:

Child care represents the largest part of the up-front investment need for successful welfare reform.

More women will be able to work when there are child care funds available. More women who have jobs now will keep them if there are funds for child care. In a report issued by the General Accounting Office in December, GAO found that child care costs are a significant portion of most low-income working families' budgets. In fact, child care consumes more than one quarter of the income for a family below the Federal poverty level. For families above the Federal poverty level, child care consumes about 7 percent of income.

Unlike the Dodd-Kennedy amendment, we know where the funds are coming from to pay for additional child care slots. I support our efforts to eliminate the deficit by 2002 but finding money for States to follow through on welfare reform is imperative. By agreeing to realize a smaller amount in overall savings from this legislation, we have taken the steps necessary to lead to successful welfare reform and help us maintain our goal to zero out the deficit.

While there has been an emphasis on the need to help States meet work participation requirements, of utmost concern is the safety of children. Some parents are already forced to leave their children in unsafe settings. I recently reviewed a report from the State of Illinois where more than 40 children, half of them under the age of two, were discovered being cared for in a basement by one adult. The cost of that care was \$25 per week.

This is not an isolated case. Recent studies have indicated that 1 out of every 8 children in child care are being cared for in an unsafe setting.

The provision for child care services in Senator DOLE's earlier substitute did provide certain protections for children who are not yet in school by prohibiting States from penalizing mothers who cannot work because there simply is no child care available.

The Senate also overwhelmingly approved an amendment sponsored by Senator KASSEBAUM to eliminate a provision that allowed a transfer of up to 30 percent of the funds from the child care development block grant. The CCDBG has played an important role since its creation in 1990 as a source of funds targeted at enhancing the quality of child care and providing subsidies to low-income families.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Without access to child care, mothers will not be able to work. When 92 percent of AFDC mothers are single mothers, the need for additional child care slots must be met if our version of welfare reform is going to be successful.

#### INTER-RACIAL ADOPTION PROVISIONS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, earlier this year I introduced the Adoption Antidiscrimination Act of 1995, S. 637, to ensure that adoptions are not denied or delayed on the basis of race, color, or national origin. I am pleased that the House passed an almost identical provision in its welfare reform bill, H.R. 1. It is my hope that the members of the conference committee on welfare reform will recognize the importance of this issue, and incorporate inter-racial adoption provisions in the conference report.

In the late 1960's and early 1970's, over 10,000 children were adopted by families of a different race. This was before many adoption officials decided, without any empirical evidence, that it is essential for children to be matched with families of the same race, even if they have to wait for long periods for such a family to come along. The forces of political correctness declared interracial adoptions the equivalent of cultural genocide. This was, and continues to be, nonsense.

Sound research has found that interracial adoptions do not hurt the children or deprive them of their culture. According to Dr. Howard Alstein, who has studied 204 interracial adoptions since 1972, "We categorically have not found that white parents cannot prepare black kids culturally." He concluded that "there are bumps along the way, but the transracial adoptees in our study are not angry, racially confused people" and that "They're happy and content adults."

Since the mid-1970's, there have been very few interracial adoptions. African-American children who constitute about 14 percent of the child population currently comprise over 40 percent of the 100,000 children waiting for adoption in foster care. This is despite 20 years of Federal efforts to recruit African-American adoptive families and substantial efforts by the African-American community. The bottom line

is that African-American children wait twice as long as other children to be adopted.

Last year, Senator Metzenbaum attempted to remedy this problem by introducing the Multiethnic Placement Act of 1994 [MEPA]. Unfortunately, the bill was weakened throughout the legislative process and eviscerated by the Clinton administration Department of HHS in conference.

After the original MEPA bill was hijacked, a letter was sent from over 50 of the most prominent law professors in the country imploring Congress to reject the bill. They warned that it "would give Congressional backing to practices that have the effect of condemning large numbers of children—particularly children of color—to unnecessarily long stays in institutions or foster care." Their warning was not heeded, and the bill was passed as part of Goals 2000. As Senator Metzenbaum concluded, "HHS intervened and did the bill great harm."

The legislation that was finally signed by the President does precisely the opposite of what was originally intended. This is because it contains several huge loopholes that effectively permit continuing the practice of racial matching. For example, it states that an agency may not "delay or deny the placement of a child for adoption or into foster care solely on the basis of [race, color, or national origin]". This language can be used by those opposed to inter-racial adoptions to delay or deny placements by using race, color, or national origin as only part of their rationale.

An even bigger loophole is contained in the "permissible consideration" section of MEPA which states that an agency "may consider the cultural, ethnic or racial background of the child and the capacity of the prospective foster or adoptive parents to meet the needs of a child of this background as one of a number of factors used to determine the best interests of a child." While this language may appear innocuous, it can be used by those who are committed to racial matching to delay or deny a placement simply by claiming that an inter-racial adoption is not in the best interests of the child.

DHHS has issued guidelines for implementing the Multiethnic Placement Act. Again, on their face, the guidelines do not appear to be objectionable. However, consistent with the underlying MEPA law, they continue to allow race to be a major consideration that may be used by those who wish to stop interracial placements. Consequently, the National Council for Adoption and Institute for Justice have informed the Department that its guidelines do not adequately address this issue. They continue to believe that new legislation is necessary.

Clearly, we need to fix last year's flawed legislation. In considering the



House provisions on this issue, the conferees should prohibit, under any circumstances, an agency that receives Federal funds from delaying or denying the placement of a child on the basis of the race, color or national origin. Racial or cultural background should never be used as a basis for denying or delaying the placement of a child when there is at least one qualified household that wants the child.

Perhaps, there are certain extremely limited circumstances in which an agency should be allowed to consider race, color or national origin, only when there are two or more qualified households that want the child and only as one of a number of factors used to determine the best interests of the child. But under no circumstances should such considerations be allowed to delay the adoption of a child. When there is only one qualified household that wants the child, that placement is, by definition, in the child's best interests.

Mr. President, I hope that the conferees will be willing to adopt a strong prohibition against consideration of race, color or national origin in placement decisions, and to close the gaping loopholes in the current law. By incorporating strong and reasonable anti-discrimination provisions in the Conference Report, we will help to remedy the national problem of children being held in foster care because the color of their skin does not match that of the individuals who wish to adopt them.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2542

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the welfare reform bill imposes upon the States a 6-month time limitation for any individual to participate in a Food Stamp Work Supplementation Program. This amendment, which is supported by the National Governor's Association and the American Public Welfare Association, would replace the 6-month limit with a 1-year limit. It would continue to allow an extension of this time limitation at the discretion of the Secretary.

Arizona's current cash-out of food stamps under its Empower welfare program allows individuals to participate in subsidized employment for 9 months with an option for a 3-month extension. There is no reason that the State should have to make another special request to the Secretary in order to maintain this policy. This amendment would allow States with such policies to continue their programs without disruption.

Ideally, I would prefer that the States be able to plan their work supplementation programs without being constrained by requirements imposed by the Federal Government. The States know best how to structure their programs to help their citizens become employable. Thus, my preference would be to eliminate the time limitation altogether.

However, I recognize that many of my colleagues are insisting upon a time limitation for individuals under

the program, and I am pleased that we were able to come to an agreement that meets the needs of Arizona and other States that wish to pursue similar policies. In the future, I plan to revisit this issue to allow States maximum flexibility to plan their work supplementation programs.

Mr. President, a primary objective of this bill is to encourage the States to innovate. The best way to achieve this is to get out of their way. We should not impose requirements limiting the States' flexibility unless there is a compelling reason to do so. This amendment will give States additional leeway to innovate in their work supplementation programs and will thereby help them achieve their employment objectives.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2544

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, this amendment would give States the right to correct problems in their welfare programs before penalties are imposed by the Federal Government. Titles I, III, and VIII of the bill impose significant penalties, in the form of reductions in grant funds, for States that are out of compliance with Federal requirements. I believe that it is simply unfair to punish States without first giving them an adequate opportunity to remedy the problems.

Under this amendment, a State would have 60 days in which to submit to the Federal Government a corrective action plan to remedy any violations for which a penalty could be assessed. The Federal Government would then have up to 60 days to accept or reject the State's corrective action plan. If it does not act within this period, the plan will be deemed to be accepted. Finally, the State would have 90 days to correct the violation pursuant to the plan before penalties may be imposed. A longer correction period would apply if it is part of an accepted plan.

A major objective of the welfare reform bill is to give States greater flexibility and freedom from Washington regulations in helping their welfare recipients to be productive, independent citizens. Where Federal requirements are imposed, States should have ample opportunity to comply with those requirements and correct any problems without being penalized. This amendment ensures this objective and the overall approach of giving States the flexibility to implement their programs.

Mr. President, this amendment is strongly supported by the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the American Public Welfare Association. I ask unanimous agreement that the letter of support from the APWA be printed in the RECORD.

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

## AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, September 12, 1995.

Hon. JOHN McCAIN,  
Russell Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR McCAIN: The American Public Welfare Association strongly supports your amendment number 2541, that relieves states from the excessive data collection and reporting requirements in H.R. 4, if sufficient funding to allow states to meet such excessive requirements is not provided. We are deeply concerned that between the 15% administrative cap approved by the Senate earlier this week, the bill's penalty provisions, and the array of new and burdensome reporting requirements contained in H.R. 4, states will not have the systems support they will all need for greatest transformation of their welfare systems to date.

APWA fully supports State accountability in the use of block grant funds for national programmatic and fiscal goals. APWA policy calls for a state federal partnership in the establishment of minimal, clear, concise federal audit standards, related penalties, or sanctions for noncompliance. In addition, APWA supports your amendment number 2544, providing states with advance notice of any impending penalty, with the option of entering into a corrective action plan. The measure provides for accountability by states and the Secretary of Health and Human Services during the implementation of a corrective action plan, and provides states with the opportunity to remain focused on reforming their systems, while coming into compliance with the statute.

Finally, we support your amendment number 2543, to broaden the definition of work to include job readiness workshops as a work activity. With regard to work programs under a cash assistance block grant, APWA policy calls for enhanced state flexibility to design and implement work programs, including the right to define work. We also support your amendment number 2542, to remove the six month limit for an individual's participation in a work supplementation program under the food stamp program. Each of your amendments contribute to increased flexibility for states.

Again, Senator McCain, thank you for offering these amendments that are so vitally important to the successful implementation of welfare reform.

Sincerely,

A. SIDNEY JOHNSON III,  
Executive Director.

## WELFARE REFORM, AGAIN

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, like many voters, I have heard before the siren call of welfare reform—that if we only pass revolutionary legislation, the recipients will work, the poor children will be nurtured, and benefits reductions will be returned to taxpayers. Frankly, I am very skeptical that this plan will work better than those that went before.

First, its promises continue to feed rife misperceptions. Note the following facts:

Welfare actually is less than 2 percent of our budget.

Illegitimacy, far from rising due to the United States welfare system, has risen across the board to approximately one third of all births (not just welfare births) in America, France, and England despite different welfare systems and declining welfare benefits in the United States.

True reform that employs recipients and cares for children is likely to cost more in the short run, not less.

In short, the savings proposed in this legislation are unlikely to materialize. The bill would not stop the rise in illegitimacy. And, without a newfound commitment from Governors to fill the gap in child care, children will be worse off.

Furthermore, the basic funding mechanism for this legislation is seriously flawed. Southern States, for a variety of reasons including lack of funds, have built smaller welfare programs as part of the historic Federal-State welfare funding partnership. Now, the legislation before us proposes to end that partnership and provide each State with a frozen level of funding and a requirement to employ 50 percent of recipients. Reasonably, the Federal Government should provide an equal per-child amount to each State under this approach since each State must reach the same target. Instead, this reform bill locks States in at the vastly different historic funding rates:

*Federal funding per child*

New York .....	\$2036
Rhode Island .....	2244
Washington .....	2340
Vermont .....	2275
Alaska .....	3248
Massachusetts .....	2177
South Carolina .....	393
Alabama .....	408
Arkansas .....	375
Mississippi .....	331
Texas .....	405

I don't know why southern children are worth so little to our current welfare theorists. There is no reason—indeed, it is offensive—to freeze in place past inequities in the name of forward-looking reform.

Again, South Carolina and Rhode Island will each be given about \$100 million per year to run their respective welfare programs, although South Carolina has more than three times as many people. Similarly, South Carolina has slightly more people than Connecticut—3.5 million rather than 3.2 million—but under the Dole plan, the Federal Government will give Connecticut more than twice as much—\$247 million yearly instead of \$103 million for South Carolina. In effect, the South Carolina taxpayer will chip in a double payment to help Connecticut while struggling to meet an extra burden at home to meet the Federal child care and training targets.

How about Kansas? Kansas has 2.5 million people. South Carolina has 3.5 million people. Despite having a million fewer people, Kansas gets \$18 million more than South Carolina from Federal taxpayers over the next 3 years to run its welfare program.

Mr. President, this unfairness has not fazed many of our governors. They want the cash and the control, whether or not the plan will work. I predict that the promises of reform will again prove false, but as before, I endorse the goals. In 1988, I voted to make it pos-

sible for States to draw down adequate funding for workfare programs and child care to really reform welfare. We have recently seen a few glimmers of success after that legislation, but only where investments have been made. Similarly, I have voted for a community works progress pilot program to allow communities and welfare recipients to benefit mutually from community improvement jobs.

More importantly, I urge my colleagues to pay attention to the policy areas that are not called welfare, but which in reality, have huge, long-term effects on welfare rolls. Chief among these policy areas are education and job protection.

For instance, over the past 20 years, high school dropouts have become more likely to end up on welfare. Overall, the welfare rate for young adults has risen slightly from 4 percent to 5 percent. However, among the high school dropouts, the rate has nearly doubled, from 9.7 to 17.1 percent. These particular high school dropouts are mostly women, since women and their dependent children make up the vast majority of welfare recipients.

However, a similar economic decline has faced their male counterparts, who generally do not have dependent children who would trigger welfare eligibility. Earnings for black male high-school dropouts fell by half from 1973 to 1989. About one third of all American men aged 25-34 earn too little to raise a family of four out of poverty. And, not surprisingly from the perspective of poor women seeking a mate, poor young men and less than one third as likely to be married. In short, jobs have dried up for the high school dropout, marriage has become less likely than before and the children of their incomplete families are more likely to be on welfare at a lower benefit level.

I urge my colleagues to take note of these facts—the importance of education and livable-wage jobs to preventing welfare dependency—as they work on the related issue of welfare reform. While we pass this reform bill on the Senate floor, recently passed cuts to education are headed for conference with the House. Just as States are taking the initiative to eliminate high school general-track education and replace it with tech prep programs that move graduates into better paying jobs, we are cutting back on the Federal tech prep program that provided leadership and the Carl Perkins vocational education program appropriations that have helped fund implementation. Just as data show that the economic split between college graduates and non-college graduates is widening, we are cutting back on Perkins loans, student incentive grants, and in budget reconciliation, college loans. In short, the data is telling us to go one way on education, but we are going the other way fast and bragging about welfare reform.

Similarly, on trade we have unilaterally disarmed, and in manufacturing

we refuse to invest. I have proposed a competitive trade policy, including a competitive restructuring of our tax policy, and have worked to invest in a stronger American manufacturing base.

Mr. President, I do not brag about today's welfare reform legislation. In fact, my favorable vote today is largely an effort to protect the child care improvements I have worked for in the Senate bill as it goes to conference with a less favorable House bill. Furthermore, I support it in the hope that, with welfare off the table, my colleagues will look at the underlying problems that I have outlined and continue to work on improving access to jobs and education.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, there is no doubt that our current system of welfare needs reforming. Each Member of the Senate knows that severe shortcomings exist in our welfare program and each is sincere in their efforts to solve these problems.

The bill before us highlights block grants as the principal instrument for reform. By folding several programs into a block grant directly to States, the Federal Government will be giving broad authority to the States to run their welfare programs, as well as lump-sum Federal payments to help cover costs. If this is done, the Federal guarantee of cash assistance to all eligible low-income mothers and children will end.

I originally supported the Daschle-Breaux-Mikulski Democratic alternative as the best, most compassionate means of reforming welfare. The Work First reform plan would have changed the current system by: abolishing the AFDC Program and replacing it with a Temporary Employment Assistance Program; establishing the Work First employment block grant for States to get welfare recipients into jobs and to keep them in the work force; and permitting the States to use block grant funds to provide such services as job-placement vouchers, wage subsidy and work supplementation, on-the-job training or other training or education for work preparation to assist recipients in obtaining jobs, and allowing the States to establish all eligibility rules.

Furthermore, it would have increased the Federal matching rate for work-related activities, consolidated child care programs and increased the Federal matching rate to make child care available to all those required to work or prepare for work, and extended Medicaid coverage for an additional 12 months beyond the current 1-year transition period. It would have also required community service for those not working within 6 months. In short, the Democratic plan would have met the basic objective of the Republican plan in terms of allowing for State flexibility.

Its strength was that it provided for much more flexibility on the part of the State governments while also correctly recognizing that arbitrary time-

limits and monetary caps do not meet the test of sound policymaking. The plan which I strongly supported provided for major reforms in the system, but at the same time allowed for the fact that every situation and case is unique, and that arbitrary standards and block-grants are not panaceas for addressing every situation. It is these unique cases and situations that, unfortunately, are not addressed in the Republican plan. These are also the cases and situations which will end up costing the system more in the long-term than under the current system. I still believe this was the best reform plan we could have adopted.

The Dole-Daschle compromise welfare reform legislation, while not as sound as the original Democratic plan, is still a vast improvement over the Republican bill. I still have some objections to certain provisions contained in the measure, but I believe, overall, that the good outweighs the bad. As is the case with virtually any comprehensive omnibus legislation we consider, this test has to be our bottom line: Are there enough positives to offset the negatives? I think the compromise we have struck is a step in the right direction, and an overall positive effort at ending welfare as we know it.

One of the major problems I had with the original Dole bill was its funding formula, which, in my judgment, was somewhat punitive to the Southern States. In essence, it places the very States where most of the welfare population lives at a disadvantage as compared to other regions. The formula in the Graham-Bumpers children's fair share amendment, which was rejected, would have substantially increased poor States' funding for legitimate recipients of welfare. Senator GRAHAM tried again last Friday to alleviate some of the problems with the funding formula by allowing the Secretary of Health and Human Services more discretion in certain funding decisions, but that amendment was also defeated. As with most funding formulas, the figures can be misleading. In any event, I think that any problems that remain can be properly addressed when they appear in the future. There will also be an opportunity for the conference committee to address remaining deficiencies in the funding formula.

The Senate also agreed to a Daschle amendment creating a contingency fund for States during times of economic hardship. The original GOP block grant froze funding for States over the next 5 years, with no consideration for economic or natural disasters. This important provision provides eligible States with the resources necessary to manage unforeseen emergencies that are impossible to predict.

The second major objection I had to the original Republican plan was that it did not provide enough funding for child care for those mothers who will be required to work after 2 years. As Senator MOYNIHAN succinctly put it during the debate on child care, we will

either have to pay for child care, or for orphanages.

Senate leaders wisely opted to cover more expenses for child care. Democrats were able to secure an additional \$3 billion over 5 years for a total of \$8 billion in funding to guarantee the availability of child care for mothers required to work. This is the key to shifting mothers of young children from the welfare rolls to the pay rolls. This major change will assist many mothers and their families to permanently move off of welfare and into the work force.

Welfare reform legislation is among the most important issues we will tackle during this or any other Congress. Our debate over the last couple of weeks has been civil, constructive, and, ultimately and most importantly, productive. We now have a bill before us which is a testament to the Senate and its leadership. In essence, it is a product of the Senate's legislative process working as it was designed to work, and I will vote in favor of this landmark welfare reform measure.

We have seen some hard-fought battles and witnessed significant changes in the original bill after some intense debate and good-faith negotiations between the two sides of the aisle. Each side has made concessions, while holding firm to certain core principles. We have arrived at agreements on several major issues. As a result, we now have a bill that contains stronger work provisions and that is not as harsh on children. While there are undoubtedly problems still remaining in the legislation that will have to be addressed down the road, the Dole-Daschle compromise is an overall positive step for reforming welfare, reducing dependency, and offering a brighter future for millions of American families.

#### CONTINGENCY FUND ELIGIBILITY TRIGGER

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, before we vote on the leadership compromise amendment, I would like to raise a concern about the contingency fund provision. I am concerned that, although included with the best of intentions, the unemployment-rate criteria used to trigger State eligibility has not worked particularly well in the extended unemployment benefits program, and may not be the best measure of State need for contingency fund assistance. I would appreciate the opportunity to work with the Finance Committee to identify another trigger that more effectively accomplishes the purpose of the contingency fund—to provide some degree of protection for States that experience economic downturns, population shifts or natural disasters. I would like to clarify whether the authors of the amendment share my concerns.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I share the concerns of the Senator from North Dakota. I, too, am concerned about the ability of State to receive needed assistance from the contingency fund in the event of a recession or some other economic, demographic or natural ca-

lamity. I am very interested in the potential for exploring other trigger options in conference.

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senators from North Dakota and Florida have raised a very important issue. I believe this issue should be looked at more closely during conference. The trigger provision in the amendment is identical to the trigger for extended benefits under the unemployment program. I think it's fair to say that few of us are completely comfortable with using that trigger in this context. We clearly need more information than time currently allows before finalizing this issue.

Mr. DOLE. I share the opinion of the Democratic leader. We have every intention of closely examining this issue to ensure the contingency fund provides States with the protection it is intended to provide.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, might I just say that this is an extremely important issue, and requires the attention of the conference committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, one of the clear messages sent by the voters in last year's elections was that confidence in the Federal Government to solve problems has declined precipitously over the past 20-30 years. As David Broder observed in his Washington Post column, the 1994 elections "ushered in a fundamental debate about what government should do, and what level of government should do it."

There is a growing sense that the trend toward more centralized government in Washington should be reversed and that decisionmaking authority should revert back to the State and local levels. Some functions of government, like defense, must be conducted at the Federal level. Other functions, however, may best be left to the States.

Having said that, I believe we have a common and national interest in assuring an effective social safety net for all Americans, regardless of where citizens may reside. So I would not support any effort to completely remove the Federal Government from the welfare system.

Washington does not have all the answers. It is misguided, if not downright arrogant, for us to assume that one-size-fits-all Federal solutions offer better hope than granting more freedom to States to design approaches that address a State's unique set of circumstances.

In considering our welfare system, I think it is useful to distinguish beneficiaries by three major groups.

First, there are those in need of temporary assistance. People who, while they are generally able to support themselves and their families, they have fallen on hard times. Food stamps and other assistance must be there to provide temporary help when unforeseen economic crises occur.

The second group includes those whom most of us would agree cannot

work. These individuals—through no fault of their own, are simply not able to economically provide for themselves. They have disabilities that warrant our compassion not our scorn. The welfare system should be there for them.

The third group consists of people who fall somewhere in between the first and second groups. They have been on and off the welfare rolls for years, yet they do not seem to fit the profile of someone whom most would agree cannot work.

It is this third group that should be the focus of the current welfare debate. The debate has often been extremely polarized. Many on the left are reluctant to vest any sense of personal responsibility in welfare recipients. They view them as unwitting victims of societal injustices, refusing to acknowledge the role that personal behavior may play.

On the other hand, many on the right are reluctant to acknowledge that no person is an island—that each of us thrives or fails to thrive, to some extent, as a result of our environment. Some on the right naively believe that we all have the same opportunities and that a failure to succeed is simply evidence of laziness.

As in most cases, the truth lies somewhere in the middle. We do no one a favor by excusing them of all personal responsibility. But some of the poorest members of our society are born into environments of drugs, crime, and severe poverty. Through government, we have an obligation to try to counter these negative influences.

Unavoidably, a debate about welfare is a debate about values. Richard Price, the author of "Clockers," a book about life in the inner city, said that during his year of living in a New York slum that he wanted to try to understand why some kids worked in McDonald's, earning minimum wage, while some of their peers hustled drugs outside, earning upward of \$1,000 a day.

He said the key difference he was able to discern was that the kids working in McDonald's had someone to go home to who offered them hope. For these kids, working at McDonald's was a beginning not an end. The kids dealing drugs, however, had little hope about the future. They sensed that, if they went to work in McDonald's, they would never get out.

According to the author, the corollary to the hope that some homes offered was a sense of expectation that their children would meet certain expectations. They instilled a sense of discipline and a sense of hope that convinced their kids that minimum wage at McDonald's was better than hundreds of dollars in the drug trade.

Parents are the principal source of moral teaching. Regrettably, too many of our young people are growing up without two parents involved in their lives. The correlation between single parenthood and welfare dependency is overwhelming. Ninety-two percent of

AFDC families have no father in the home.

Society must also acknowledge the correlation between crime and fatherlessness. Three-quarters of all long-term prisoners grew up without fathers in their homes or active in their lives. When 24 percent of children born today are born to unwed mothers, we cannot avoid this issue if we hope to break the cycle of poverty and crime that permeate some of our communities.

Unfortunately, no one really knows how to counter this trend. For this reason, I do not support efforts to attach a lot of strings to the welfare block grants, including provisions ostensibly designed to curb illegitimacy. It is clear that welfare reform cannot disregard the growing incidence of out-of-wedlock births, teen pregnancy, and absent fathers, but it is also clear that we do not know what will counter this trend. Accordingly, we ought not prescribe a Federal solution that would hamstring the ability of States to try different approaches.

Time will tell how effective States will be in improving our welfare system. To the extent that we clarify what level of government is responsible for welfare, I think we will go a long way to making the system more accountable and thereby more effective.

I support the general thrust of the pending welfare legislation to turn more decisionmaking authority over to the States. Consistency would suggest that we not at the same time put a lot of requirements on States on how and who to spend Federal welfare dollars. I do think that it is important to ensure that States share responsibility with the Federal Government by investing dollars at the State level in welfare programs. For this reason, I think it is important that the block grant provision include a maintenance of effort requirement.

Under current law, States have an incentive to spend their own money on AFDC and related programs. That incentive is the Federal match. Fourteen States receive 1 Federal dollar for each State dollar they invest. The rest of the States receive more than a dollar-for-dollar match.

A maintenance of effort provision continues the incentive for a State to spend its own resources to aid its own people. Understand, however, that the State match does not require a State to spend money. If a State is successful in trimming its costs, there is no requirement that it maintain its spending. But if a State is going to realize savings in its welfare program, I think the Federal Government should share in the savings, too.

I am also concerned about the bind States may find themselves in with respect to child care. Even under the current system of entitlement, there are more than 3,000 children of working parents already waiting to receive child care assistance in Maine. Some of these parents have transitioned off of

welfare, others are at risk of going on welfare. The pending legislation has a strong work requirement—States that are not successful in placing 25 percent of recipients in work programs in 1996 will lose 5 percent of their block grant allocation, no questions asked.

The provision for child care services in Senator DOLE's substitute does provide protections for children who are not yet in school by prohibiting States from penalizing mothers who cannot work because there simply is no child care available.

I believe we are addressing my concerns with child care. Last week, the Senate overwhelmingly approved Senator KASSEBAUM's amendment which prohibits the transfer of money from the child care development block grant to activities not associated with child care. The amendment also streamlines the administration of child care programs because States will now be able to operate a unified child care system. No longer will mothers who successfully move off of welfare have to move their children out of a child care facility simply because they are no longer eligible for AFDC.

To give States a shot at meeting the goals of welfare reform, we have now provided States with \$3 billion to expand child care services. In the year 2000, States must put 50 percent of their welfare population to work. This means that Maine will have to increase the number of working welfare recipients by 64 percent. Now that we have reached an agreement to realize a smaller amount of overall savings in the short term, in the long term these additional dollars will pay off.

A vivid example of a welfare program run amuck is the SSI Program, which I have investigated over the past several years through my work on the Special Committee on Aging.

Our investigations have discovered that the Federal disability programs, which were intended as a vital safety net for America's most vulnerable citizens—the elderly and the disabled poor—have mushroomed into the largest and fastest growing cash welfare programs in the Federal Government. Despite the huge outlay of taxpayer and social security trust fund dollars, we have paid far little attention to how these benefits are being spent and taken far too little notice of how the disability programs are being abused.

The lax management and rampant abuses in the SSI Program that have come to light through these investigations shocked the public. Drug addicts and alcoholics have been using cash SSI benefits to subsidize and perpetuate their addictions, and many addicts were actually seeking out the SSI Program as a steady source of cash to support their habits. The message of the program has been, "Stay addicted and you qualify for benefits. But stop drinking or shooting up drugs and the benefits will stop."

Tragically, these policies have not only drained the Federal Treasury, but

have also been destructive to substance abusers themselves, by rewarding addiction and discouraging, or failing to require, necessary treatment to pave the way to rehabilitation.

Following legislation I introduced to correct these abuses, Congress took swift action to place protections on disability benefits paid to drug addicts and alcoholics. We took the cash out of the hands of the addicts by requiring them to have third parties handle their benefits for them, and made alcoholics and addicts eligible for SSI only if they receive treatment for their addictions. Finally, we imposed a 3 year cut-off of SSI and disability insurance benefits for addicts and alcoholics.

These changes enacted last year removed major incentives for abuse of the SSI Program and encouraged rehabilitation, rather than lifelong dependency.

Another stunning example of abuse of the SSI Program pertains to one of the major areas of growth in the SSI Program, namely, benefits for legal immigrants. Just last week, for example, I released a GAO report finding that the Social Security Administration is not doing enough to crack down on fraud by translators who fraudulently assist legal immigrants qualify for SSI benefits. In one case, a middleman arrested for fraud had helped at least 240 immigrants obtain \$7 million in SSI benefits by coaching them on medical symptoms and providing false information on their medical histories. The GAO has identified major weaknesses in how SSA awards SSI benefits to legal immigrants.

While the bill before us will go far in reducing the problem of unchecked benefits to legal immigrants, this will continue to be an area of potential abuse that we must continue to watch carefully.

Fraud and abuse in SSI should not be the only cause for reform of the disability programs. Even more fundamental problems should motivate reform. First, the SSI and disability insurance programs as now structured encourage lifelong dependency, not rehabilitation. The programs return virtually no one to work: Less than 1 person in 1,000 on the SSI-DI rolls gets off the program through the programs' rehabilitation efforts.

We must address the growth of these programs if we are to preserve them for the truly disabled. Persons are getting SSI at younger ages, with very little chance of ever getting off the rolls. The SSA recently estimated that a typical SSI recipient will stay on the rolls for about 11 years, and we are paying out roughly \$51,000 in SSI benefits to each new person on the rolls over this period of time. The cost to the Government for each recipient is far higher when Medicaid and food stamps are added to the equation: Recipients can receive total Federal benefits of about \$113,000 when these other programs are taken into account.

With dollars this large at stake it is crucial that we do all we can to reform

the disability program so that it emphasizes rehabilitation rather than dependency. In reforming this program, our guiding principle must be that we preserve the disability programs for the truly disabled, but that we not remain blind to the very real problems that exist within the SSI Program.

As Marvin Olasky noted in his recent book, "The Tragedy of American Compassion," effective welfare requires the ability to distinguish those who have fallen on hard times and need a helping hand from those who simply refuse to act in a disciplined and responsible manner. When welfare is a Federal entitlement, it is very difficult to make these distinctions. Giving State and local governments more discretion in the welfare system is a step in the right direction.

Block-granting AFDC to the States is not a panacea. A welfare system that has clearer lines of responsibility and accountability will be more effective. But this is not the end of the welfare debate. Hopefully, the legislation we enact this year will make meaningful improvements in the current system. But turning these programs over to the States will not itself fix the problems. Congress and the President must continue to work with States to improve the welfare system to make sure that a safety net is there for those who need it but is denied to those who abuse it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 4, the landmark welfare reform legislation that the Senate will be adopting this afternoon.

Mr. President, I call H.R. 4 landmark legislation first and foremost because it ends the 60-year status of welfare as a cash entitlement program. Once this bill becomes law, no person will be able to choose welfare as a way of life. Likewise, no person will be entitled to cash benefits from the Federal Government simply because he or she chooses not to work.

By dramatically cutting the Federal welfare bureaucracy and providing welfare block grants for the States, H.R. 4 recognizes that the best hope for making welfare programs successful lies in shifting major responsibility for their administration to a level of government where innovation and experimentation can flourish. That is a significant step toward reinvigorating federalism in our system of government.

H.R. 4 transforms welfare from a handout that fosters dependency into a temporary helping hand for those who fall on hard times. The bill places a 5-year lifetime limit on receiving welfare benefits. Individuals will be permitted to move on and off of the welfare rolls, but will, after a cumulative total of 5 years, become ineligible for additional benefits.

In return for Government's temporary helping hand, H.R. 4 requires that welfare recipients work for their benefits as soon as their States determine that they are "work ready." If a recipient refuses to report for work, then a pro rata—or greater—reduction

in benefits is imposed. In fact, the States may terminate benefits for such recipients if they so choose.

Although I supported amendments to the bill that would have taken stronger steps to reduce the Nation's escalating out-of-wedlock birth rate, H.R. 4 does address that crisis in several very important ways. Most important, the legislation requires that minor mothers who have children out-of-wedlock must stay in school and live under adult supervision in order to receive welfare benefits. In doing so, the bill removes the perverse incentive under current law for a young girl to become pregnant and have a baby in order to receive a welfare check and thus become financially independent of her parents.

Moreover, Mr. President, H.R. 4 permits the States to refuse to give more cash benefits to mothers who have additional children while on welfare. Finally, H.R. 4 provides \$75 million to encourage the States to establish abstinence education programs designed to reduce out-of-wedlock births and encourage personal responsibility.

I am also pleased, Mr. President, that H.R. 4 takes a number of steps toward ending the abuse of the welfare system by those legal immigrants who come to America not to go to work, but to go on welfare. H.R. 4 does this by giving the States the option to deny welfare benefits to noncitizens.

Equally important, Mr. President, H.R. 4 requires that, for most means-tested welfare programs, both the income and the assets of a legal immigrant's sponsor are deemed to be those of the noncitizen for a period of 5 years. This "deeming" provision is designed to prevent noncitizens from going on welfare. This is good public policy. Noncitizens, after all, remain, by definition, citizens of other countries. If they come to the United States and fall on hard times, they can, quite simply, go home. They should not, in all fairness, expect to be supported by Americans who are not their fellow citizens.

In summary, Mr. President, I commend those among my colleagues in the Senate who have worked long and hard to make this a strong welfare reform bill. I am pleased to support it. I look forward to supporting an even stronger bill when it comes back from the conference committee.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, this is not the best welfare reform bill that Congress could pass. And, this is not how I would have designed a welfare reform bill. There are, in my view, still some problems with it.

But, I cannot ignore why we are here today. Democrats and Republicans sat down together and came up with a bipartisan compromise.

That is what the American people sent us here to do. Not to bicker. Not to fight. Yes, to have honest disagreements. But, in the end, to sit down and

work out our differences. That is exactly what happened here on welfare reform.

The result of us working together is a dramatically better bill than when we started. Not perfect. But, much, much better. And, it is far superior to the bill passed by the House of Representatives earlier this year.

The welfare bill before us today stresses that welfare recipients work for their benefits—and many will be required to do so.

It limits the amount of time that individuals can spend on welfare—so that welfare is no longer a way of life.

It takes a significant step toward ensuring that innocent children are protected—by providing safe day care while their mothers are working.

And it toughens the child support enforcement laws—so that everyone knows that when they bring a child into this world, they have a responsibility for that child.

These are the general principles that I have previously outlined as the major components that must be included in any welfare reform bill. And, the requirement that welfare recipients work for their benefits is a proposition that I have advocated since 1987.

Nevertheless, as I said a moment ago, this bill is not perfect. The details are not as good as I believe they could—or should—be.

I believe we could have had a bill that was both more compassionate to the children—by ensuring that they are taken care of even if their parents are kicked off of welfare—and also more demanding of the parents—through even stricter work provisions.

And, I still have concerns about the whole concept of block grants to States.

But, as Senator MOYNIHAN stated long ago, we should not let the best be the enemy of the good. This is not the best bill, but it is a better bill. And, I dare say that after the bipartisan agreement, it is a pretty good bill.

Mr. President, I cannot turn my back on the significant improvements that have been made in this proposal. And I cannot turn my back on the good faith bipartisan effort at reforming our welfare system.

So, I will—despite my continued reservations about some aspects of the legislation—vote for this welfare reform bill.

I only hope that this delicate compromise—and not the draconian House bill—is accepted when the bill goes to conference.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will vote for passage of the welfare reform bill that has been crafted over the past several weeks.

I do so, however, with trepidation over where this reform may lead.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] has spoken eloquently on many occasions about the potential consequences of ending over 60 years of Federal commitment to the welfare of children who through no fault of their

own have either been born into a life of poverty, or who have fallen into poverty because of family misfortune.

I will vote for this bill because the current system is badly broken, and we must find an alternative to the status quo.

No one likes the current system, least of all the families trapped in an endless cycle of dependency, poverty, and despair. We must change the system and I see this bill as the most moderate measure likely to move forward in the current climate.

The basic premise of this bill rests upon the notion that the current system has failed and that we ought to allow the States the opportunity to try to do a better job, with as much flexibility as possible. This approach places a great deal of faith in the good will of State governments to implement programs designed to help, not punish, needy citizens.

As a former State legislator, I have a good deal of respect for State governments. I am not convinced that the Federal Government always knows best how to handle every problem. Certainly, there are areas—like civil rights—which are national in dimension, which require a consistent, bedrock level of Federal involvement to insure that rights derived from our national constitution are fully protected. But I am not convinced that social policy, welfare policy in particular, must always be controlled from Washington.

I recognize that part of my willingness to try this approach of greater State control is based upon the fact that I come from a State, Wisconsin, which has long been a laboratory for progressive social policy and demonstration programs. I have said on the Senate floor that much of what Wisconsin has tried to do through direct investment in job training programs for welfare recipients makes sense and is designed to help people join the workforce. Some of the policies, like Learnfare and Bridefare, I have voted against because there is little evidence to show that they will have any real impact on helping people move off welfare and into the work force. I have voted against mandatory family caps for the same reason.

Mr. President, I want to reiterate that this is not the kind of bill I would draft if I were the author.

I think it falls far short of what is needed in the areas of child care, job training, and services that will help families become self-sufficient.

Mr. President, the changes made in the bill through the bipartisan leadership amendment make this a more desirable bill than the one we began debating several weeks ago.

This amendment will provide an additional \$3 billion for child care services. It includes a maintenance of effort that will require States to spend at least 80 percent of their 1994 level of State funding in order to receive the block grant. Without such a maintenance of effort requirement, Federal

dollars would simply replace state contributions, and States like Wisconsin which make a substantial contribution to investing in welfare programs would have simply seen their dollars shifted to States which lack such investments.

The amendment contains a contingency grant fund to help States which run out of money under the block grant because of higher unemployment rates. It provides that up to 20 percent of recipients can be exempted from the 5-year time limitation for welfare assistance—a provision that will allow some flexibility in a provision which might otherwise cause untold hardships. The inclusion of each of these provisions has been critical to my decision to support this bill.

At the same time, the bill still falls far short of what I think needs to be done to achieve real, meaningful change. I believe that the States will be back here within a few short years asking for more Federal dollars to get the job done.

I am also deeply concerned about the provisions of the bill that remove the guaranteed Federal safety net for young children, replacing that 60-year Federal commitment with a system of State block grants which will create a patchwork quilt across this Nation to replace the current Federal commitment.

Many States will continue to provide protections for these children and will work hard to help families move from welfare into the work force. The Senate wisely rejected several efforts to impose the punitive-type provisions contained in the version of welfare reform passed by the other body.

But there will be some States which will exercise the punitive options available under this bill and will opt to impose harsh requirements upon needy families.

These provisions and the lack of national protections for children, wherever they may live, are deeply troubling to me.

But we cannot continue the current system. I am hopeful that many of the States will enact innovative programs, like the New Hope program in Milwaukee, WI, that will provide real opportunities for welfare recipients to become economically self-sufficient members of the work force.

This bill will give the States the opportunity to demonstrate whether they are willing to make the kinds of investments that will promote this self-sufficiency, rather than serve simply to punish those who fall through the system.

As I said at the outset, I am voting for this bill because I am not convinced that welfare policy can only be made in Washington, DC. I think the problems of welfare policy are so complex and difficult that it is a mistake to believe that there is only one approach. This bill will encourage State experimentation which may well lead to better policy development over the long period.



I believe that the vote being cast today is either for or against the status quo, and I do not support the status quo.

Although I will vote for the Senate bill, I want to make it very clear that I will not support a conference report that contains the kinds of punitive, harsh measures contained in the welfare reform bill proposed by the other body. I hope that the bill that emerges from conference will reflect the moderate efforts that went into the Senate bill.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, in my home State of New Mexico and across the country, agreement is virtually unanimous: it is time to reform our Nation's welfare system.

The current system is not working as well or as efficiently as it could. The many State waivers already approved by the Secretary of Health and Human Services are compelling evidence that the current system is incapable of meeting the wide variety of differing needs across our country.

We need a system that is less costly; more efficient; and truly capable of moving people permanently from welfare to work. Most important, we need a system that gives States the flexibility they need to fund and operate programs specifically tailored to meet the needs of their citizens.

But as we move toward reform, we must do so carefully and thoughtfully. We need to fully understand the ramifications of our actions, and we need clear, measurable goals.

As we prepare to vote on final passage of welfare reform legislation, I would like to take a few moments to talk about effective goals and objectives for reform and to discuss how the majority leader's Work Opportunity Act and the Democratic Leader's Work First Act meet these goals. I would also like to discuss three critical differences in the two bills and the effect of these differences on my home State of New Mexico.

Recently, I read a book on homelessness in America, "The Visible Poor" by Joseph Blau. One of the statistics in the book that made a significant impression on me was that something like one-third of all the homeless people in this country are working Americans.

These Americans are doing everything we ask, and they still do not have the resources to afford basic housing.

Joseph Blau attributes this phenomena to several factors. One is the sorry state of our economy, and the fact that the minimum wage is not really a living wage in this country.

Many Americans are facing a declining standard of living. This has the obvious effect of forcing people to allocate a larger percentage of their income to the basic necessities; and when all of their income is not enough, to relinquish adequate housing in favor of food.

The declining standard of living in America also has the effect of exerting

downward pressure on our social safety net.

I think all of us agree with the principle that work has to be rewarded. Working should pay more than not working.

For most of American history, when our living standards were on the rise, this philosophy did not conflict with ensuring that everyone in this Nation had the basic necessities of life. It was quite possible to help some people in need to obtain food, housing, and clothing without violating the premise that those who were working should have a better life. We did not create the perfect social safety net, but we did the best we could to ensure that the poorest among us—especially children, who are the most vulnerable members of any society—had the basics of life.

Today, however, when our economic living standard is in decline, some think the way to ensure that working pays more than not working is to take away from those who are not in the system.

In other words, the argument is that if our Nation is confronted with a situation where a person can work and still not be able to afford a place to sleep, then to correct this problem, we need to remove any benefits that would have enabled those outside the employment system to have a place to sleep.

Rather than making sure that those who work have a standard of living we can be proud of, we find ourselves taking away from the most vulnerable in society to make sure that those who work at least can find someone worse off in this Nation.

I believe a saner approach is to make sure that everyone who works for a living in this Nation gets a decent living. This approach ensures that everyone who can work has the right incentives to do so, and that we do not have to literally take food and shelter from children to ensure that those who work are receiving more than those who do not.

I hope that in the future, the Senate will engage on a debate on how to raise the rewards of working, through increasing the minimum wage, keeping the earned income tax credit, improving job training, and creating a national strategy on competitiveness. That would be an excellent policy debate.

In the meantime, however, it appears that we must first fight to ensure that we do not force more people who are on public assistance to the streets so that to work becomes relatively attractive.

I believe the scope of the compromise amendment worked out by the Democratic and Republican leadership is limited to this basic issue. The agreement should not be characterized as a significant step forward in the effort to reform and improve our Nation's welfare system.

The agreement simply will help prevent us from taking too many steps backward.

The compromise we are voting on today will enable States to get more

unemployed parents into the work force because it will help make affordable child care more accessible for some. Not all families in need will be covered under the compromise, but a number parents in each State will be able to move from welfare to work.

If the Senate votes today to reject the compromise amendment, in favor of the majority leader's bill, there is no question but that a substantial number of families, a growing percentage of the homeless already, will be forced onto the streets.

If we vote to accept the compromise amendment, we will lessen the blow to some, but not all, of these families. Throughout the welfare reform debate, I have been concerned about the effect of a massive overhaul of our public assistance programs on these families, and the working Americans who are hanging on to the economic ladder just one rung above them.

I am not saying that change is not needed. Some change is clearly needed. But in making changes, the Congress and the American people need to be aware of the degree to which these issues and programs are interconnected.

We need to understand the ripple effect of changing one, or two, or three Federal programs. If one nutrition program is eliminated or consolidated, are more working Americans going to have to make a choice between food and housing?

Of particular concern to me is the ripple effect in New Mexico: What does block-granting vital domestic programs mean to New Mexico's children?

What does it mean to New Mexico's poor working families who can just barely make ends meet today?

How are we going to guarantee that the basic needs of New Mexico's poor working families are met?

How are we going to guarantee that poor, rural States like New Mexico are not left with disproportionate and unmanageable financial and administrative burdens?

In seeking answers to these and other questions, I have reached the conclusion that the chief goals of welfare reform should be to create a system that encourages—and demands—personal responsibility and that helps people become self-sufficient, productive members of our society and workforce.

To reach these goal, I believe we need a system focussed on education and on building the skills they will need to compete in the global marketplace of the 21st century. Four key components of an education-oriented system are: First, a strong public education system that includes training for adults, and, in particular, parents; second, affordable, accessible child care; third, affordable, accessible primary and preventive health care, including nutrition programs such as child care food assistance, and school lunch and breakfast programs; and fourth, real opportunities to earn a wage that allows working families to maintain a decent standard of living.

I do not believe the Republican leadership's Work Opportunity Act will help us reach these goals. In fact, I believe the block grants contained in the Republican bill take us in the wrong direction and lead us away from our goals.

Reducing essential funding and lumping many important social service programs into a few omnibus block grants, without any assurance of accountability or continuity among the states simply is not the best way to reach our goals.

Instead, we in the Congress need to work together with three objectives in mind: First, to enact well-considered, effective, and fair legislation where needed; second, to consolidate, coordinate, or eliminate duplicative or outdated programs; and third, to support and improve those Federal programs with proven track records of success, such as child care programs, the school lunch program, and the child care nutrition program.

In my view, these three objectives are at the core of the Democratic leader's Work First welfare reform plan, which I am pleased to cosponsor.

The Work First plan recognizes the need for a Federal partnership role in helping States and individuals gain the tools and skills—education, effective job training, and child care—they need to become productive, contributing members of society. The Republican bill does not.

The Democratic and Republican plans differ significantly in three key areas: First, commitment to work; second, commitment to child care; and third, commitment to States and American families in general.

The top priority of the Democratic leader's plan is to move people from welfare to work. In fact, under the plan, welfare recipients must either go to work or enroll in school or job training within 6 months or sooner. To help meet these stringent work requirements, the Democratic bill helps States fund the education and training programs they will need. States will submit detailed plans for program implementation, so progress toward goals can be measured, but the states will have a great deal of flexibility in designing programs.

The majority leader's Work Opportunity Act also sets up work requirements, but it does not fund them. Instead, the bill shifts AFDC, Emergency Assistance, and transitional and at-risk child care into a single block grant to the States; then it freezes the annual funding for the total block grant at the fiscal year 1994 level—\$16.7 billion—for the next few years.

If the Senate leadership's compromise is adopted, and additional \$3 billion in funding for work-related child care, above the fiscal year 1994 level, will be available over the next 5 years.

Because the work requirements under the Republican plan are mandatory, many believe the bill essentially

amounts to an unfunded mandate of more than \$23 billion over 7 years.

In my home State of New Mexico, the unfunded work mandate totals \$161 million over 7 years.

As I understand it, the compromise agreement addresses a portion of the burden of this State mandate by allowing States, at their option, to require that single parents with children age 5 and under work 20 hours per week, as opposed to 35 hours under Senator Dole's bill.

A key difference in the two bills, which is addressed in the compromise, involves child care. Both the Democratic bill and the compromise recognize that the No. 1 barrier to work for most parents is lack of child care.

The Democratic bill would ensure that child care is available for all welfare recipients who are working. The Senate leadership's compromise would help ensure that child care is available for many welfare recipients who are working.

In my view, this is a key difference between the Republican and Democratic bills—under the Dole plan, child care is not required or ensured. Existing Federal programs are simply lumped into an omnibus block grant to the States.

Under the Democratic bill, access to child care is real. No parent will be able to use inability to find child care as an excuse for not finding work. Under the compromise, child care is not guaranteed, but it is more likely to be available. In addition to the overall increase in funding, \$3 billion over 5 years, the compromise stipulates that funding will be distributed at the Medicaid match rate to those States that agree to maintain funding for at-risk child care programs.

Despite the improvements that the leadership compromise would make to the majority leader's legislation, the Democratic and Republican proposals remain dramatically different in their fundamental commitment to the States and American families. The foundation of the democratic plan is an individual entitlement to American children and families. The foundation of the Republican plan—and the Senate leadership's compromise—is a block grant to the State.

Why is this distinction important, particularly in light of the increased funding under the compromise?

It is important, especially to poor families and poor States, because an individual entitlement is an unbreakable promise made by the Federal Government to its States and its citizens that in times of need, assistance will be there.

Now, I want to make clear: this is not unconditional assistance. This is not a give away. Always, assistance will be contingent on certain requirements, such as job training, completing school, or seeking employment.

Consistent with the Democratic bill's focus on work, the entitlement has a 5-year time limit, with exceptions for

children. In addition, it is dependent on the signing of a parent empowerment contract, stating a participant's commitment to finding a job. No aid is provided unless a contract is signed, and penalties will be applied to those who violate the terms of their contract.

On the other hand, the majority leader's plan and the leadership compromise are based on block grants. These are fixed amounts of money given to the States with little or no requirement for accountability, either to taxpayers or the State's citizens, and with no assurance of continuity among State programs unless amendments offered and accepted during the floor debate are retained in conference.

The real problem is that the block grant may or may not be sufficient in times of need. When a State runs out of money, it runs out of money. Help simply will not be available to eligible, needy children and their families unless State and local taxpayers pick up the tab.

To help alleviate this situation, the compromise includes a \$1 billion contingency grant fund, which States could use—so long as they meet certain matching requirements—in fiscal emergencies.

According to the information and statistics I have, my home State of New Mexico could be one of the first to apply for such a grant.

Under the Republican leadership's plan, an additional 14,400 jobs for welfare recipients would be needed in New Mexico by 2000, or the State would be assessed a 5 percent penalty in reduced Federal funding. Now, 14,400 new jobs may not sound like a high figure when compared to States like Texas or California, which must add more than 116,000 and 358,000 jobs to their economies respectively. But in a poor, rural State like New Mexico, 14,400 new jobs is a significant number—it represents a required increase in the State's current welfare-related work participation rate of 123 percent. And it represents an increased cost to the State of \$13 million in fiscal year 2000 alone.

Directly tied to the increased work requirements are increases in the number of families needing child care.

In fiscal year 1994, about 2,970 children in New Mexico received AFDC/JOBS-related child care. Based on the Republican plan's work requirements, the number of children needing AFDC/JOBS-related care would grow to at least 4,720 by 2000. This represents an increase of 159 percent, and an increased cost of at least \$23 million in fiscal year 2000.

Yet, the Republican plan does not provide any additional funding to cover the child care needs of these families. As a portion of the new temporary assistance block grant, the plan freezes funding for AFDC/JOBS child care at the fiscal year 1994 level.

The Senate leadership's compromise is only slightly better. It would make an additional \$3 billion available over the next 5 years. When the additional

funding is divided between the 50 States and spread over 5 years, the significance of the compromise tends to diminish. Fortunately from New Mexico's perspective, this additional funding would be drawn down by the States at the Medicaid match rate.

Mr. President, let me just review the costs to New Mexico of the increased work requirements and related child care expenses. Estimates are that by 2000, New Mexico would have to spend: \$13 million more for work-related operating costs, \$23 million more in child care costs. In total, from fiscal year 1996 to fiscal year 2000, \$115 million increase.

These two costs represents 40 percent of New Mexico's total block grant, leaving only 60 percent to cover cash assistance and other programs. If this is insufficient, as it would be if benefit levels remained where they are today, the State will have no option but to greatly reduce benefits, deny eligibility to many families, or spend much more than it does today in State funds.

Based on current law projections, by 2005, 72,000 New Mexican children would be eligible for AFDC benefits. Under the Republican plan, which would strip parents—and their children—of all AFDC benefits after 60 months, 19,000 children—or 26 percent of all recipients—in New Mexico would be denied benefits.

Further, the State could decide to maximize its Federal funds by implementing various penalties available as options under the Republican plan. Each penalty denies more children benefits:

Children denied family cap: 12,000 if the family cap is added back in conference.

Children denied birth to unwed teen: 320.

Children denied family benefits for 24 months: 36,673.

Today, we are debating the wisdom of block granting essential safety net programs. The block grants would be authorized for the fiscal years 1996 to 2000. Because we cannot project with certainty the economic and employment situations of each State in future years, or whether migration among States will be more or less significant than it is today, or a variety of other factors, we cannot precisely project the actual degree of harm one State may endure under a fixed formula for block grants.

Mr. President, earlier in my remarks I said it was critical that we in the Senate work together, in a bipartisan matter, to enact real, goal-oriented welfare reform. I believe the compromise amendment worked out by the Senate leadership represents a step—albeit a small step—in that direction.

I will support the compromise, and despite some serious misgivings, I will vote to pass the underlying bill. However, I remain deeply concerned that in the rush to cut spending and send a message to the American people, the very people who need our compassion

and assistance the most—vulnerable children and their families—could be the most gravely hurt.

In closing, I urge my colleagues who will take this bill to conference with the House to approach their deliberations carefully and thoughtfully.

Without question, we need to better coordinate our public assistance programs; we need to streamline many of them; but we cannot do so in a way that threatens the health and well-being of New Mexico's—or any State's—children and their families.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I intend to support this welfare reform bill and advance it to a conference with the U.S. House of Representatives. I do so even though I have some real problems with some provisions. Despite my concerns, I think it is important to move this legislation forward.

Mr. President, there is broad consensus in this country that the current welfare system serves no one well—not the recipients, not their children, not the American taxpayer. It fails both the people who need help and the working people who are paying for it. It has trapped all too many people, especially women, into a lifetime of dependency instead of helping them on a temporary basis to get on their feet and into the labor force. Sadly, the children of long-term welfare recipients all too often suffer irreparable harm and are likely to remain poor and disadvantaged for the rest of their lives.

Mr. President, the American people want us to overhaul a system which they perceive to be one that encourages dependency rather than one which encourages work. They see the current system as inefficient, unproductive, and a waste of their hard-earned tax dollars. They want a system that demands responsibility and accountability—a system where able-bodied individuals are required to work for their benefits. That is why we are here today.

But the American people are also compassionate. They do not want innocent children punished for the behavior of their parents. They expect us to protect poor and vulnerable children. And that is the most serious flaw in the legislation before us—innocent children are not guaranteed protection. The bill before us today does not guarantee that the children of parents who violate the rules or are removed from the rolls because of they have exceeded the time limits for benefits are protected.

I think we have a moral responsibility for these children. They ought not to be punished for the mistakes of their parents. There ought to be a safety net in this bill to ensure their protection. There is not. If this egregious hole in the social safety net is not remedied by the conference committee, I will have great difficulty supporting the final package. I am not willing to gamble with the life of one child in welfare reform.

Despite my very serious concerns about the impact this legislation will

have on innocent children, the bill we are considering today is a vast improvement over the bill that emerged from the Finance Committee this spring. With bipartisan support, a number of the most serious flaws in the original legislation were corrected.

Nevertheless, I remain concerned about the block grant, no-strings-attached approach to welfare reform. I am especially concerned that the block grant funding levels are frozen for a 5-year period. In my view, that is a dangerous experiment. And it is an experiment that could impact the lives of 10 million children.

If a cash assistance welfare block grant had been enacted in fiscal year 1990, an historical analysis by the Department of Health and Human Services concludes that States would have received 29 percent less funding in fiscal year 1994 than they would have received under current law? If States do not have enough money to meet needs, what do we expect them to do? Surely, they will not raise taxes. What they will be inclined to do is establish more stringent eligibility criteria and reduce benefit levels to make ends meet. And who could suffer? Poor and vulnerable kids.

So let me repeat. I have serious reservations about the block grant concept. But a majority of Members of Congress seem to like the idea, and most governors relish it. We will not know the results of this block grant experiment for a number of years. Only then will we know for certain if it has been a wise or foolish undertaking.

Every expert agrees that lack of adequate child care is the No. 1 barrier in moving individuals from welfare to work. It is the linchpin for successful welfare reform. Yet, as originally proposed, not 1 dollar of the block grant was earmarked for child care. Under the compromise offered by Senators DOLE and DASCHLE, \$5 billion of the block grant was earmarked for child care and an additional \$3 billion was added to that pot. While the \$8 billion funding level is still well short of the estimated need, it is a step in the right direction. Without this commitment to child care, the welfare reform effort was doomed to failure. If the final package does not contain this commitment to child care, I simply cannot support it.

Other modifications to the original Republican proposal were important to garnering my vote in support of this measure. First, mothers with children under age one will not be forced to go to work to receive benefits. Second, single mothers with children under age 5 will be exempt from the 5 year time limit if no child care is available. In other words, the 5-year clock will not begin ticking for these mothers if States do not make child care available to them. This makes eminent good sense. The last thing we should want to do is create a situation where young children will be left home alone. That is irresponsible. And that was exactly

the scenario we were creating under the original proposal.

Finally, States will be given the option of not requiring single mothers with children under age 5 from working more than 20 hours a week. Giving mothers the ability to stay at home and nurture their children during the most formative years is the right thing to do.

These three improvements were crucial components in my decision to support this bill, and they must be retained in conference or I intend to oppose the final measure.

Shortly before final passage, the Senate finally agreed to include a maintenance of effort provision. As originally crafted, this bill did not require states to contribute one red cent of their own money for welfare reform. Under current law, states contributions constitute about 45 percent of total welfare expenditures. Think about that. Without a maintenance of effort provision, the pot of welfare money could have been reduced by almost half overnight. That was unconscionable in my view. Welfare has always been a State-Federal partnership. That partnership should be retained. The compromise agreement requires States to contribute at least 80 percent of the money they spent on welfare in 1994 in order to be eligible for their block grant money. While I would have preferred a 100 percent requirement, I can live with this percentage. This State maintenance of effort requirement must be retained by the conference committee. It is the right and fair thing to do.

Lastly, Mr. President, the compromise included a provision to address the crisis of teen pregnancy. Seventy percent of teen mothers are not married, and that percentage has escalated each year for the past two decades. If we do not get a handle on this problem, all our good efforts for welfare reform could prove to be in vain.

Too many unmarried teens are becoming parents, and too few are able to responsibly care for their children either emotionally or financially. The result: the child is deprived of a fair start in life, and the mother will very likely be doomed to a lifetime of poverty. No welfare reform effort can succeed without addressing this problem.

The compromise that was agreed to last week included a provision on teen pregnancy that was part of the Democratic plan. It is a good provision. It will establish second chance homes where unmarried teen parents can live in adult-supervised homes where they will receive the support and guidance they need to finish school and become successful parents and productive citizens. This provision ought to be enthusiastically embraced by the conference committee.

Mr. President, the original Republican plan for welfare reform has been significantly improved with the adoption of some very important bipartisan amendments. I commend the leadership of both parties for working to-

gether to make these changes. And I hope the bill will be further improved by the conference committee. If the final bill does not guarantee that innocent children are protected, however, I will have great difficulty in supporting it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Today, we will vote on final passage of S. 1120, the so-called Work Opportunity Act of 1995, better known as welfare reform.

During the robust Senate debate on welfare reform, I have been a critic and a skeptic about the fundamental fairness and the workability of the legislation advanced by our majority leader, Senator DOLE.

I have also watched this bill improve with time, and I remain hopeful that progress will continue through the conference process.

I remain hopeful because I have an abiding, underlying interest in achieving genuine welfare reform because I know the current system does not work.

The incentives in the current system are in all of the wrong places and trap individuals into welfare dependency. For so many Floridians on welfare, it pays to stay there instead of to work.

Why? Because without day care you can not train to get a job that pays a living wage. Without transitional, subsidized day care it is difficult to make ends meet when you first go back to work. And, finally, without some form of health insurance, a sick child in the house, is reason enough to stay at home and to stay on welfare.

That is the failed system that we have today in America. That is what we seek to discard today.

But we must make sure that the new system we are contemplating today is not a patchwork of slogans and wishful thinking, but instead a meaningful attempt to provide temporary assistance to families in need until they can return to the work force quickly.

Mr. President, you cannot just wish away the children on welfare while you deal with the adults who receive the welfare checks.

We must remind ourselves that children comprise almost 70 percent of the number of welfare beneficiaries. It is for the children that the old system was built, and in so many cases that system has failed them.

As we construct a new system, we must look at the real needs of the children: quality and available child care is a critical need.

I spoke earlier of the recent efforts which have been made to improve S. 1120. I would be remiss if I did not commend the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and also Senator DODD who helped lead the charge, for the improvements in the child care provisions from the original bill.

The additional \$3 billion in funds for child care represents meaningful progress in the movement toward true welfare reform.

We know very well from our experiences in Florida that you can not get a

mother back to work if her children have no place to go during the work day.

The old system forced a woman to choose between her children and work, and an enhanced Federal investment in subsidized child care can allow her to address both concerns. That is what the \$3 billion Federal investment is intended to buy.

But before we celebrate these advances in the funding levels for child care, we need to look at the cold realities facing the families who comprise the so-called working poor.

Today in Florida, there is a waiting list of 25,000 children who are seeking subsidized day care. This number is not even representative of the actual unmet need when those who do not bother to add their names to this gargantuan list are considered.

Because Florida has taken steps the last several years to invest more dollars into its child care system, the amount of Federal dollars that will go to Florida due to the additional \$3 billion in this bill, will barely maintain Florida where it is today.

This new money will actually only assist Florida to the point that it does not have to cut back on its subsidized day care program. Today Florida is investing in child care well beyond the 1994 spending base upon which S. 1120 is predicated.

Further, I think every Member of the Senate should pause and contemplate the effect the new work requirements will have on the availability of subsidized child care for the working poor.

In Florida, of the total child care pie, about half of it goes to the children of the working poor, primarily through the child care development block grant and the social services block grant programs.

S. 1120 imposes a requirement that 25 percent of all welfare recipients must be working in the first year, and 50 percent by the year 2000. Therefore, the States will be under extreme pressure to move all eligible welfare families to the front of the line for day care, at the expense of the working poor families presently enrolled.

The numbers speak for themselves, and currently Florida is barely half way toward that goal of 25 percent employment.

As the conferees wrestle with the issues of maintenance of effort, work requirements and State flexibility, they need to focus on this important child care trade-off.

This is not the time for shell games, moving some people off welfare and into work, while forcing others on welfare because we have withdrawn child care help from them. For a working poor family trying to make ends meet, the approximately \$300 a month per child in day care in Florida can be a budget buster.

Mr. President, I want welfare reform. The people of Florida want welfare reform. The people of America want welfare reform.

For that reason, I am voting for this bill, with reservations. I am voting for this bill to keep this legislative process alive, with the hope that the bill will be improved when we vote on the conference report.

I would rather support this bill and keep this process moving, than vote no and kill any chance of welfare reform this year.

With that premise stated, I want to outline two key reservations about this bill:

First, The fundamental inequity of distributing resources under the proposed block grants to States.

Under this legislation, we would divide Federal resources based on spending patterns in 1994. This arbitrary method would lock in current inequities, would disadvantage growth States, would be difficult to change once its in place, and would set a troubling precedent for our upcoming decisions on Medicaid.

In the past, the Federal welfare allocation to States has varied from State to State due to the local match incentive. If a State put more funds into the welfare system, it got more funds from Washington.

By using 1994 as the baseline for future allocations, we would perpetuate wide disparities among States. On a per-child basis, some States would receive five or six times the amount received by less-affluent States.

These stark disparities raise fundamental questions of fairness which I am hopeful the conference committee will address.

Second, My second reservation about this bill deals with its unfair treatment of legal immigrants.

Mr. President, most people of this Nation trace their heritage to somewhere else. My family came here from Scotland.

This Nation has benefited from a long tradition of legal immigration. Let me repeat: Legal immigration.

We set out rules and expectations for legal immigrants to become citizens. Under this bill, we are saying to legal immigrants who have followed the rules that we are going to change the rules, retroactively, on their way to citizenship.

Again, this raises fundamental questions of fairness.

Denying benefits to legal immigrants would unfairly impact certain communities in this Nation that have attracted a large number of newcomers.

I will leave for another day the discussion over how Florida currently picks up the Federal tab for illegal immigration, to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

Permit me to focus on the dollars that are spent today for legal immigrants. In Florida in November, 1994, there were 34,224 legal immigrants on the welfare rolls, and 149,732 on the food stamp rolls. The estimated annual costs associated with these groups are \$39 million and \$133.5 million, respectively. In addition, Medicaid costs for

legal immigrants in Florida in 1994 was greater than either AFDC or food stamps.

This represents a substantial sum of money which Florida spends and which Florida might be asked to absorb under certain versions of this welfare reform legislation.

This is a significant issue which must be addressed in conference.

Furthermore, changing the rules for legal immigrants would be unfair to the newest Americans. I am particularly concerned about access to education.

One of the great principles of America, that has bound us together as a diverse people and provided a foundation for the American Dream, is access to education.

I implore my colleagues to consider the impact of this legislation on students. At Miami-Dade Community College, an estimated 8,000 students could lose financial aid.

Is that the type of message we want to send to tomorrow's citizens, that the door to education is closed to you in the name of welfare reform?

I am hopeful that the House-Senate conference can work to remedy this inequity in the overall bill. In part, I base my hope on public comments made by Majority Leader Bob DOLE, who visited Florida last weekend.

Senator DOLE said he would prefer more flexibility on the issue of providing benefits to legal immigrants.

The Gainesville Sun, on Sunday September 17, reported Senator DOLE's views as follows:

Dole later said he supported giving some benefits to legal immigrants and said the amendment would be reviewed when the welfare package goes to conference committee.

I am pleased that the majority leader has not closed the door on changes to the portion of this bill that deals with treatment of legal immigrants.

I look forward to reviewing the product of the conference committee with the hope that my concerns about fairness will be addressed.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise to commend my colleagues for the honest debate which has produced the legislation we will vote on later today . . . legislation which takes a solid step toward fixing our badly broken welfare system. Both sides have put forth credible arguments, and more often than not we've been able to work together to find common ground.

Yes, we may disagree on many of the details of this compromise legislation . . . but we all agree that the welfare system is in desperate need of an immediate overhaul.

These facts are clear and indisputable: today, one American child in seven is being raised on welfare . . . one in three children is now born out of wedlock. And despite the \$5.4 trillion taxpayer dollars we have funneled into the welfare system over the last 30 years, the poverty level has remained nearly the same.

Three years ago, during his presidential campaign, President Clinton

promised the American people that he would "end welfare as we know it." Since then, however—even though his party controlled both the House and Senate—the welfare system remained untouched. Today, less than one year after Republicans gained control of both Chambers, we are on the verge of passing legislation to dramatically reform a welfare system which has too often entrapped both welfare recipients . . . and the taxpayers who subsidize them.

At the heart of our legislation is the strong message from this Senate that the days of welfare without work are over.

The American taxpayers are fed up, Mr. President. They go to work every day—both spouses, more often than not—and struggle to make ends meet while trying to carve out a better life for themselves and their families. They make a combined average income of \$47,000 . . . but hand over more than a third of that to the Federal Government. And when they see those precious tax dollars going to support welfare recipients who simply refuse to work . . . well, they have every right to be furious.

The taxpayers of this country have always been generous . . . but nobody likes to be taken for a fool.

The "pay for performance" provisions of this welfare reform legislation offered by myself and Senator SHELBY are intended to put accountability into the system. If a welfare recipient wants a federal check, all we ask is that they start making a contribution to society . . . to their own future . . . by working for that money.

It is hardly a revolutionary concept. Every taxpayer in the Nation does the very same thing.

I am proud that this bill incorporates a second amendment of mine to further strengthen its work requirements. This amendment permits states—for the purpose of meeting their work participation rate—to count no more than 25% of their welfare caseload as "working" if they are enrolled in vocational education.

Without my amendment, the work requirements in this bill could be circumvented by substituting vocational education for actual time spent on the job. It is already happening in many states, where officials are avoiding the work requirements of the 1988 "Family Self-Sufficiency Act" by counting voc-ed programs as work.

Let me make this clear, Mr. President—work does not mean sitting in a classroom. Work means work.

Any farm kid who rises before dawn for the daily chores can tell you that. Ask any of my brothers and sisters what "work" meant on our family's dairy farm. It didn't mean sitting on a stool in the barn, reading a book about how to milk a cow. "Work" meant milking cows.

Now, I am not opposed to vocational education. Not every voc-ed program can be considered a success, but we are

fortunate to have a number of effective programs operating in Minnesota . . . and we need to continue to give these kinds of efforts a chance.

But my neighbors back home are tired of sending other people's kids through school. They are struggling to send their own children to school. They want this government to reflect their values—hard work, respect, personal responsibility, and accountability.

It sometimes seems that the work ethic upon which this Nation was founded has gotten a little dusty. For example, experts say that less than one percent of the adults who receive welfare benefits are currently engaged in real work. That is a sharp departure from the past: during the Great Depression, welfare beneficiaries were expected to work for the assistance they received through federal programs such as the Civilian Conservation Corp and the Work Progress Administration.

What has changed?

Mr. President, the government has become the first call for help. But what we too often forget is that the government is funded by other people's money . . . and should be the last call for help.

One leading welfare expert sums it up quite clearly: "In welfare, as in most other things, you get what you pay for. By undermining the work ethic, the welfare system generates its own clientele. The more that is spent, the more people in apparent need of aid who appear."

What is most troubling of all is that because there are no incentives to move themselves off welfare and into the workforce, too many welfare mothers and fathers have given up the search for that better life. And the taxpayers who foot the bill feel powerless, too.

Mr. President, if we ever want welfare recipients to become self-sufficient, we must begin holding them to the same standards that apply to the taxpayers. How can we ever expect welfare beneficiaries to lift themselves up if we continue to ask less of them than we do of every other productive, tax-paying American citizen?

By allowing states to count 25% of their welfare caseload as "working" if they are engaged in vocational education, my amendment closes a gaping loophole . . . strengthens the work requirement . . . and gives states the flexibility to continue successful vocational education programs, while recognizing there is no substitute for work. Most importantly, this amendment moves welfare recipients a bit closer toward self-sufficiency.

Mr. President, the Majority Leader's welfare reform legislation is a serious first step toward fixing our fractured welfare system. While I am pleased that both of my tough work amendments were included in this final bill, I recognize that we still have a ways to go before we can say we've truly conquered the welfare problem.

Many important provisions which were not included in the Senate bill

will be addressed by the House-Senate Conference Committee. I look forward to the Senate's consideration of the conference report . . . which I hope truly will end welfare as we know it. That is what we promised the American people, and that is what we must deliver.

"Far and away the best prize that life offers is the chance to work hard at work worth doing," said Theodore Roosevelt.

I urge my colleagues to hear those words and give this bipartisan legislation their support. It is good for welfare families . . . it is good for the taxpayers . . . and it is good government.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have decided to vote for the Senate's welfare reform bill because I believe a bipartisan consensus has greatly improved it.

First child care to job training, to going after deadbeat parents—this Senate bill has moved in the appropriate direction.

I strongly oppose the House bill and believe that a strong vote going into the conference committee is essential.

I must state, however, that it is unfortunate to see the National Government backing away from a responsibility toward our Nation's children—a responsibility embraced by the Democratic alternative which was tougher on work and more compassionate toward children. I will work in the future for adoption of that kind of common-sense welfare reform.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will vote for the compromise welfare reform bill which is before the Senate.

The Nation's welfare system does not serve the Nation well. It is broken in a number of places. It has failed the children it is intended to protect. It has failed the American taxpayer.

The compromise bill before us represents a bipartisan and constructive effort. Meaningful reform should protect children and establish the principle that able-bodied people work. Also, it would tighten child support enforcement laws and be more effective in getting fathers to support their children.

Additional funding has been included to assure that more child care resources will be available for children as single parents make the transition into work. This is a significant improvement in the bill and strengthens the work requirement because it better assures that States can effectively move people into job training, private sector employment, and community service jobs.

A provision has been added to strengthen the requirement on States to assure that they will take more responsibility and maintain their ongoing contribution to the welfare program.

The compromise adds a \$1 billion contingency fund to provide for assistance to the States in economic emergency situations. The establish of such a provision is very important. As re-

sponsibility is shifted to the States and a block grant provided, it is critically important that there is some flexibility in the event of a recession or other economic crisis. I am particularly concerned about working people who lose their jobs and have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. Tens of thousands of such individuals are currently on welfare in my home State of Michigan. Such working people need the assurance of the safety net. I am also concerned that adequate contingency funds be available to protect children during periods of economic hardship. The contingency fund is a step toward such flexibility. I doubt that \$1 billion will prove to be adequate, but Congress can revisit that issue in the future.

I am particularly pleased that the compromise bill contains my amendment which strengthens the work requirement in the bill.

The original Dole legislation required recipients to work within 2 years of receipt of benefits. My amendment, in its final version, adds a provision which requires that unless an able-bodied person is in a private sector job, school, or job training, the State must offer, and the recipient must accept, a community service employment within 3 months of receipt of benefits. In order to obtain its passage, it was necessary to include a provision which gives the States the flexibility to opt out of the requirement. However, I hope and expect that pressure from the American people, who overwhelmingly support strong work requirements, will convince their States to enforce the provision and not opt out.

Mr. President, this welfare reform bill is a positive step in the effort to get people, now on welfare, into jobs. It is a significant improvement over the original proposal put before us. It is stronger on work. It better protects children. It cracks down on parents who do not meet their responsibility to support their children. It provides some necessary child care.

I am troubled by some shortcomings. I would prefer a bill which did not end the Federal safety net for children, a bill like the Daschle Work First legislation which failed in the Senate narrowly and which I cosponsored. I am not fully convinced that the block grant approach will prove to be the right approach. Also, as I have already mentioned, I am not certain that the contingency fund which we have established will be adequate in a recession.

The decision is a close one.

So it is particularly important that partisanship not dominate the conference between the House and the Senate.

If it does, the progress made in the Senate would be undermined and welfare reform would be jeopardized.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Senate has now debated welfare reform legislation for several weeks. The changes that have been incorporated in the legislation before us today are profound,



marking a great departure from the system that has been in place for 60 years. As one who has served my State of Rhode Island and this Nation as a U.S. Senator for 35 of those 60 years, I do not take lightly the vote that I am casting today. I have thought long and hard about the desire for change, for reform, and for a better welfare system, and I share all of those goals.

As I look at the bill before us, I remain concerned. It does not provide nearly enough of what I think is necessary for quality welfare reform. And it does not sufficiently protect our children or provide adults with the tools they need to move off of welfare and into work.

But the bill before us is also a drastic improvement over the House welfare legislation, and, with the addition of the Dole-Daschle compromise, moves us more in the direction that I think is best for our Nation. So while it is with some reluctance, I have decided to cast my vote in favor of the bill before us today. I am doing so with the understanding that the American people want and demand action, and are seeking a new way of accomplishing what the existing system has not been able to accomplish. I am willing to try a new way, but acknowledge freely that without the minimal protections put into place by the Dole-Daschle agreement with respect to child care and other important provisions, I would not be voting "yea" today.

I cannot help hope that the conference committee will see fit to incorporate more of the provisions contained in the work-first proposal introduced by Senator DASCHLE, which I cosponsored. I still support and strongly prefer its provisions—its emphasis on transitioning welfare recipients to work, its understanding that providing childcare is a linchpin of successful reform, and its premise that, despite very real abuses of the current system by some welfare recipients, most people want to get off welfare and work at a job that provides a living wage. But I realize that the conference committee is more likely to move this bill in a direction that I cannot support, by being more punitive to parents and, in the process harming children who have not chosen their parents or their circumstances.

Mr. President, it would be my intention, should the bill return from the conference committee stripped of these moderating provisions, or including any of the more draconian provisions we defeated during the Senate debate, to cast my vote against the conference report. I hope that this will not be necessary and that we will be able to pass a conference report that really does move the Nation in the direction that we all want to see toward workable reform that moves this generation off of dependency while ensuring that the next generation does not suffer from its parents' failures or misfortunes.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of a com-

prehensive overhaul of our Nation's welfare system.

I would like to commend the distinguished Majority Leader, Senator DOLE, and many of my colleagues for bringing a much-needed and timely bill to the floor of the Senate for action.

I am also looking forward to what I believe can be a genuine spirit of bipartisanship as we seek to address some of the aspects of our welfare system that have hurt, rather than helped, Americans forge a better future for themselves and their families.

Although it has been characterized as such, welfare reform should not be a conservative-versus-liberal issue, or a Democrat-versus-Republican issue. It should be an issue where we seek to involve and include various constructive points of view for a cause whose worth stretches beyond partisan political lines.

Simply put, what we must strive for in this debate is to end welfare as a way of life for millions of Americans and their families, while at the same time preserving a safety net for those in our society who need a leg-up rather than a hand-out to succeed in their personal quest of the American dream.

What we must be compelled to accomplish is to require more individual responsibility, a strengthened work ethic, and a sense of discipline and order to the family, all while continuing to maintain our historic and compassionate commitment to those who need our help in those dark times that are a part of everyone's life at some time or another.

Mr. President, I believe we can—and must—give them change with a human face. It is not necessary to be less compassionate or less understanding, but it is possible to be less spendthrift and less generous to those who have taken undue advantage of our system.

As we begin to meet these challenges and others, I am eager to work with all my colleagues to further improve this legislation and, in the process, craft a better America and set our Nation on a new and more responsible course into the 21st century.

Everything we and our parents have worked for to give us a better life and instill in us a sense of national purpose as well as personal responsibility is at stake in this debate.

We, in America, all too frequently judge our Nation and measure our country's worth as a people by standards of economic statistics, by gold, silver and bronze medals won at world tournaments, or by military might as the world's greatest democracy.

But to judge America in terms of a society, clearly we are lacking in many respects.

In today's society, it is hardly uncommon for an individual to be smoking or drinking by the time they are 10; to be caught stealing by the time they are 11; to be hooked on drugs by the time they are 12; to be sexually active by 13 years of age; to be pregnant by the time of their 14th birthday; to be

on welfare at 15; to be a high school drop-out at 16; and to have the American dream be nothing more than a pipe dream at 17.

Mr. President, to many this may be nothing less or nothing more than a worst-case scenario. But, unfortunately, in the 1990's it has become an acceptable scenario in America. How tragic; and how wrong.

Welfare in America has become a way of life, a culture of despondency, a tradition of dismay, and has bequeathed a sad inheritance of dependance for millions of our citizens.

Our challenge in these proceedings is not to make their lives more difficult by our efforts here, or to perpetuate any negative stereotypes, or to treat harshly those people in need of help; our solemn challenge is to give them a new chance, a new beginning, and to show them a different and better way of life.

In the 1960's, when many welfare programs were designed and implemented by the Federal Government, we were willing to risk the involvement of central government in people's lives for the benefit of helping them to help themselves.

Instead, welfare in the 1990's is out of touch, out of cash, and out of tune with people's lives. In an August 1993 Yankelovich poll, respondents were asked, "Do you think our current welfare system helps more families than it hurts, or hurts more families than it helps?" Twenty-four percent said that it helps more, while a commanding 62 percent said it hurts more.

Many might wonder what it is that we have bought with over \$5 trillion in welfare funds over the past 30 years. Many might wonder what the returns have been on an investment we made three generations ago.

It is a disappointing litany of our shortcomings as a society and as a compassionate democracy.

Mr. President, what we are doing is rewarding the failure of the individual spirit to strive for greatness and personal responsibility. As one pollster said, "Welfare rewards what life punishes."

Moreover, these social and cultural trends play a major role in other trends involving crime and violence, both on the streets and in our homes; they affect education, urban decay, and our economy. Their link to each other is unmistakable.

As former Education Secretary William Bennett said:

Over the last three decades we have experienced substantial social regression. Today, the forces of social decomposition are challenging—and in some instances, overtaking—the forces of social composition. And when decomposition takes hold, it exacts an enormous human cost.

These figures exact the toll and tally that cost.

Since 1960, illegitimate births have soared by more than 400 percent; while only 5.3 percent of all births were out-of-wedlock in 1960, illegitimate births rose to 30 percent of all births by 1992.

The pregnancy rate among unmarried teenagers has more than doubled since the early 1970's, amounting to over one million—one million—teen pregnancies every single year.

While America's marriage rate has declined spectacularly for 20 years by almost one-third to an all-time low, America's divorce rate has increased by nearly 300 percent in the past 30 years, subjecting more of our children to more broken families than ever before.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that 77 percent of unmarried adolescent mothers become welfare recipients within 5 years of the birth of their first child. And many of them are staying on welfare for a long time. In fact, more than half of the 9.5 million children receiving AFDC have parents who never married each other.

Single-parent families account for 65 percent of poor families with children, and they account for over half of all poor families. I should mention that studies show that almost 1 out of every 4 children from one-parent families will be in poverty for 7 years or more, compared with only 2 percent from two-parent families.

And, despite an explosion in welfare spending, more children live in poverty today—22 percent—than in 1965; 15 percent, which is when the famous—or infamous—War on Poverty began. What does 22 percent mean in real terms? Try over 15 million children living in poverty in America today.

The percentage of all American children dependent on AFDC welfare increased from 3.5 percent in 1960 to over 13 percent in the 1990's.

While we are talking about AFDC—it has become a \$23 billion Federal-State program supporting approximately 14.5 million people—and that is a 31-percent increase not over 1960 or 1965 or even 1970, but a 31-percent increase over 1989; only 6 short years ago.

Probably worst of all, among these terrible numbers, are these:

First, of the 4.5 million households currently receiving AFDC benefits, well over half will remain dependent on the program for over a decade—10 years—and many will remain dependent for 15 years or even longer.

Second, and even worse, children raised in single-parent families are three times more likely to become welfare recipients themselves as adults—a clear continuing legacy of failure and the unmistakable mark of what the Heritage Foundation calls intergenerational dependence.

That is highlighted by the fact that 60 percent of welfare recipients today are the children of welfare dependents from the previous generation.

As I mentioned, America has spent \$5 trillion in welfare assistance since the start of the War on Poverty.

Mr. President, we are losing—badly losing—the war within our borders against poverty and social decay.

But through the haze and maze of this debate, we can learn from some of

the success stories of people who were once on welfare and had the courage and stamina to leave the system and seek a better life.

For some, welfare meets a critical need; sometimes, a critical lifeline in troubled times. Our challenge is to reform this system so that it works for more people, encourages more to leave the system for good and return to wage-earning jobs, and yet retains the vital portions of the safety net for the neediest among us.

It can happen. It can work. We can make it a reality.

I know because I have met the success stories firsthand. Take Melissa Brough from Portland, ME. She succeeded in welfare. Sadly, she succeeded despite the system, not because of it. Listen to what she has to say:

I started out just needing some subsidized child care so I could find a job to support us. I ended up trickling down through the system for 4 years. What a way to build self-confidence and self-esteem!

It's no wonder people get trapped in the welfare system, when competing resources seem to have money and statistics in mind instead of individuals \* \* \* [L]et's provide the resources and support \* \* \* to help people along the road to self-sufficiency.

Mr. President, Melissa is right. Self-sufficiency should be our goal, and the system we design must provide the resources and support to help people along that road.

Sometimes, getting to success and self-sufficiency requires short-term sacrifices and tough choices. But there are stories to show that they are worth it.

Tecia Girardin is a proud mother of three sons living in Readfield, ME. She works 50 hours a week and takes home \$350 weekly in pay through her job at Progressive Distributors, a warehouse distribution center. She is now getting \$345 a month in child support, and 2 years ago put a downpayment on 48 acres of land, where she hopes to build a house in the near future.

But it was not always this way for Tecia and her boys. Years ago, she counted on food stamps to put food on her table at night. She used to rummage for aluminum cans to pay for the rent.

Looking back, Tecia recalls, "It was a nightmare, but we made it." She adds, "I was determined to make it on my own. I just do not think a life of dependency is good—whether it is dependency on alcohol, drugs, or government assistance \* \* \* I wanted to be free of welfare."

With her pride and her self-confidence, Tecia broke the shackles of welfare and took several tough jobs before landing a position at Progressive Distributors, where she has now been for 5 years. She is off food stamps and off Medicaid, and it is been 4 years since her last benefit check. But times are still tough for her and her family.

We still need to do more to help people like Tecia break free of the system.

I believe the majority leader's plan makes a good attempt to help people break free of the labyrinth of welfare.

This legislation recognizes that the Federal Government does not have the ability to create a one-size-fits-all welfare program. Instead, it has made a necessary and bold change: States are awarded block grants to design a local program that meets unique State needs.

I support this basic concept, and believe it is essential that welfare reform give States the flexibility to address the unique problems of their citizens. At the Federal level, we simply do not know what will work. Each State should have the flexibility to address the problem as they understand it.

In Maine, the principle reason that families go on welfare is divorce or separation. That is the No. 1 reason: 42 percent of all AFDC recipients are forced onto welfare as a result of divorce or separation. In Maine, 61 percent of adult AFDC recipients have obtained their GED. The people behind these statistics may require quite different welfare programs than people in densely populated States.

That is why flexibility is a crucial tool—missing from existing welfare programs—that must be extended to the States.

I also support the restoration of AFDC as a temporary assistance program, rather than a program which entangles and traps generation after generation after generation.

The legislation before us allows States to provide benefits for 5 years, but after that point benefits are terminated. As soon as a recipient is work ready, he or she will be required to work for their benefits. All recipients will be required to work after receiving benefits for 2 years.

Nothing like a time-limited welfare system has ever been tried in this country. But we need to send a message to recipients that there are responsibilities associated with receiving a welfare check: responsibility brings dignity. And to promote responsibility, there must be consequences to action or inaction.

This bill also makes progress in another critical area of concern, one that, for many welfare recipients, has forced them into poverty: child support enforcement.

Child support enforcement is one of the most important provisions in our campaign to revamp the welfare system of this country. It affects every State—children at every income level—and it affects both single-mothers and single-fathers. As a national problem, child support enforcement merits a national solution. And we must demonstrate our leadership by providing it.

I am proud to have worked in a bipartisan manner with the majority leader, Senator DOLE, and the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. BRADLEY, to develop a sound and comprehensive national child support enforcement solution. The major provisions of our legislation have been incorporated into this proposal.

To strengthen efforts to locate parents, the bill expands the federal parent locator system and provides for State-to-State access of the network.

To increase paternity establishment, the bill makes it easier for fathers to voluntarily acknowledge paternity and encourages outreach.

To facilitate the setting of effective child support orders, it calls for the establishment of a National Child Support Guidelines Commission to develop a national child support guideline for consideration by Congress, and provides for a simplified process for review and adjustment of child support orders.

And to facilitate child support enforcement and collection, the bill expands the penalties for child support delinquency to include the denial of professional, recreational, and driver's license to deadbeat parents, the imposition of liens on real property, and the automatic reporting of delinquency to credit unions.

This provision has proven very effective in my own State of Maine, where the State has collected more than \$21 million in child support payments by sending letters to delinquent parents with a very real threat to revoke professional licenses.

This bill also grants families who are owed child support the right of first access to an IRS refund credited to a deadbeat parent and permits the denial of a passport for individuals who are more than \$5,000 or 24 months in arrears.

Mr. President, as I have pointed out, this legislation seeks to implement on a national level some of the successful child support enforcement mechanisms being utilized by some innovative States, like my home State of Maine.

Clearly these efforts pay off. But we can—and must—do much more. We have the tools to replicate the successes of States like Maine on a national level and begin to ease and eventually lift the economic and emotional burdens caused by delinquent child support payments.

Mr. President, as we reform the system to encourage welfare recipients to work, we must also ensure that we provide for appropriate and adequate child care for mothers with young children. And in instances where that child care is not available, we cannot penalize mothers with young children at a very fragile and unstable time in their lives as they struggle to make ends meet.

When we in this chamber talk about the need to protect the neediest in society and to protect some of our less fortunate citizens by casting a so-called safety net, nothing could represent that support more than helping mothers care for their children as they seek to make the move from the world of welfare to the world of work.

We must not condone a situation where a woman would be forced to choose between her children's well-being and her job and benefits.

We cannot allow, for example, a woman to leave her two young children

at home alone, unattended, because she is required to work. To do so would be to give them a Catch-22 choice, a choice between the devil and the deep blue sea.

And many more women could be faced with that difficult choice than ever before under this bill. By requiring work participation rates to reach 50 percent by fiscal year 2000, it is estimated this will add an additional 665,000 children to those currently in need of child care.

The truth is, we have a long way to go before we can assure access to child care—let alone affordable child care. In dozens of States across America, there are long waiting lists for child care. In Alabama, for example, there are nearly 20,000 children on the waiting list for child care, adding up to an average wait between one and one-and-a-half years.

In Texas, a staggering 35,692 children are on the waiting list, with waits as long as two years. In my home State of Maine, there are more than 3,000 children on the child care waiting list.

Fortunately, there is light at the end of what for many women in this country is a very long tunnel.

I am extremely pleased to be able to say that the majority leader has decided to incorporate a major provision. I authored along with some of my colleagues, into this proposal to help address the issue of child care for parents on welfare. This is a critical issue for welfare reform, and one I have been working to address since the debate on welfare began.

With this new provision incorporated into the proposal, States will be prohibited from sanctioning mothers with children aged 5 or under if the State cannot provide adequate and affordable child care for those recipients whom it requires to go to work.

This is important considering that the Department of Health and Human Services has estimated that almost 62 percent of welfare recipients have children aged 5 or under.

I am also pleased to have been involved in a bipartisan effort by working with Senators ORRIN HATCH, CHRISTOPHER DODD, BILL COHEN, JOHN CHAFEE, JIM JEFFORDS and NANCY KASSEBAUM to allocate an additional \$3 billion over 5 years in child care services funding.

Under this agreement reached with the majority leader, the States will be required to match child care funds at the Medicaid match rate.

This additional funding, when combined with the \$1 billion that Senator HATCH's amendment sets aside for child care, will go a long way to ensuring that we make our welfare reform proposals viable and realistic options for single parents who need care for their children in this country.

Adequate child care funding is a major issue that the Governors themselves—in a letter to Majority Leader DOLE dated September 13—called the largest part of the up-front investment

needed for successful welfare reform. And they are right.

This provision on child care funding is a significant point of agreement and consensus for all of us in this historic legislation, and I am heartened to see its addition to the bill.

We have also made progress in another area that I consider critical to our reform efforts—and that is the important issue of State maintenance of effort.

I, along with many of my colleagues, believe this area is a central component to the success of the reforms before us because we believe it is essential to continue the shared Federal-State partnership in welfare.

Since 1935 when title IV of the Social Security Act was signed into law, welfare has been a shared Federal-State responsibility. As we move to reengineer the system, both sides must renew their commitment to the partnership—and by this I mean both their moral commitment and their financial obligations.

Indeed, the States, like the Federal Government, face many competing forces for funding.

With the mandate from the public to reduce spending and balance State budgets, Governors and State legislatures face the same tough choices that we in Congress are in the process of making.

Some have written that this "is not a question of trust." But I believe it is, and some States are working hard to meet that trust, and they are succeeding.

Many States, like my State of Maine, have already made a strong commitment to welfare reform and I know that they will continue to do so. But my concern is that some States—precisely because of those competing forces for funding—may not.

States have a tremendous stake in the success of our welfare system. They should have a financial commitment as well, both in the cost as well as in the potential savings.

That is why we must include provisions requiring States to continue the Federal-State partnership.

Let me be clear about one point: We are not asking the States to increase their financial contribution, but we need to make sure that they do contribute. Toward that end, I supported and was cosponsor of the Breaux amendment to make those figures a 90 percent contribution over five years.

In response, the leadership agreed to include language that would require States to provide 80 percent of their fiscal year 1994 contribution to welfare for 5 years—the full lifespan of this bill.

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that, like all broad-reaching Government reforms, this is not a perfect solution to the vast challenges that face our welfare system. There are some aspects that can—perhaps should—be improved. But I believe that this legislation moves us closer to a workable solution.

We have already spent countless billions on a welfare system that has made little progress in resolving the problems of the poor. We cannot afford to simply do nothing—to maintain the status quo, with all of its perverse incentives.

Instead, we must act now, and begin the process of ending welfare as a way of life, and restoring welfare assistance to its original purpose, to provide temporary help to our neighbors in need.

Americans have long demonstrated their generosity and their commitment to help our neighbors, families, and children in need. Yet Americans deserve to see results for their efforts and their investment in assisting the neediest. For 30 years, our welfare system has delivered positive results sporadically at best. Americans are demanding more for their investment, and we in Congress must heed their call and help States achieve welfare's noble goals.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, for a very long time, I have argued for welfare reform. My fundamental goal for reform is to see parents work and accept personal responsibility. Welfare should be a temporary program to help people become independent, not a trap of long-term dependency. But at the same time, innocent children should be protected and not punished for circumstances beyond their control.

I rise to explain how I came to the conclusion to vote for the final version of welfare reform legislation before the Senate this afternoon. My vote is for the basic idea that the current welfare system can't be continued. It must be changed. This bill is now our opportunity for changing the rules and encouraging major reform. While I strongly opposed the original bill offered by the Majority Leader, BOB DOLE, I am relieved that the persistent, dedicated work of a team that I was proud to join has resulted in many changes—including some major improvements that were essential for West Virginia—to the legislation. In my view, there are still flaws and disappointments in this bill. But as someone who serves to achieve the most good possible through consensus and cooperation, I am voting for this bill to do just that.

West Virginians have told me for a long time why they are anxious for welfare reform. It is unfair to hard-working families when it is too easy for others to receive public assistance that does not end. And for parents who want to work or can work, the system has to emphasize the means to that end instead of the criteria for staying on welfare. None of this will be easy, but it is time for these changes.

This is not a new mission for me. I have worked on ways to reform our welfare system for years. In 1982 as Governor of West Virginia, I was proud to start a program called Community Work Experience Program in our State that required many parents on welfare

to work in their community when they could not find private sector jobs, mostly because of high unemployment. This idea is more commonly known as workfare, and West Virginia was one of the first two States in the country to start this program and we are still using it today. I believe in workfare and community service as important alternatives when a private sector job is not available.

In the Senate, I continued to work on changing the welfare system, and I am proud of the efforts begun in 1988 under the Family Support Act that passed with strong bipartisan involvement and support. This legislation was an important first step. While we all know that the Family Support Act was not perfect, it began to change the system to move families from welfare to work. The Family Support Act also gave States the latitude to try various approaches to welfare reform which have now encouraged bolder efforts, today.

Based on my goals for West Virginia and my work as Chairman of the National Commission on Children, I participated in the welfare reform debate as a cosponsor and strong proponent of the Democratic Leader's bill, "Work First." In my view, it was a mistake for the Senate to reject our amendment containing this bill. "Work First" would end welfare as we know it by eliminating the existing Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC). The Democratic alternative would require work and promote parental responsibility, and yet at the same time provide the best safeguards for both children and State budgets during times of economic downturns. Unfortunately, this strong package was not taken seriously by the Republican side and was defeated.

So in good faith, Democrats did not disappear from the process to enact welfare reform, nor did we surrender on the goals we think the American people share, too. We have spent the last week on the floor to push for consensus and compromise on very important issues. It was discouraging to deal with the original Republicans' bill that made promises without the means to keep those promises. The early refusal to work in a bipartisan spirit was unnecessary, and made it very difficult to work through decisions that will have consequences for taxpayers and poor families in our States. But we persisted in order to make our best attempt at achieving welfare reform and protecting principles represented in the "Work First" alternative.

As a result, major changes have been made to the Republican bill on the Senate floor, including adding a maintenance of effort requirement to ensure that States continue to invest their fair share to help needy children and their families. This was a victory for the principle of responsible government and a major step in reserving adequate resources for poor children.

Child care funding is another fundamental change to the original Dole bill

that is absolutely crucial if we are serious about moving parents from welfare to work. We should insist that parents go to work, but we also must be realistic and acknowledge that a lack of safe, affordable child care remains a barrier. Democrats worked very hard to secure additional funding for child care. I still worry that this final compromise might be short on funding, but I am relieved that we secured the additional funds for something that families literally can not go without. Let us remember that parents are put in jail for leaving children unattended. Government can not require parents to be at work if they do not have a way for their children to be cared for. When we talk about family values, child care belongs in how to turn our rhetoric into reality.

If we make the huge leap from an entitlement to a block grant program, one of my early goals has been to secure a contingency fund to provide additional help to States when poverty rises. Under the Democratic "Work First" alternative, we maintained the historic Federal-State shared responsibility for this population so there was no need for a contingency fund. But under a block grant approach, there is a need for some type of safeguard in times of high unemployment, natural disasters, or other unforeseen reasons that increase the number of very poor families in a State.

As a former Governor who led my State of West Virginia through a severe recession with double-digit unemployment rates, I am keenly aware of this problem. Families who always worked and never wanted welfare were temporarily forced to seek assistance because of harsh economic conditions in my State in the 1980s. Then, Federal assistance was there to help needy families through hard times even though our State revenues declined, and it would have been impossible for West Virginia to serve needy families without additional Federal help. Even with a contingency grant fund, I worry how a block grant approach will work when a State or several States face problems of high unemployment or a natural disaster. But after a hard battle, we managed to get a provision into this final legislation that will make the contingency fund a grant program, instead of loans, and which will offer real help when families and States hit difficult times.

As we think about the problems of unemployment, it brings to mind the worries of what happens to families who hit the time-limit in the midst of a deep recession? I know numerous personal stories, because I know families on welfare in West Virginia who would eagerly work, but the jobs just are not there. I submitted two specific amendments to this bill designed to give States the option of waiving the time limits for good reasons—such as high unemployment or if adults simply could not work because they were ill, incapacitated, or caring for a disabled

child. In my view, it would be best to spell out limited reasons for exceptions. While my criteria were not adopted, our success in winning an increase in the States' hardship waiver from 15 percent to 20 percent will achieve the same goal. I appreciate the strong support for my amendments that was voiced by the National Governors' Association, State Legislatures, and other officials who know the practicalities involved in real welfare reform.

I also want to note why it is so essential to maintain the Senate approach on child welfare, foster care and adoption assistance. In the Finance Committee, we specifically stated our intention to retain current law so that the Nation's basic commitment to abused and neglected child would continue. Child welfare is very different than general cash assistance for poor children. Child welfare serves children at risk of abuse and neglect in their own homes. We should not reduce or cap Federal aid to such vulnerable children. That means we must maintain the entitlement nature of foster care and adoption assistance. There is support from both sides of the aisle for this in the Senate, and I specifically want to commend Senator CHAFEE for his leadership on the important issue. The Senate approach on child welfare and foster care system must be preserved in the conference, and I am personally determined that we not retreat from the country's important guidelines and reliable support that abused and neglected children rely on.

Bold changes in child support enforcement are a real victory in this legislative package. Because this was one section developed in a bipartisan manner from an early point, it has not attracted much debate or public attention. But West Virginians and our fellow Americans certainly know the significance of child support and insisting on parental responsibility. There are billions of dollars owed to children by absent parents. I cosponsored the bipartisan legislation offered by Senator BRADLEY which provided a good framework for the tough provisions in this legislation that will help collect those dollars. Getting tough on child support is a priority.

In addition to changing the rules, we also need to change attitudes. It is pathetic that adults are more responsible about paying their car loan payments than their child support. This is unacceptable and must be turned around.

As Chairman of the bipartisan National Commission on Children, I have been working on the issue of welfare and families closely for years. I want to find creative, bipartisan ways to strengthen and stabilize families. Our Commission issued a unanimous report that called for a whole new approach on children and family policy at all levels—Federal, State, and in our communities. The legislation passed today reflect some of the direction recommended by the Children's Commis-

sion. I strongly support the idea that States and local communities must take a leadership role in helping all families, including those needy families on welfare.

And again, I repeat my hope that this country will maintain a nationwide, steadfast commitment to safeguarding children. Our country has a stake in every child, whether a child is born to a poor family in rural West Virginia or a family in an inner city. A child born to an unwed mother has the same basic needs and the same potential, as a child who is more fortunate and born into a stable, wealthy family. I honestly don't believe that the legitimate cry we hear for welfare reform is a demand to forget or abandon children.

As I said at the outset, I believe in welfare reform, and it is obvious that the American public demands it.

As someone who has fought for children and families for years, I hope that the States receiving so much new responsibility for the fate of their poor citizens will take it very, very seriously.

Children are two out of three people who depend on welfare today, and they should not be punished. Because of this deep concern, I was one of the members who pushed very hard to incorporate an evaluation amendment into this legislation. We should acknowledge that this legislation is a huge experiment. We are eliminating the Federal safety net that has assured minimum support for needy children and families for over 60 years, and this legislation will replace it with a new approach. While AFDC has serious flaws and must be changed, this approach is new and untested. I feel a strong moral obligation to thoroughly study and evaluate how this new approach serves children and families. Optimists and staunch supporters of the Work Opportunity Act predict this bill will reduce dependency and move families from welfare to work. Critics warn that children will end up on the streets.

I am willing to try, and I am willing to vote for this legislation. But I insist that we monitor it closely to evaluate carefully how children are affected. Because of our evaluation amendment, we now have this commitment and obligation.

I truly hope that this bill fulfills its bold promise to help move families from welfare to work and to end the cycle of dependency. When a conference is established to negotiate the final welfare reform bill to send to the President, I hope that the debate and revisions that have taken place here in the Senate will be taken extremely seriously. And if and when a welfare reform bill is signed into law, and if the warnings of the critics are true and children are abandoned, we must swiftly revise the law and try again.

My fundamental principle remains that children should be protected. From my work on the National Commission on Children, I believe in building consensus and trying creative ap-

proaches. For the sake of our children, and the future of our country, we need to chart a bipartisan course that emphasizes cooperation on behalf of children and families. Children should not become pawns in a partisan rhetoric and politics, and I hope that the conference on welfare reform will adopt such an approach so that common ground and reasonable compromises will be achieved.

I congratulate the numerous Senators, staff members, and experts who devoted untold hours and energy into preventing the original Dole bill from succeeding and working out important, vital improvements. West Virginia was better served through the process of these revisions, and will be better equipped to prod and help poor families avoid dependency. I worked hard to achieve the changes most important to my State, and I hope they will remain in the final welfare reform legislation that must be negotiated with the House.

Welfare reform must also work in the real world. We have seen in the recent months once again how attractive the words are to politicians and others who see advantage in dividing people, scoring cheap points, and pretending that the country's problems are easy to solve. That is an injustice to all Americans, to taxpayers frustrated with the welfare system and to the families who find themselves poor for whatever reason. We know that America feels best when we succeed in achieving ambitious goals by pulling together, living up to our Nation's principles, and making the effort required to get the job done. Welfare reform is a very ambitious goal, and the passage of this bill takes us one step further to accomplishing the real results and true change that Americans expect.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, 30 years ago President Johnson had a dream of a "Great Society" where the United States Government would undertake to lift the poor out of their wretchedness. Today, the intended nobility of his dream has been obliterated by the horrors of crime, drugs, illegitimacy and total family breakdown. Mr. President, I am not just saying that welfare does not work; I am saying that it is hurting those it purports to help.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans are suffering because the Federal Government insists on centralized control over a system that is not living up to its promises. Thirty years of welfare state have not eradicated poverty, not made a dent in poverty; if anything, poverty in America has become more wretched than ever before.

What we know now, Mr. President, is a Federal bureaucracy that has shown itself virtually incapable helping needy people. More Federal mandates are not the answer. Control over welfare must be relinquished to State and local governments. Federal control certainly does not work, and the only way we can determine what kind of public assistance program will work is if we let

States and local communities experiment.

Mr. President, I have heard from people in Washington State who have knowledge of and experience with the present system and who fervently believe in disassembling welfare as we know it.

This year, Washington State legislators tried to overhaul the State welfare system. Their frustration mounted as their innovative ideas were killed by overwhelming amounts of waivers, directors and general red tape from the Federal Government.

Social workers are often too busy keeping up with paperwork and complicated, sometimes conflicting, Federal regulations to help people get jobs and become self-sufficient.

I have listened to people who are on or have been on welfare. Their stories alone are enough to convince me that the system has to be changed. Welfare, you see, punishes people for trying to get out. One woman in Whatcom County was not allowed to participate in a job training program because she hadn't been receiving public assistance long enough.

Mr. President, the faults and iniquities of welfare run wide and deep. We must face the problem. We must stop pretending that by tinkering here or changing a bit there that everything will be better. What we must do is completely restructure public assistance in America. It is well past time for Washington, DC to relinquish control over welfare to States and local communities.

There are a lot of things the Federal Government is good at—handing out checks and creating bureaucracies are particular areas of expertise. But the Federal Government is not so good at setting people free from its control.

The current system pits people against government institutions. It prohibits innovation. When local communities try to implement new ways to combat poverty, unemployment and illegitimacy, the bureaucracy balks, throwing up barriers to new ideas and community involvement, and enforcing the same old mandates.

Frankly, Mr. President, bureaucracies do not care if people get off welfare or stay on it for the rest of their lives. But there are many of us who do care, who do want to relieve the plight of so many of our fellow Americans.

The liberals who have supported the Welfare State these many years are reacting with vehemence against proposals to let States and local communities have more of a say in public assistance programs. This reaction points to the distrust most liberals have toward people, as opposed to government institutions. Does it make sense to say that a bureaucrat in Washington, DC cares more about needy people in Spokane, WA, than do the actual citizens of that community? I do not believe so.

Mr. President, the only way to stop the dependency, the illegitimacy, the family breakdown, and the hopeless-

ness of the current system is to truly change—not merely tinker with—the way it is run. If our goal is to improve people's lives, then we can't continue on the path we're on now.

We must allow people the opportunity to make their own lives, to provide for themselves and their families, to feel the pride of honest work, and to be the deciders of their fate—not to have the Federal Government as their master.

Mr. President, I support the majority leader's welfare reform bill because it provides the best means for giving responsibility back to local communities and ending the Federal Government's control over how money is spent and programs administered. This legislation, America's Work and Family Opportunities Act of 1995, does not fall into the trap of trying to manage the system from Washington, DC. State and local governments, instead of being told what to do by Federal bureaucrats, are allowed to experiment and come up with solutions that meet local needs.

The last thing we need is yet more Federal mandates to stifle local innovations and solutions. Mandates that sound wonderful in the Nation's Capital can wreak havoc when they are put into practice—in truth, we have no way of knowing if they will work. Giving States flexibility will produce programs both successful and unsuccessful; when we can distinguish one from the other, perhaps more Federal guidance will be in order.

Our only hope for ending welfare as we know it, Mr. President, is to end the bureaucracy, end the incentives for staying on the rolls and out of work, and end the institution which has bred social disintegration. Washington, DC is going to have to do something entirely foreign to its nature: give up some of its power and mind its own business.

Mr. President, it is no longer enough to say that we mean well, that we have the proverbial good intentions. Let's stop the arrogant, self-important assumption that we can single-handedly run things out of Washington, DC. In the case of welfare, that's what we've been doing for 30 years, and it's been a disaster.

My goals is reforming welfare area straightforward: Do away with the current system, and replace it with one that encourages work, discourages illegitimacy, and stops the cycle of family destruction. I believe America's Work and Family Opportunities Act of 1995 will best accomplish these goals.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, although I vote today in support of welfare reform, it is with strong reservations.

We all agree that our Nation's welfare system needs reform. Members on both sides of the aisle, most of our constituents, our Governors, everyone agrees that the current system does not work.

And while we all have agreed that the system needs change, there has not

been agreement on the right approach. The original Dole welfare proposal was totally unacceptable. It failed to designate a dime for child care, would force parents to leave kids home alone, and did not focus on actually getting our current welfare recipients into real work.

Enough significant improvements have been made, however, to lead me to vote for this bill. It looks totally different from the House version and is no longer the bill introduced by the majority leader.

The bill now emphasizes work. Unlike its original version, it now measures work instead of participation rates. It recognizes that child care is essential to getting people with young children to work. The bill now includes a work bonus for States and includes other provisions that truly commit us to moving adults off the welfare rolls and onto payrolls.

The current version of the bill also includes many more protections for children. The original Dole bill designated no money for child care. We now have \$8 billion over 5 years to help ensure that no child is left home alone. I initially pushed for \$11 billion, the amount we have heard is necessary to make the work requirements effective, and came close to securing that amount.

In the original Dole bill, women with infants and toddlers, in effect, would have been told to leave their kids home alone or face penalties. The bill we vote on today says that mothers with children under 6 cannot be sanctioned if they cannot find child care. The modification also says that States can limit required work hours for parents with kids under age 6 from 35 hours to 20 hours per week.

Democrats made significant improvements in other areas too. The bill now includes a maintenance of effort requirement for States so that taking care of our Nation's poor children remains a joint responsibility between the Federal and State governments. And the bill provides a limited contingency fund for States to deal with downturns in the economy. It is not as much as I would like to see, but it recognizes that flat-funded block grants do not address sudden or prolonged changes in a State's economy.

The bill also, now, provides money for second chance homes—as a way to really try and get at the problem of teen pregnancy. The original Dole bill had no money for these homes. I also am pleased that punitive measures that would have required all States to impose the family cap and deny benefits to teen mothers have been defeated and excluded from the bill.

While I am pleased with the changes we were able to make in the bill, problems remain. It includes no protection for children whose parents meet the time limit. Republicans opposed even allowing States to decide whether or not they would provide vouchers for children whose parents met the time



limit. The absence of this provision—a safety net for kids—troubles me.

Also of concern, the contingency fund offers States only \$1 billion where we sought \$5 billion. I worry, ultimately, about the impact of these deficiencies on States that face economic downturns.

But ultimately, all of us must make a choice here today, and despite the measure's deficiencies—I intend to vote to move the process forward. But I want to make myself perfectly clear: if it returns from the House, looking less like the bill we have here today—if it destroys child protection programs, if it takes away school lunches, if its child care provisions do not reflect the significant progress that's been made in this body over the passed week—then this bill and welfare reform is in real trouble.

So I hope that a strong vote for the bill today will not be construed as an indication of support for whatever comes back from conference. This is simply not the case. A serious retreat from what we adopt here today will lead me to stand up and oppose the legislation.

As I have said all the way along, I believe that going from welfare to work is something that ought to be supported. This vehicle gives us the opportunity to do that with the improvements that have been made in it. So, with reluctance, I will support this legislation and await the outcome of the conference.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, making significant alterations in a governmental service or program that affects many people almost always will be controversial. The Senate will act today on a bill that falls into that category. The welfare reform legislation addresses a vexing set of social problems, a portion of our population that indisputably has great need, and our society's hopes and desires that people, especially children, be treated humanely but that all adults able to do so contribute to the Nation in which they live and achieve self-sufficiency to the extent of their potential.

There are some component issues about which there is widespread agreement. The existing welfare structure fails in far too many cases to provide a sufficient incentive to adults—and the various kinds of temporary assistance they need—to move toward self-sufficiency. The abuses of the existing system—while they very likely are statistically infrequent—are sufficiently frequent and sufficiently provocative that the system has lost the support of the American people. The commendable benevolence of the American people toward those who truly have experienced misfortune due to no fault of their own and need some help in getting back on their feet, has been sorely tested.

Indeed, my patience with the existing welfare system has been exhausted. It is my judgment that our welfare system badly needs overhaul. It is failing to contribute sufficiently to the self-

sufficiency of those it is intended to help. Instead, all too often it perpetuates dependency.

Welfare reform was a prominent objective of those whose party won the elections last fall, and who gained control of both Houses of the Congress. They produced legislation to dramatically alter the existing welfare structure and system. Earlier this year, the House of Representatives passed a far-reaching bill. That bill basically takes the welfare problem and dumps it in the lap of State governments. It announces in effect, "Henceforth, the wellbeing of impoverished adults and their children will not be a Federal problem." That bill takes the Federal funding now being spent on welfare, and, after cutting the amount, simply hands it to the States and says "Go solve this problem. Good luck." While that is admittedly a dramatic oversimplification of the bill, it is a bill I could not support.

The majority leader, Senator DOLE, brought a welfare reform bill to the Senate floor in August—a significantly modified version of legislation reported earlier by the Senate Finance Committee. Mr. President, that bill was not satisfactory to me. It was excessively punitive—it appeared to penalize the poor harshly for conditions not infrequently beyond their control. It, like its House counterpart, appeared to be a headlong rush to dump the problem of welfare on State governments, with little concern for the impact on the impoverished or the States or the social fabric of our Nation.

But I'm pleased and relieved to say that, to a considerable extent, the legislative process our Founding Fathers established worked as it was designed. A number of colleagues on this side of the aisle, some on the other side, and I offered a series of amendments designed to transform the bill into a bill worthy of the term "reform."

The results of this process confront us today, Mr. President. It is not a perfect bill, not by a long shot. It differs in a number of ways from the bill I would design were I in a position to decree the complexion of our Nation's welfare system.

But in the face of great need to shore up the way in which our Nation deals with its impoverished population, a widespread demand by the public to make major changes in our welfare system, and the social imperative to focus our available resources on moving poor adults into self-sufficiency and provide a path from poverty for poor children, I believe this is a bill that meets the threshold test for acceptability. It turns the corner from a street going the wrong direction onto a street pointing toward our objective.

One has only to look at the alterations made in the bill while it was being considered on the floor.

While the ultimate responsibility for poor people is shifted to the States, the States are required, for the next 5 years, to continue to spend a minimum

of 80 percent of the amounts they spent for welfare in past years and 100 percent of the amounts they have spent for child care. The original Dole bill contained no such maintenance of effort requirements.

The original Senate bill contained no funding whatsoever for child care for children of adults required by the bill to seek work. The bill on which we will vote today authorizes \$8 billion for this purpose.

The original bill measured its success in moving persons from welfare to work on the basis of participation rates. The bill on which we will vote today will measure actual work.

The original Dole bill raided existing job training funds to include them in the welfare block grants to the States. The bill before us today drops the job training titles, and the Senate will return to address those separately at a later date.

The Dole bill required all adults on welfare to seek work and accept jobs when offered. The bill on which we will vote today exempts mothers of infants less than 1 year old.

The Dole bill made no distinction between women with very young children and women with school-age children. The bill we consider today permits the States to comply with the work requirement if mothers of children under age 6 work a minimum of 20 hours a week.

Mr. President, I am confident this bill will pass the Senate today. I intend to support it. Should this bill, or one substantially like it, become law, it will establish the national laboratory desired by the Governors and legislators of many of our States. The attention will now shift to the States—to see if they can, as they have fervently maintained, achieve economics never realized by the Federal Government, and, in particular, to see if they can move adult welfare recipients into work. I am very hopeful that the advocates—both at the State level and here in Washington—knew what they were talking about and will show themselves to have merited our trust and confidence on these very important matters.

This course is not without risk, but the imperative for reasonable action demands that we take some risk. That is the only way we can leave behind a psychology of dependency and instill a psychology of self-help with temporary, transitional government assistance. It is the only way we can redefine welfare so that, for the able bodied adult population, it means assistance in preparing for, finding, and holding gainful employment. I support these changes in direction; consequently I will vote to pass this bill.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to emphasize two key considerations. First, the conference action on this bill will be critical. The safeguards and moderations added to the bill on the Senate floor are vital to my support and that of a number of my colleagues.

I am very hopeful that the conferees, particularly those of the majority party, will keep this in mind, and that they want to enact a bill that has the support from both parties that will be necessary to secure enactment.

Second, if this bill passes today—even if this bill becomes law—no one should prepare to relax. Some of the vexing problems confronting our society are addressed in this bill. But by and large this bill deals with persons who already have been left behind by our society. Its provisions are remedial. The bill does nothing to reach out to this Nation's greatest resource—our children—and provide to them the educational opportunities and the opportunities for participation in positive activities ranging from Boy and Girl Scouts to athletics that will weave them into the fabric of our culture, prepare them to take their place as self-sufficient and psychologically stable adults, and give them an alternative to falling into the activities of the street that can spell alienation, lives of crime, or even untimely death. We have much, much more to do, Mr. President, and this is only the opening chapter.

I commend those who struggled to make this bill more realistic, more humane, and more likely to live up to the grand promises it pronounces. I share the hope of those who vote for the bill that it will, indeed, change the course of public assistance for the benefit of the children and adults directly affected, our communities, our taxpayers, and our Nation as a whole.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the American people are united by the fundamental issues of welfare reform which have divided us throughout much of this debate. It is clear that they have demanded a dramatic change to a system which they view as ineffective and indeed as an impediment to the progress of both the individual and society as a whole. The \$387 billion welfare system has sapped the spirit of many, most especially of our young people, and our national economic strength.

It has now been 60 years since the Social Security Act was passed which created the aid to families with dependent children program. According to the act itself, the purpose of title IV of the Social Security Act, is in part, to help maintain and strengthen family life and to help such parents or relatives to attain or retain capability for the maximum self-support and personal independence.

For too many, this is no longer a system which helps to maintain and strengthen family life in America. Many, in fact, believe the welfare system has the opposite effect on families. The theories which supported public policy in the past have been dispelled by the last 30 years of experience. The misplaced hope that Washington could somehow correctly calculate the formula to solve the problems of poverty is simply wrong. What happens in the

home, in the neighborhood, in schools and churches is far more powerful than the Federal Government. We have known this all along.

But knowing is different than doing. Today is the day we do something about what we know.

We know that work is necessary to attain self-support and personal independence. Today, we elevate the value of work to its proper level of esteem in public assistance programs. We know that if welfare is to be only a temporary means of support, the key to personal independence is work. We know this basic fact of life is true for all families, at all levels of income. It is true for past generations. It is true for this generation and all future generations. Work is not only necessary as the means for obtaining our daily bread, it is part of our social fabric. Whether in the neighborhood or in the world, work brings order to chaos. Many other freedoms flow from the freedom to work.

We know the current welfare system is designed for failure. Under the heavy hand of the ponderous and paralyzing bureaucracy of the Potomac, no one is accountable for results.

Today, we will provide the States with the responsibility and authority they need to break down the barriers and false promises of the present system. Properly understood, welfare reform is about reforming how Government works. The American people will greatly benefit from the rejuvenation of the States' role in our system of federalism. The lines of accountability have been blurred for far too long.

Mr. President, today is the day to leave the past behind. To sum up what this debate is truly about, let me quote from a letter sent last week by Governor Allen of Virginia:

What the debate really boils down to is who does the U.S. Senate trust to make these policy decisions—the Federal bureaucracy or the elected representatives of the people at the State level. This is a basic philosophical question. The choices you make will determine whether the bold innovations that are occurring in Virginia and other States can move forward, or whether Federal bureaucrats will continue to micromanage and second guess the decisions of the people of the States and their duly elected representatives. I respectfully urge you to place your trust in the States, which are leading the way.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to put our confidence and faith in the sovereign States. Let us break from the past and free the States and the families who need a temporary hand-up from the system which has failed us all.

Mr. President, there are a number of Members and staff who deserve our recognition and appreciation for moving this legislation forward. Above all, the majority leader has done a masterful job in delivering on the promise of welfare reform. At several points over the past few months, it looked as though a comprehensive bill would slip through our fingers. Once again, he has demonstrated his skills as a true leader.

I congratulate Senator MOYNIHAN on his tireless efforts on this legislation. His knowledge of these issues cannot be matched.

Let me also thank those Senators who did remarkable jobs managing this legislation under very demanding and trying circumstances, especially Senators NICKLES, SANTORUM, GRASSLEY, CHAFEE, HATCH, and SIMPSON.

Few people will understand or appreciate the enormous job done by the staff in helping to get this legislation passed. The bill itself was nearly 800 pages long at the beginning of consideration. We added more than 200 amendments into the process. The staffs from Finance, Agriculture, and Labor Committees as well as from the leadership offices, the Congressional Budget Office, and legislative counsel accomplished a rather remarkable feat. In particular, let me thank and commend Sheila Burke in the leader's office, and Lindy Paull, Kathy Tobin, Rick Grafmeyer and Joe Zummo from Finance for their great efforts and dedication. Other staff members who deserve our thanks are Dave Johnson, Peg Brown, Susan Hattan, and Shannon Royce. From the Democratic side, Margaret Malone, John Secrest, Joe Gale, and Mark Patterson made special contributions to this legislation.

There is still much work ahead of us as some of the details differ between this legislation and welfare reform as passed by the House last March. But the most important test, the strength of our will to break the cycle of poverty, has been met. I look forward to completing our work and to sending real welfare reform to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished managers and the Senator from Wisconsin for permitting me to speak for 5 minutes at this point on the welfare reform package. I have been engaged for the past several weeks, almost continuously, with the Ruby Ridge hearings, but I did want to make a few comments and have them printed in the RECORD before the vote.

Mr. President, I think we have passed a reasonable welfare reform package today with overwhelming, bipartisan support. The issue of welfare reform has been one that I have been very much concerned about for many years, having introduced welfare reform legislation going back to the 99th Congress, with Senate bills S.2578 and S.2579, and then in the 100th Congress, with Senate bills S.280 and S.281.

I especially compliment my colleague, Senator SANTORUM, for his outstanding contribution on this bill and all the Senators for working on a bill which has broad bipartisan support—a virtual consensus—of 87 votes in favor of this bill.

I am very much worried, frankly, about the admonition of our distinguished colleague from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, who has issued the concern, the warning, that we may find

children sleeping on grates. As we have structured this 5-year reform package, we have to be vigilant on that. Certainly, we have seen the development of a homeless class in America as a result of the release of people from mental institutions in the late 1970's without appropriate community support.

I am pleased to see that there have been significant improvements on this bill, characterized by the Congressional Quarterly this week at page 2805, September 16, 1995, commenting about how centrist Republicans have been able to achieve significant results with what you might characterize as the balance of power, coming in with a very strong stand on important matters like child care and maintenance of effort provisions for the States.

The bill did contain a provision, on which I worked from the outset of the welfare reform debate, that would not sanction the benefits of a single, custodial parent with a child under 5 who demonstrated an unmet need for child care.

There were a couple of important provisions where, frankly, I casted a couple of votes I was not happy about but did so in order to set the stage for compromises. One of them was an amendment to fund child care offered by Senator DODD, which was defeated narrowly, 50 to 48. My principal concern for opposing the amendment was a lack of an offset for six of the eleven billion it proposed. But that negative vote was cast in anticipation of a compromise which was later reached, providing for some \$3 billion over 5 years exclusively for child care.

The second issue was the maintenance of effort provision, where Senator BREAUX offered an amendment requiring States to maintain 90 percent of their 1994 match on welfare spending for 5 years—the duration of the bill. I opposed the Breaux amendment with the assurance from the managers and the distinguished majority leader, Senator DOLE, that a 80 percent provision on maintenance of effort for the States would be inserted and would be fought for in conference as opposed to the 90 percent provision which would not be retained in conference. As usual, the better is the enemy of the good. I supported the majority leader's position, voted to defeat the Breaux amendment, and we have eight-tenths of the loaf with an 80 percent maintenance of effort.

Senator DOMENICI led a very important battle on the vote to strike the family cap, which was agreed to by a very substantial number, 66 to 34.

So that as we have come to the end of the debate on welfare reform, I think we have a reasonably good bill. Of course, we will all be watching it very, very closely to see what the outcome is from the conference. Beyond the conference report, we will have to maintain a very close vigil over this very important subject to make sure that the prediction and concerns expressed by Senator MOYNIHAN do not even-

tuates, where we do not find the situation where children are sleeping on grates.

Mr. DOLE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. President.

For 30 years we have tried to fight the war against poverty and after 30 years, poverty is winning that war. We talk about helping children, yet today more people are below the poverty line than when we began the war on poverty—most of them children.

It is hard to argue that the programs that have been in effect are the ones that help children when you see the results of those programs up close, as we do in my State of Michigan. The last few years, through waivers, we had more flexibility in our State and we have been able to address many of the welfare problems much more effectively than any other State in the country.

This bill gives all States the kind of flexibility to deal with these problems the way we are dealing with them in Michigan. I believe it will succeed in moving more people to work and helping more children than the present system possibly could allow.

Mr. President, this bill also addresses, I think for the first time, the illegitimacy problem in this country. It may not go as far as some would like but takes an important first step in that direction. And, above all, I think by requiring tough work sanctions, it finally places the welfare debate, I think, where most persons would like to see it, where people who are the beneficiaries of Federal support and State support perform some type of community service or work in order to make a contribution to the process.

As a result, I think the majority leader deserves great credit for what he has done in 9 short months here. We have really ended business as usual. When we pass this bill today, we will be saying business as usual in welfare is over.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. DOLE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, fellow Senators, first I want to join in complimenting Senator DOLE on putting together a bipartisan bill.

I have been sitting here listening to those who oppose this bill and it seems to me they are talking about a program, talking as if we have a welfare program that works. The problem is, we have a welfare program that does not work. We are not the only ones saying it does not work. About 90 percent of Americans say it does not work.

Why would we keep something that does not work? It would seem to me that we ought to try something new and different.

My second point is a very simple one. We are talking here as if the only one

that knows how to take care of poor people is the U.S. Government. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, and fellow Senators, there is no welfare in America unless the States put up money. If the States have decided they do not care about children and they do not care about need, there would be no welfare program in the sovereign States of America.

All we are saying, since they put up the money, at least part of it—half of it or more—let them try to run the program. Some would have us think that that money they will get for 5 years from us they can spend on high-ways. They have to spend it on those people that are needy in their State.

We are giving them some flexibility to try to do it better. What is wrong with that? Essentially, we are saying to our States, "You have been paying for a program. We have been telling you how to run it. Now we would like you to run it yourselves." And the only way that the ominous predictions of those on the other side who have opposed this would be anywhere close to true is if the States in America, the Governors and the legislators, decide that they are going to purposely ruin the program. And even at that, they cannot spend the money on anything else.

I believe we are going to have better welfare programs, more responsive programs, that people are going to go to work if they are able-bodied—and I stress able-bodied—and I do not think there is anything wrong with that experiment.

It is as noble as the experiment that has failed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes of the Democratic leader's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, my colleagues in the Chamber today should vote for this bill, not because it is a perfect bill, because it is not, but because it is a good start. Some have said this bill is a block grant and for the first time Washington, DC, gets out of the way. My concern is that, being a block grant, it does nothing to solve the problems of welfare reform. It just puts all the problems in a box and mails it off to the States and hopes the State do a good job.

Someone said "Today, Washington, DC, gets out of the way." The original Republican proposal said and allowed for the Federal Government to, perhaps, pay for 100 percent of the costs of welfare reform. That is hardly saying that Washington would get out of the way, but rather that Washington would get stuck with the entire bill for welfare reform.

This bill really does address work. For the first time it says people should go to work within 6 months. Welfare

reform is not about programs, it is about creating good jobs for people on welfare. This bill is a step in the right direction.

Reform should be about taking care of children, and while this bill is not perfect, it provides \$8 billion for child care because of the efforts of many of us—my colleague from Connecticut on this side included. When it left the Finance Committee it had zero money for child care. This bill puts \$8 billion in it for child care.

In addition, it says the State should do something. That is reform. The Finance Committee bill said the States had to do nothing whatsoever, and that was going to be reform. This bill says the States have to maintain at least 80 percent of what they were doing.

Mr. President, we should pass this bill. It can become a better bill. That is our hope.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator Santorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the leader for yielding. Mr. President, I want to say, we have come a long way. Having worked on the House task force, 2 years ago, on welfare reform, and having introduced a bill and worked on it diligently since then, I do not think anyone, in as short a time as 2 years ago, would have expected us to pass a bill as dramatic, as progressive, and as focused in trying to create a dynamic system to try to help people out of poverty as we created in the Senate today, and I am proud of the accomplishment.

I want to recognize several people who turned this ship around when it did not look like it was going to sail. First, I thank Senator PACKWOOD from the Finance Committee. He put together the shell of this bill and really did work diligently with Senator Ashcroft and Senator GREGG, two former Governors, in putting together this shell that we then filled in as the process of negotiations off the floor and on the floor continued.

I also thank Senator HUTCHISON. I think, if we had not figured out the financing mechanism, the formulas, this bill would just simply not have been able to sail. She just did yeoman's work in putting that together, and really deserves a lot of credit for moving this bill forward.

For what happened all throughout the process, but particularly at the end, I thank the leader. He really had faith in the process to continue to move it forward, to bring it up when many thought it could not be done. He continued to push forward, finding common ground between the moderates and conservatives, bringing people together, constantly bringing people together to keep moving. Because I think he recognizes, as all of us do, the importance of solving this serious prob-

lem for millions of Americans. He deserves a lot of credit for this bill.

This bill is dramatic. You are going to hear reported it does not go as far as the House bill, and this is a minor reform, and they are going to downplay this. All they are going to talk about in the press is how we differ from the House. But I tell you, this bill goes so much farther than anyone could have anticipated just a short time ago. It ends the entitlement to welfare. It requires work. It puts a time limit on welfare benefits, which again is a dramatic change in the current system.

I have heard people say we have eliminated the safety net. I do not know what safety net they are looking at, but I tell you, when you see millions of people trapped in poverty for their whole lives, generation after generation, that is not a safety net, it is a fisherman's net. You are trapping people in a fisherman's net, and what we are trying to do is cut back the net so people can climb out, not so people fall through.

That is the difference between what has been proposed in the past and what we are proposing today, and it is dramatic. It is significant. And I can tell you, the difference between the House and the Senate, while it will be played up in the press, is not that significant. What we have are the frameworks of two bills that are very similar. We are going to move in the same direction. I believe, when we get to conference, we will be able to get a bill and I do not think it is going to take as long as people think.

We have a lot of common ground here. We understand it is important to get this bill in for reconciliation and I believe we will do it. I, again, just want to tip my hat to the leader for his tremendous work on this bill. If it was not for him, we would not be here today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask consent to speak for 2 minutes under the leader's time.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I will be very brief. First of all, let me commend those who have been involved in this debate. We talked about a number of Members here today. Let me point out, as I have on numerous occasions, the distinguished senior Senator from New York, who has forgotten more about this issue than most people ever remember. I commend him and thank him for the enlightenment which he has shed on this particular issue.

Having said that, I am going to vote for this bill. I do so with a high degree of reluctance, as my colleagues know. I think this is a narrow call, but in my view, the product we vote on now is a substantial improvement over what was originally proposed. I say that with all due respect to my friend and colleague from Kansas, the majority

leader. There are improvements here. And, it is substantial in its difference over what was passed in the House of Representatives. Of course, there are fundamental differences which may never be resolved over issues such as the entitlement.

But, because of the 20 or so improvements that were made to this bill by amendments offered from people on both sides of the aisle, principally on this side, this is a bill which I think can be supported today. It goes much further than the original proposal, certainly, in the area of child care. There was zero money designated for child care in this legislation at first. My colleagues know that I would have done more in the child care area. I would have liked to have seen as much as \$11 billion over 5 years. We ended up with \$8 billion over 5 years—still, a substantial improvement.

Let me say to those who will be responsible for moving this product forward, if this bill comes back from the House with any kind of serious retreat from what we have adopted here, then I will stand up and vehemently oppose the legislation and recommend that the President veto the legislation.

This is a bill that, in my view, can be supported. It steps in a direction, and no one can say with absolute certainty where it will take us. I appreciate that. But, clearly, the system does need changing and this proposal offers us that opportunity.

As I have said all the way along, I believe that going from welfare to work is something that ought to be supported. This vehicle gives us the opportunity to do that with the improvements that have been made in it. So, with reluctance, I will support this legislation and await the outcome of the conference.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming, Senator SIMPSON, a member of the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I never dreamed, when I came on the Finance Committee, we would be involved with so many vigorous activities. Of course, this was the principal beginning, and now, within these next hours, our committee will meet to decide how to trim some \$470 billion from Medicare and Medicaid. And that is a must or else that program will go broke in the year 2002.

Welfare reform is long overdue. We have had 2 weeks of debate on all of the issues. It is time to pass this in a bipartisan way, give these programs over to the States. What we have done before has failed. So change is difficult, but something is very, very wrong with welfare. We know it. The Democrats know it. The Republicans know it. The President knows it. Now is the chance—to have a chance for the States to run these programs with

much less Federal regulation, much more flexibility. They have recognized the needs of so many of us in this body.

I want to commend leader DOLE, BOB DOLE, Senator DOLE, on listening to our concerns, paying careful attention to our needs at every level, every State receiving necessary attention to the things that concern us and, because of his efforts, this is now a bipartisan effort with most Senators voting to support this legislation. He has accommodated many of the Democratic concerns, including much needed child care, State maintenance of effort, and a contingency fund for the States.

I thank him for his efforts. We will wait for the conference report but, hopefully, those of us who have been involved in this one so long know it is better to get a crumb when you cannot get a loaf, in this type of work.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I yield myself the remaining 3 minutes in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the word reform means to restore to an earlier good state. Sir, there was no earlier good state of our present welfare system. It began as a widow's pension, a societal transformation program.

In 1988, with the Family Support Act we began to say that welfare cannot be a permanent way of life; it has to be a transition. It has to be an exchange of effort between the society, and the individual caring for children.

A year and a quarter ago on this floor, I introduced S. 2224, the Work and Responsibility Act of 1994. This was the administration's welfare reform measure. I introduced it on behalf of myself and Mr. Mitchell, the majority leader at that time, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER. It had taken a year and a half to get to it, but it was welcomed, and it was in the tradition that we have upheld for a good 20 years now.

The table of contents sets the tone. Title I, JOBS—job opportunities and basic skills; title II, work; title III, child care; title IV, provisions with multi-program applicability; title V, prevention of dependency; title VI, child support enforcement; title VII, improving Government assistance and preventing fraud; and title VIII, self-employment and microenterprise demonstrations. That was the track we were on. The Family Support Act of 1988, to which this was to be a successor, came out of this Senate floor 96 to 1.

I fear we have lost that tradition. We are ripping out a portion of the Social Security Act today. I fear we may be now commencing the end of the Social Security system.

The one thing not wrong with welfare was the commitment of the Federal Government to help with the provision of aid to dependent children. We are abandoning that commitment today.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I thank all concerned.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both the majority leader and I have each have 10 minutes remaining in the final moments of this debate.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, first let me begin by thanking Senators MIKULSKI, BREAUX, DODD, and MOYNIHAN for the great effort they have put forth to bring us to this point. Were it not for their leadership and their participation, we would not be here today.

I also want to thank the majority leader for his willingness to work with us and address many of the concerns that we have raised during the course of the last several months.

Most of us began this debate with the realization that the current welfare system needs repair. It does not enable people to become self-sufficient. It does not contain the resources to put people to work. It is not flexible enough for many States. It sends the wrong messages to welfare recipients—that work does not pay and that welfare can become a trap.

As a result, most people agree that reform—or whatever term we may want to use to address those problems—be addressed legislatively. We recognize that there is no perfect solution. There is no easy solution. As Senator MOYNIHAN has said, in spite of our best efforts, we have not found one today.

The disagreement really has been about the solution. In the view of most Democrats, the original Republican bill was extreme and misguided. It boxed up all of the current system and shipped it off to the States, saying, "You do it." It was our view that that was not reform.

The bill we have before us today is a better bill. The bill before us today requires that the States provide at least an 80 percent maintenance of effort, and 100 percent maintenance of effort for child care. There is a \$1 billion contingency grant fund, and there are no mandates from the extreme right wing.

In our view, the original bill was not about work. In fact, the Finance Committee bill did not even require work. It did not measure work. It only measured what we call participation in the welfare system. No work was required for two years, and in our view that was not reform.

We have a better bill now, a bill reached in agreement over the last several days that measures real work and provides a work bonus when States exceed the goals that we lay out in this legislation. It sets out \$8 billion in child care funds, dollars that can only be used for child care and nothing else. It requires 80 percent maintenance of effort from states. It deletes the job

training titles that ought to be outside the realm of welfare itself, and provides for them to be addressed in other legislation later on.

It establishes a personal responsibility contract very similar to the parent empowerment contract that was required in the Work First bill. It allows a work exemption for mothers with children under 1, and requires work after 3 months.

Mr. President, we have made very significant improvements in many areas of the legislation that I believe warrant our support today. The original bill hurt children. It included no funds for child care. In fact, many of us originally called it the "home alone bill" simply because of our concern for what it meant for children whose mothers and fathers would have to go out and find jobs.

It sanctioned mothers who could not find or afford child care. It allowed 30 percent of the funding under the child care development block grant to be transferred. It included no safety net for children and only a 10-percent exemption to the time limit. And that, in our view, was not reform at all. That is aiming at the mother and hitting the child.

But we have a better bill now, reached in agreement over the last several days—\$8 billion in child care; \$5 billion as part of the block grant, and \$3 billion in additional funding to address the very needs that we have talked about for the last several weeks. One hundred percent maintenance of effort is required on child care. Transfer of funds from the child care development block grant is prohibited. Mothers with children under 6 will not be sanctioned if they cannot find or afford day care.

We gave States the option to allow mothers with children under 6 to work no more than 20 hours per week in lieu of the 35 hours per week that was originally required. We increased the time-limit exemption from 15 to 20 percent. We require teen mothers to stay at home or live in an adult-supervised environment, just as required in the Work First bill. We provide \$150 million for second chance homes, and we do not have any mandates that deny aid to teen mothers or impose family caps.

This is a better bill. The original bill was an unfunded mandate of enormous proportion. It provided no funds for child care, even though child care is the linchpin between welfare and work. Although work rates increased from 20 to 50 percent, the CBO originally projected that 44 States would have failed to meet them. There was no contingency grant fund for uncontrollable circumstances.

That is not reform. That is shifting the welfare problem to the States. That is telling local taxpayers that they have to pick up the tab.

But Mr. President, it is a better bill now. Through agreements reached over the last several days, we provide the \$3

billion in additional child care money, and \$1 billion in contingency grant funds. We passed an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Senator WELLSTONE, to revert the Food Stamp Program back to an entitlement if the number of hungry children increases.

It is a better bill now. It is not perfect. It is not the bill I would have drafted alone. It is not the bill that would have passed 5 years ago or perhaps even last year. It does reflect, in my view, the political reality of today. It is the best bill that we are going to get under the circumstances that exist in the caucus, in the Senate, in the Congress, and in the country.

I have a number of reservations about this bill. There were provisions in the Work First bill that I regret were not adopted. I regret, for example, that the bill does not have the vouchers we proposed to address the needs of children after the time limit.

I regret that the bill ends the Federal-State matching responsibility for all those who qualify based on State-set criteria.

I regret the bill does not exempt families from time limits based upon specific criteria like high unemployment or serious disability.

I regret that there is no increased funding, beyond child care, for States to really put people to work.

I regret that the contingency fund is probably underfunded and we will likely have to revisit that issue again in the future.

I regret that the food stamp block grant option was not eliminated. Many food stamp recipients are working poor trying to stay off welfare; similarly, many food stamp recipients are elderly, and their problems will only be exacerbated. I remain concerned about the food stamp block grant choice.

So, as other Senators have indicated, we will be watching what the conference does. We were successful in enacting more than 20 major changes in this legislation, and those changes, Mr. President, are absolutely critical to retaining our support in the future. If the conference bill is not very close to the Senate bill, I will oppose it and I will recommend the President veto that bill when it reaches his desk.

The American people want a welfare system that is truly reformed. The American people want changes, not through rhetoric, but through reality. They want able-bodied adults to work. But they also want children to be protected. Children left home alone is no good for anybody. Arbitrary time limits alone will mean local taxpayers pick up the tab.

We have to ensure that we maintain the broad bipartisan support that final passage in just a few moments will represent. We will be watching the conference closely.

This is the beginning, Mr. President. If we can, indeed, come back from the conference with what we have accomplished in the Senate intact, then I be-

lieve it is the beginning of a series of changes over the course of the next several years that can move us to a welfare system that truly will work as we want it to. This cannot be the final word on what happens on welfare this decade. I support this legislation with reservations. I will watch closely as work continues in the conference committee.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Democratic leader. I thank him for his support and his cooperation in getting us this far. I think we are going to have a display that we have not had recently of bipartisan support for major legislation, which I believe the American people will appreciate.

The Senate began debating welfare reform on August 7, and I predicted in my opening statement we were going to have a lot of contentious votes, a lot of debate, tough votes, and I also said that throughout all the debate we could not lose sight of two overriding facts. No. 1 was that our current welfare system had failed and, No. 2, it was our duty to fix it—talking about the Senate, not Republicans or Democrats.

So we have had about 100 hours of debate since that time, and some of it contentious, and we have now had I think 40 votes; 41 will be the final vote.

My colleagues remember the first week in August we thought we might be able to take up and finish welfare reform. But it appeared we had reached a roadblock after a couple days, and I recall some of the headlines. The media was quick to report that the Senate Republicans had failed and that welfare reform was on its last legs. The media got the story wrong because what is on its last leg in this Congress is the status quo.

Today, I am proud to say that the Senate has kept its promise—no more business as usual, no more tinkering around the edges with a system that has cost American taxpayers \$5.4 trillion—that is with a “T”—in Federal and State spending over the past 35 years. Instead, we are fulfilling our duty. We are not only fixing welfare, we are revolutionizing it. We are writing truly historic landmark legislation, legislation that ends—ends—a 60-year entitlement program. And in the process we are closing the books on a 6-decade-long story of a system that may have been well-intentioned but a system that failed the American taxpayer and failed those who it was designed to serve.

So today we begin to write a new story, a story about Americans who earn a paycheck rather than drawing a welfare check, a story about an America where welfare is no longer a way of life and where people no longer will be able to receive endless Federal cash benefits just because they choose not to work, a story about an America where power is actually transferred away from Federal bureaucrats in

Washington and given back to our 50 State capitals and our Governors, Democrats and Republicans, and our State legislatures, Democratic or Republican, a story about an America that recognizes that the family is the most important unit in our society.

Mr. President, there are some in this Chamber, including Senator MOYNIHAN from New York, for whom I have the greatest respect, who believe the story we write today may turn out to be a harsh one. I disagree. I believe nothing could be more harsh on American men and women and children in need than to continue with the system that has failed them year after year after year. And rather than being harsh, I believe the vast majority of Americans agree that the system we create today is fair, it does help those in need and, above all, it is based on common sense.

It is common sense to require welfare recipients who are actually able to work to do just that. It is common sense to put a 5-year lifetime limit on welfare benefits so it does not become a way of life. It is common sense to give our States the flexibility to devise programs that meet the specific needs of their citizens.

I remember what Governor Thompson of Wisconsin told a group of us in my office, speaking to the Governors, that we were talking about mandating Governors, strings, conservative strings in this case, and Governor Thompson said, “Who do you think we are? We are elected by the same people you are. Do you think I am going to allow somebody to go without medical treatment or without food in the State of Wisconsin?”

It is common sense. It is putting our faith in elected officials who are closer to the people. It is common sense to put a cap on spending because no program with an unlimited budget will ever be made to work effectively and efficiently. It is common sense to require that teenage mothers who have children out of wedlock stay in school and live under adult supervision in order to receive benefits. Otherwise, they have no chance to move off welfare. It is common sense to grant our States the ability to try to reduce our alarming illegitimacy rate.

Mr. President, the American people should know that this legislation is not perfect. It is not going to magically solve all the problems, regardless of how we vote today, whatever the conference vote may be when it comes back. But the Work Opportunity Act does put an end to a failed system. It does offer hope and opportunity to millions of Americans. It is a revolutionary step in the right direction, and it is further proof of the commitment this Congress has made to the American people.

At the risk of forgetting someone, Mr. President, I wish to thank a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who helped make today's victory for the American people possible.



There have been references to my colleagues, Senator BREAUX and Senator DODD and certainly the Democratic leader and others on that side of the aisle. All members of the Senate Finance Committee, including Senator PACKWOOD, who was our chairman when we started this revolution, certainly deserve credit. Senator PACKWOOD put the original bill together, brought it to the floor and we have made changes. Senator HUTCHISON was instrumental in reaching agreement on the formula which kept the bill alive. Senator FAIRCLOTH led the fight for important amendments regarding abstinence education.

I wish to say a special word of thanks to our remarkable freshman class. They sunk their teeth into this issue from day one and never let go. Senators Abraham and Snowe and Ashcroft authored important amendments, and particularly Senator Santorum, who was in the Chamber every day, almost every minute, making certain the debate was moving forward. And he understands the program because he worked on it on the House side. I think he did an excellent job. And I know there are others I may have forgotten. But I thank also America's Governors, Republicans and Democrats—particularly Republicans because I work closely with the Republican Governors, whether it is Governor Voinovich of Ohio, Governor Engler of Michigan, or Governor Edgar of Illinois or Governor Thompson of Wisconsin, Governor Pataki of New York. They worked very closely with us throughout the process and so did State legislators and local governments because they are going to have the authority.

We are going to follow the 10th amendment. We are going to return power to the people, power to the States that the 10th amendment and Bill of Rights say we should.

So we are going to cast our votes in a few moments. It is not the end of the process; as the Democratic leader has indicated, we have to go to conference. We will have to reconcile our differences.

In the Senate-passed bill, I think we save between \$65 billion and \$70 billion. The House has more savings. About \$40 billion of our savings, I think, are under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. I think we will iron out the differences we have, and then we will send a historic bill to the President of the United States, who has indicated, at least preliminarily, he will sign the bill.

I hope he will join with this Congress and the American people in writing a new chapter in the history of this great Nation.

As I listened to the debate and I listened to the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota, I regret that they believe we are going to punish America's children. I disagree with that, because I believe we are creating a better opportunity for our children in

this legislation, a future of more hope and more opportunity.

All of us come from different places in our lifetime. We have different backgrounds. Many come from hard-scrabble backgrounds and some not so hard scrabble. I can recall a long time ago in my family, in the small town of Russell, KS, when every member of the family worked. There were four children. Both my mother and father worked.

I can remember a time, even in those days, because of the Dust Bowl and a lot of other things that were happening, we could not make ends meet. We moved into the basement, six of us, and rented out the upstairs so we could make ends meet.

I think all of us can go back into our lives and say we had it tough. I remember coming to the Congress and working with Senator George McGovern from South Dakota on the Food Stamp Program, the WIC Program, and a lot of other programs that I believe protect children, contrary to what the Senator from Minnesota may have indicated.

I also can think back to the days when I was a county attorney in my small county of Russell County. One of the responsibilities of the county attorney in those days in my State was to sign every welfare check that left the office. In a small county, you know everybody who received those checks. In fact, it was old age assistance at the time. I knew two of them, my grandparents, who were caught up in the Dust Bowl days, in the dust storms and who had no other recourse but to seek help.

So I think when we vote on this bill, we should understand that, obviously, some are going to be in need and they are going to be taken care of and they are going to be young and old. But it is our hope that what we have demonstrated here, based on a lot of hearings and a lot of debate, is that we want to help people move out of this cycle of welfare, generation after generation, back in the mainstream, working, regaining their dignity and their self-esteem. That would be the goal of any welfare reform plan that I can think of.

So I know how tough it is for some people to accept assistance, and I have always had the view that people want to work. If given the opportunity, they will work. We call our bill the Work Opportunity Act of 1995. It is not going to be perfect but, in my view, it is a big, big step in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this bill. It is a big, big step in the right direction. The American people, by a vote of 88 percent, said this is the way they want to go, and I hope we will follow their lead.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators vote from their desks and that their vote be announced.

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

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass, as amended?

Mr. DOLE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is absent due to illness.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 443 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Abraham	Exon	Lott
Ashcroft	Feingold	Lugar
Baucus	Feinstein	Mack
Bennett	Ford	McCain
Biden	Frist	McConnell
Bingaman	Glenn	Mikulski
Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Boxer	Graham	Murray
Breaux	Gramm	Nickles
Brown	Grams	Nunn
Bryan	Grassley	Packwood
Bumpers	Gregg	Pell
Burns	Harkin	Pressler
Byrd	Hatch	Pryor
Campbell	Heflin	Reid
Chafee	Helms	Robb
Coats	Hollings	Rockefeller
Cochran	Hutchison	Roth
Cohen	Inhofe	Santorum
Conrad	Inouye	Shelby
Coverdell	Jeffords	Simpson
Craig	Johnston	Smith
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Snowe
Daschle	Kempthorne	Specter
DeWine	Kerry	Stevens
Dodd	Kohl	Thomas
Dole	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Levin	Thurmond
Dorgan	Lieberman	Warner

NAYS—12

Akaka	Kerrey	Moynihan
Bradley	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Faircloth	Leahy	Simon
Kennedy	Moseley-Braun	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Hatfield

So the bill (H.R. 4), as amended, was passed.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to enhance support and work opportunities for families with children, reduce welfare dependence, and control welfare spending."

Mr. DOLE. 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 ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees.

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

• Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to praise the magnificent work of the people on the Senate Finance Committee, majority office, and in my personnel office who were at the core of my welfare reform team and who helped develop and reach a consensus on much of the historic welfare reform legislation that has passed the Senate today.

These individuals have been working tirelessly and at length this entire year with me and with other Senators, crafting policy that ends the broken welfare system as we currently know it. The reforms will help our Nation's poor develop self-respect, train them for jobs, lessen the burdens on the hard working taxpayers of this country, give our Governors the greater flexibility they have been asking for, and leave the safety nets of aid and nutrition in place for families, for the elderly and for the disabled. Well deserved praise and my thanks to Lindy Paull, Rick Grafmeyer, Kathy Tobin, Joe Zummo, and Rob Epplin of the Finance Committee, and Marcia Ohlemiller and Ginny Worrest on my personal staff. •

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to tell my colleagues why I voted against the Dole welfare reform bill.

Mr. President, we live in the greatest Nation on earth. We are the wealthiest country in the world. But it is clear that some in our society do not share in this wealth. They are poor. They are jobless and in some cases homeless. And they must rely on public assistance to survive. In America, this is unacceptable. And we should be committed to improving their lives.

Mr. President, there is no question that the current welfare system needs reform. But the central goal for any welfare reform bill should be to move welfare recipients into productive work.

This will only happen if we provide welfare recipients with education and job training to prepare them for employment. It will only happen if we provide families with affordable child care. It will only happen if we can place them into jobs, preferably in the private sector or—as a last resort—in community service.

But the Dole bill is not designed to help welfare recipients get on their feet and go to work. It's only designed to cut programs—pure and simple.

It's designed to provide funds so that Republicans can provide huge tax cuts for the rich. That's what's really going on here.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the radical experiment proposed in this legislation will harm our society while producing defenseless victims.

Those victims are not represented in the Senate offices. They're not here lobbying against this bill. They don't even know they're at risk.

The victims will be America's children, and there will be millions of them.

Mr. President, the AFDC Program provides a safety net for 9 million children. These young people are innocent. They did not ask to be born into poverty. And they don't deserve to be punished.

These children are African-American, Hispanic, Asian, and white. They live in urban areas and rural areas. But, most importantly, they are American children. And we as a nation have a responsibility to provide them with a safety net.

The children we're talking about are desperately poor, Mr. President. They're not living high off the hog. These kids live in poverty.

Mr. President, it's hard for many of us to appreciate what life is like for the 9 million children who live in poverty and who benefit from AFDC.

I grew up to a working class family in Paterson, NJ, in the heart of the Depression. Times were tough. And I learned all too well what it meant to struggle economically.

But as bad as things were for my own family, they still weren't as bad as for millions of today's children.

These are children who are not always sure whether they'll get their next meal. Not always sure that they'll have a roof over their heads. Not always sure they'll get the health care they need.

Mr. President, these children are vulnerable. They're living on the edge of homelessness and hunger. And they didn't do anything to deserve this fate.

Mr. President, if we're serious about reforming a program that keeps these children afloat, we won't adopt a radical proposal like the Dole bill. We won't put millions of American children at risk. And we won't simply give a blank check to States and throw up our hands.

Mr. President, this Republican bill isn't primarily a policy document. It's a budget document.

Mr. President, if the Republicans were serious about improving opportunities for those on welfare, they would be talking about increasing our commitment to education and job training. In fact, only last year, the House Republican welfare reform bill, authored in part by Senator SANTORUM, would have increased spending on education and training by \$10 billion.

This year, by contrast, the bill before us would cut education and training dramatically, with the bill's total cuts exceeding \$65 billion.

So what's changed? The answer is simple. This year, the Republicans need money for their tax cuts for the rich.

Mr. President, shifting our welfare system to 50 State bureaucracies may give Congress more money to provide tax cuts. But it's not going to solve the serious problems facing our welfare system, or the people it serves.

To really reform welfare, Mr. President, we first must emphasize a very basic American value: The value of work.

We should expect recipients to work. In fact, we should demand that they work, if they can.

Of course, Mr. President, that kind of emphasis on work is important. But it's not enough. We also have to help people get the skills they need to get a job in the private sector. I'm not talking about handouts.

I'm talking about teaching people to read. Teaching people how to run a cash register or a computer. Teaching people what it takes to be self-sufficient in today's economy.

We also have to provide child care.

Mr. President, how is a woman with several young children supposed to find a job if she can't find someone to take care of her kids? It's simply impossible. There's just no point in pretending otherwise.

Unfortunately, the Dole bill doesn't address these kind of needs. It doesn't even try to promote work. It doesn't even try to give people job training. It does little to provide child care.

All it does is throw up its hands and ship the program to the States. That's it.

Mr. President, that's not real welfare reform. It's simply passing the buck to save a buck. And who's going to get the buck that's saved? The people the Republicans really care about: Those who are well off.

Mr. President, the Senate did adopt the leadership amendment that made some improvements in the Dole bill. This amendment increases funding for child care, limits State cuts in welfare to 20 percent, and includes a \$1 billion contingency fund.

Mr. President, I commend the Senators who crafted these improvements. But they do not change the basic design of the bill, which remains deeply flawed.

This bill would take away the safety net we established for poor children 60 years ago. It does far little to move recipients from welfare to work. And, when you get right down to it, it's main effect will be to take from the poor so that Congress can give a huge tax cut for the rich.

This was a historic vote, Mr. President. And I fear we are making a bad situation even worse. I only hope I am proved wrong.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senate voted to approve welfare reform legislation by a vote of 87-12 this afternoon. I have spent weeks thinking about my vote on this issue, and today, after listening to people on all sides of this issue, including my family and my colleagues, I reluctantly cast my vote in favor of the Dole bill, as amended. In my brief tenure here in the U.S. Senate, this was one of the most difficult votes I have cast. Mr. President, I would like to explain why.

From the beginning of the welfare reform debate, my No. 1 concern has been about finding a way to rebuild American families. I have always believed we can only do that by emphasizing

real personal responsibility, providing adequate child care for both working poor and welfare families, and ensuring our children can count on help from adults.

It has been my hope that we could achieve some positive changes to the current system. If there is one thing everyone can agree on, it's that the current system is flawed. It needs fixing, and I vowed to support reform. My challenge has been to influence that reform in the most constructive direction possible.

As someone who came to the Senate during the 1992 election year, I know we cannot continue to do things the way we always have. We must take a hard look at the sum total of our Government programs, and rework them to accurately reflect society's strengths, weaknesses, and needs.

We entered the debate with two bills, the Dole version and the Daschle Work-First bill. I cosponsored and voted in favor of the Daschle bill. I supported it because I felt it was the right place to start. It reflected a genuine commitment to helping poor families move up and into the work force.

Unfortunately from my perspective, a majority in the Senate rejected the Daschle bill. But I didn't give up there. I and others began devoting our energies to improving the Dole bill.

First, we offered an amendment to require full funding, and full protection for child care and children's programs. It would have provided the full \$11 billion estimated by the Department of Health and Human Services to be necessary to meet child-care needs. Again, this amendment was narrowly defeated, 50-48.

Given the closeness of this vote, Senators DOLE and DASCHLE were able to reach a compromise that strengthened the Dole bill, but fell short of our original amendment. It includes provisions which: require States to maintain their welfare spending at a minimum of 80 percent of current levels; strike the job training title—which had no business in a welfare bill to begin with, establish a contingency grant fund to take care of States in times of economic downturns, and provide a total of \$8 billion for childcare services nationwide. I support this compromise, though I feel ultimately we will have to do more.

Following the child-care debate, I cosponsored an amendment to establish greater protection for victims of domestic violence. I believe domestic violence to be the single, most destructive force against families in America today. No one, not the Senate, the President, or anyone else, can place a value on the price paid by mothers and their children attempting to survive an abusive household. This time the Senate agreed, and my amendment was adopted unanimously.

Having worked hard to improve the Dole bill, I found myself faced with a very difficult decision. I could either vote against the Dole bill based on its

shortcomings for children, or I could vote to affirm the improvements we made to it.

I believe the Dole bill to be deeply flawed. I believe it draws into question the welfare of poor children throughout the Nation. But I also believe we have to start somewhere. The current system needs to be changed, and the Dole bill changes it fundamentally. Therefore, I voted yes.

Mr. President, change of any kind always involves risk. We will never know how great that risk is until we try something different. What we do know, however, is that change brings new responsibility.

We do not know whether this bill will make it into law. If it is enacted, we don't know if it will work. It may prove a fabulous success, or it may only prove to make problems worse for the poor.

But today, we have created a grave new responsibility for this Senate: to be watchdogs for our children. More than ever before, all Senators have an obligation to make the law work in favor of poor children. All Senators have a responsibility in the future to consider the successes and failures they have created this day, and to be prepared to make changes later if things don't work out.

The most unfortunate part of this debate, in my opinion, is that people don't think of children when they think of welfare. People think of dependency, complacency, poverty, and all the worst stereotypes. This troubles me because it is children who face the most difficult struggles. It is children who are most deserving of our care.

The outcome of this debate does not change one iota this basic fact: we need a national commitment to children in this country. I believe this to the very core of my being.

Children are under assault every single day in this country. In their homes, in school, on the streets, and yes, in this Congress. We see it in cuts to education and dismantling of crime prevention. We see it in Medicaid cuts, defunding of AmeriCorps, and elimination of student loans.

Today, I voted for change, to try something new. But I also took responsibility to live with that change, and to work even harder promoting a broad, national commitment to our children. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to accept that responsibility with equal sobriety, and with equal vigor.

The outcome today was not in doubt. Nor is this the end of the debate. There will be a conference committee. We may even debate a conference report. More likely, we will see this bill again in the budget reconciliation yet to come.

I think we can change welfare for the better, and move more people into the work force. I look forward to working with you, Mr. President and all my colleagues, to this end; but also to build a stronger commitment to children. We must do this in welfare reform, and

across the whole spectrum of issues we consider this session. The future is simply too important. And unlike before, it is our new responsibility.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

#### CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, on rollcall 440 I voted aye; my intention was to vote no. I did not know it was a tabling amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote, which in no way will change the outcome of the vote.

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

#### AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

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

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

EXCEPTED COMMITTEE AMENDMENT ON PAGE 83, LINE 4, THROUGH PAGE 84, LINE 2

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, what is the pending business, I inquire of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the committee amendment on page 83 of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, 4 minutes remains to be debated on the amendment before we conclude debate on this subject?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, there is not order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, 4 minutes remain in debate time on this amendment. We have agreed Senator BOXER will use the first minute and the managers 2 minutes and then Senator BOXER will close the debate for the remaining 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will listen to this because it is such a common sense issue.