

Saints. In addition to his education career, Sherm Lindhardt served in our Nation's Armed Forces, attaining the rank of captain in the U.S. Army.

Again, Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to Sherman J. Lindhardt for his dedication in teaching our youth. The success of his efforts are clearly evident as we enjoy the benefits of a new generation of community leaders and upstanding citizens. While this day marks the setting of the Sun on a fine career, I am sure that it also marks the beginning of many continued years of service and honorable pursuits by Sherm Lindhardt. In those pursuits I wish him the very best.

#### WHERE'S WELFARE?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as we all know, welfare reform has been one of the most hotly debated issues of this Congress. Two and a half years ago President Clinton promised to end welfare as we know it, and the public has reinforced that message by telling us unequivocally that they want to see this done.

The ball lies in Congress' court, and we have a clear task in front of us. The House has set the stage by passing the Personal Responsibility Act almost 3 months ago. In fact, the House felt this issue was so pressing that they included welfare reform as one of their 10 highest priorities in the Contract With America.

While many of us may disagree with the substantive course the House chose to take, they were clearly responding to a mandate from the public to address this issue in some way.

It is now the Senate's turn. The Finance Committee has completed action on a bill that has been reported to the full Senate, and I think I speak for all Senators on my side of the aisle when I say that we are ready for floor consideration of this legislation.

Mr. President, we had been led to believe that welfare reform might be on the floor as early as the 12th of June. And then we were told by the majority leader that welfare reform would be considered immediately upon completion of action on the telecommunications bill.

That bill was wrapped up last Thursday. It is now the 22d of June, and we are hearing rumors that welfare reform may not be considered in June at all, and may not be considered this summer at all. It may be considered in July—but, then again, we're told by some in the Republican leadership that we may not get to welfare until September.

Mr. President, the notion that the Senate may put off consideration of welfare reform until September is unacceptable.

We are ready. We are ready now.

President Clinton challenged us to have a bill on his desk by July 4, not because of politics, but because it is important for the Nation that we fix a welfare system that is not working—

not working for those on it, and not working for those who are footing the bill.

The public has told us that they view the welfare crisis as one of the most pressing problems facing our Nation today. The public is clearly ready for us to address this issue. And Democrats are ready to address it.

The question is, Are Republicans ready?

More to the point: Are Republicans serious about addressing this issue? Are they serious about reform, or just serious about rhetoric?

The Finance Committee reported a welfare bill on June 9. It is now June 22, and I understand my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are divided on how to proceed. They are divided on a number of provisions, either included in, or excluded from, that bill.

Mr. President, I understand division. And I, too, have concerns about the Finance Committee bill. But the proper forum to address these concerns is on the Senate floor.

Bring the bill to the floor and let those who want to offer amendments to modify current provisions do so. Let those who want to add provisions through the amendment process do so.

That is the legislative process.

What concerns me and many on my side of the aisle is that the welfare bill will be delayed until July as Republican Senators meet behind closed doors to try and work out problems.

Then, in July, those doors will still be closed as secret discussions continue. Before we know it, it will be September.

Yes, there are problems with the Finance Committee bill. But let us air those problems on the floor and address them through the open legislative process.

As for the Finance Committee bill, I too, am troubled by many aspects of that legislation.

First, the Finance Committee bill does not solve the problems with our welfare system. It merely boxes up that system and ships it to the States. That is not reform.

Second, the Republicans have said that they want to put welfare recipients to work. But, although the Finance Committee bill requires increased numbers of people to be participating in programs intended to move them toward work, it provides no resources to meet these participation requirements.

The Congressional Budget Office has said that 44 States will be unable to meet the participation requirements in the Finance Committee bill. The U.S. Conference of Mayors has said that this is the mother of all unfunded mandates.

What is clear is that Finance Committee bill is not reform. And it is not about work. In fact, if it is about anything, it is about shipping the welfare problem to the States and—ironically enough—passing the largest unfunded mandate in history.

In essence, the Finance Committee bill represents the kind of typical two-step about which the public is most cynical: It says one thing and means another. It sounds, but is actually disastrous. The Finance Committee bill is about rhetoric, not reform.

It will reap exactly the kind of results the unfunded mandates bill was meant to prevent, and having it come so quickly upon the heels of the unfunded mandates legislation represents hypocrisy at its worst.

It is ironic that most Members put their serious face on when they say that they do not want to hurt children. Mr. President, I want to believe them. But again, it is the difference between rhetoric and reality.

The reality of the Finance Committee bill is that some 4 million children will be cut off from assistance. Some 4 million children could be put out on the street.

Children should not pay for the mistakes or misfortune of their parents.

That is not fair. That is draconian. That is mean.

And that is plain old un-American.

It is one thing to require that able-bodied people go to work. That was the original intent of welfare: To provide out-of-luck families with a helping hand to get back on their feet. I believe most Americans support that kind of a safety net today.

But the Finance Committee plan cuts kids off welfare while doing nothing to help their parents find work. That is wrong; it is unfair; it is shortsighted.

This leads to yet another problem I see with the Finance Committee bill. Anyone who has kids knows that one of the real linchpins between welfare and work is child care. It is impossible to work unless you have some means of caring for your children—it as simple as that.

Nevertheless, the Finance Committee bill fails to address the child care issue in any serious way. It mandates child care for welfare recipients who are working only until the child is 6 years old.

What happens to a 7-year-old? Or an 8-year-old? Or any child that should not be left alone?

Beyond that, the bill does not increase funds for child care, so that as the participation requirements increase—requiring a greater population of welfare mothers to participate in the JOBS Program—there is no corresponding increase in funds for child care.

If we are to increase the mandate for adults to work, but not provide for a corresponding increase in child care funds to enable parents to work, then we are not really expecting parents to work.

Or we are expecting the States to pick up the tab—a sort of unwritten unfunded mandate.

Or we are suggesting that young children can be left alone.

None of these alternatives are acceptable.

So the Finance Committee needs a lot of work. But Democrats are ready to do the work, and the Finance Committee bill does provide us with a mechanism for bringing welfare to the floor of the Senate for debate.

If Republicans have problems with their own bill, they should offer amendments to improve it. That is what Democrats intend to do.

In fact, we will offer an alternative plan that is truly about work.

And so today I urge the majority leader to bring the welfare bill to the floor.

It is time the Senate fulfills its obligation to give the American people what they want and deserve: True welfare reform that will move people off welfare and into work, not by punishing children, but by providing people access to the real means to become self-sufficient.

#### WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as of the close of business yesterday, Thursday, June 29, the Federal debt stood at \$4,898,835,701,662.79. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,596.06 as his or her share of that debt.

#### REGULATORY REFORM ACT

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, during consideration of S. 343, the Regulatory Reform Act, I intended to offer an amendment to waive administrative and civil penalties for local governments when Federal water pollution control compliance plans are in effect.

I believe this amendment is a simple issue of fairness to local governments and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment and the text of my "Dear Colleague" letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### AMENDMENT No. —

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. . WAIVER OF PENALTIES WHEN FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT COMPLIANCE PLANS ARE IN EFFECT.

Section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1319) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) WAIVER OF PENALTIES WHEN COMPLIANCE PLANS ARE IN EFFECT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no civil or administrative penalty may be imposed under this Act against a unit of local government for a violation of a provision of this Act (including a violation of a condition of a permit issued under this Act)—

"(A) if the unit of local government has entered into an agreement with the Administrator (or the Secretary of the Army, in the case of a violation of section 404) to carry out a compliance plan with respect to a prior

violation of the provision by the unit of local government; and

"(B) during the period—

"(i) beginning on the date on which the unit of local government and the Administrator (or the Secretary of the Army, in the case of a violation of section 404) enter into the agreement; and

"(ii) ending on the date on which the unit of local government is required to be in compliance with the provision under the plan.

"(2) REQUIREMENT OF GOOD FAITH.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply during any period in which the Administrator (or the Secretary of the Army, in the case of a violation of section 404) determines that the unit of local government is not carrying out the compliance plan in good faith.

"(3) OTHER ENFORCEMENT.—A waiver of penalties provided under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a violation of any provision of this Act other than the provision that is the subject of the agreement described in paragraph (1)(A)."

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, June 27, 1995.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: When the Senate begins consideration of S. 343, the Regulatory Reform Bill, I intend to offer an amendment to lift the unfair burden of excessive civil penalties from the backs of local governments that are working in good faith with the Clean Water Act.

Under current law, civil penalties begin to accumulate the moment a local government violates the Clean Water Act. Once this happens, the law requires that the local government present a Municipal Compliance plan for approval by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), or the Secretary of the Army in cases of Section 404 violations. However, even after a compliance plan has been approved, penalties continue to accumulate. In effect, existing law actually punishes local governments while they are trying to comply with the law.

Under my amendment, local governments would stop accumulating civil and administrative penalties once a Municipal Compliance Plan has been negotiated and the locality is acting in good faith to carry out the plan. Further, my amendment would act as an incentive to encourage governments to move quickly to achieve compliance with the Clean Water Act.

This amendment is a simple issue of fairness. Local governments must operate with a limited pool of resources. Localities should not have to devote their tax revenue to penalties, while having to comply with the law. Rather, by discontinuing burdensome penalties, local governments can better concentrate their resources to meet the intent of the law in protecting our water resources from pollution.

I hope you will join me in supporting this commonsense amendment for our towns and cities. If you have any questions or wish to cosponsor this amendment, please feel free to have a member of your staff contact Quinn Mast of my staff at 4-5842.

Sincerely,

LARRY PRESSLER,

U.S. Senator.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I see no other Senator seeking recognition. I yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### THE RESCISSIONS BILL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand we have morning business until 10:30, at which time I will ask consent that we turn to H.R. 1944, the rescissions bill, and that no amendments be in order; there be 10 minutes for debate to be equally divided in the usual form; and that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the bill be advanced to third reading and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

I will make that request at 10:30. I hope we can have the cooperation of our colleagues. This is something the White House wants. We have a statement from the administration. This contains the money for the Oklahoma City disaster. It contains money for the earthquakes in California. And if my colleagues on the other side do not want to pass it, that is up to them.

We have had a lot of negotiation on the rescissions package. The President vetoed it, and we went back and tried to accommodate some of the President's concerns. Now I am advised at this last moment there may be some other political efforts made to delay the bill or frustrate the will of the majority.

I hope that at 10:30 sharp we can take up the bill under the previous considerations.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I know we are waiting until the hour of 10:30, but just for the public record, I now have a copy of this bill. This is the first time I have seen this bill.

I voted for the \$16 billion in cuts when it was on the Senate side, but I want to make it crystal clear that there have now been additional cuts, for example, in low-income energy assistance. I am from a cold weather State. I want to talk about that program. I represent people in my State. Just because people are low income does not mean they do not have representation.

Just now I received a copy of this bill. There was a program that we had that was an important program—the majority leader actually helped me on this before—which provided counseling to elderly people so they do not get ripped off on some of the supplemental health care coverage to Medicare. That came out in the conference committee.

So, Mr. President, there is also a range of important programs here for dislocated people, workers with summer youth employment. I just received this bill—just received it. I have not even had a chance to look at it. I certainly would oppose any kind of a unanimous-consent agreement that said we would have a vote at a time certain.