

more to undermine our sense of common responsibility than our failed welfare system."

In just a few weeks, President Clinton will deliver another State of the Union Address.

And he will do so with the knowledge that he bears total responsibility for the continuation of that failed welfare system.

America heard a great deal of rhetoric in 1992 from candidate Clinton, and a great deal of rhetoric since then from President Clinton about "ending welfare as we know it."

But all the words in the world cannot obscure President Clinton's action of last night.

Given his promises, it is no wonder President Clinton used the cover of darkness to veto the truly revolutionary welfare reform bill which would have kept his commitments.

This bill was, of course, the result of almost a year of hard work by a bipartisan group of Members of Congress, Senators, and, very importantly, our Nation's Governors.

The President may have tried to hide his stealth veto by doing it late at night, but he can not hid the message he is sending to the American people: a loud and clear message that he will stand in the way of fundamental change, and, instead, will fight for the status quo.

The President's veto means that American taxpayers will enter 1996 continuing to pour countless millions into a system that has failed, according to everyone. The system failed, and failed, and failed. And those who are served by the system will enter a new year with little or no hope for escaping from a future of welfare.

What a different 1996—and a different future—it would have been had the President backed his words up with action by signing the legislation.

Instead of the status quo where all authority resides in Washington, we would have shifted power to our State capitals, and given our Governors the ability to create a system that meets the unique needs of their States.

Instead of the status quo, where welfare often becomes a way of life, and where some receive Federal; cash benefits just because they choose not to work, we would have a system where people are required to work after 2 years, and one with a 5-year limit on the receipt of Federal benefits.

Instead of the status quo, where children are rewarded for having children and for moving away from home, we would have one which recognizes the importance of family—one that discourages illegitimacy, and encourages personal responsibility.

Instead of the status quo, which often allows deadbeat dads to escape their financial responsibilities, we would have a system that streamlined paternity establishment, that established State registries, that made child support laws uniform across State lines, and that required States to use

the threats of denying drivers licenses to parents who refuse to pay child support.

Instead of the status quo which wastes billions of taxpayer dollars, we would have a system that gives our States the authority and responsibility to crack down on fraud and abuse.

I am not claiming that our welfare reform legislation was perfect. Nor would it have magically solved our Nation's many social problems.

But it did put an end to a failed system.

It was a sharp departure. It was a fundamental change.

It was a big, big, step in the right direction.

It did return power to our States and cities, and to our people.

It did offer hope and opportunity to millions of Americans.

And we did want to stress work, and not welfare.

But instead of beginning in 1996 by signing this legislation, the President has chosen to begin it by keeping the status quo intact.

I suspect that in this year's State of the Union Address, the President will again talk about how he wants to end welfare as we know it.

But they are words that will sound very hollow to many in this Chamber, and to all Americans who pay for, or who are served by, the status quo: And that is a failed system that remains intact thanks to the President's actions of last evening.

It seems to me that here is a bill that passed the U.S. Senate by a vote of 87 to 12. If one absentee, Senator HATFIELD, had voted "aye," it would have been 88 Senators—good, bipartisan, strong bipartisan support.

The bill went to conference, and we came back with a fundamental Senate bill. And by then it had become politicized again, and it was more of a party-line vote, with one exception on the other side.

We have discussed welfare reform in all of the meetings we have had at the White House. But I do not see how the President could veto a bill that we were so close to coming together on, one that he praised when it passed the Senate, one that he said he can support. I must say, if there are any sharp differences in those two bills—our bill and the bill that came from conference—they were not major.

So we will try again. We will try again in 1996. It seems to me, and it seems to most of my colleagues—at least the 87 who voted for welfare reform—that system has failed. We need fundamental change.

We are willing to trust the Governors. We are willing to send power back to States. Therein lies the problem. Therein lies the problem, because I do not think the President of the United States wants that to happen, unless the Federal Government determines eligibility and determines who is going to be covered and everything else. If you put all those regulations on

Governors, they will say, "No, thank you. If you don't give us flexibility, we can't save the money."

We are talking about saving somewhere in the neighborhood of \$60 billion over 7 years. And \$60 billion is a lot of money to the American taxpayers. We believe it can be done. We believe it can be done, and we can still preserve the benefits for those who need the benefits.

There will always be some who need help, and we understand that. But we will also tighten up the system so those who should be working will be working, and the alternative will not be receiving benefits.

So we regret that the bill has been vetoed. I guess you can say it came as no surprise. But in our view we had a good product that should have been signed. It seems to me that we will have to take our case to the American people and let them make the final decision.

#### PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 133, calling for an adjournment of both Houses of Congress until January 22, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 133) was agreed to, as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 133

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the calendar day of Tuesday, January 9, 1996, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, January 22, 1996, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on the calendar day of Wednesday, January 10, 1996, pursuant to a motion offered by the Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, January 22, 1996, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.*

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

#### EXPECTATION OF VOTES

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me say that I am pleased with the majority leader's remarks about the expectations for votes for the next couple of weeks. In case Senators are not clear, as I understand it, unless some significant unforeseen development arises, we

do not anticipate votes for the next couple of weeks. The next week and the week following are weeks within which votes will not be likely.

#### TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN MIKE SYNAR

Mr. DASCHLE. The majority leader talked about someone for whom I feel a great deal of affection. Mike Synar and I came to the Congress together in 1978. He was the very first person I met in the House of Representatives. He was the first Member of Congress I accompanied to his district. He was the first Member of Congress I brought to South Dakota. We got to be very, very close friends. Over the years that friendship grew, and our affection for one another grew with it.

As most people remember, Mike Synar was awarded the Profiles In Courage Award just last year for the remarkable display of courage he demonstrated on a whole range of issues. Whether one agreed with him or not, one would have to say that when it came to standing up for his convictions, when it came to his belief that you either come to Congress to do something or be something, he chose to do something. You could not deny that that is exactly what he was here to do, to make what he could out of an opportunity to be a Member of Congress from a conservative district in the State of Oklahoma.

Mike Synar stood up for what he believed. The antithesis of the perception of a modern-day politician, he stood up to the special interests. Whether you agreed with him or not, he stood up and fought for everything he could in the time he was here—campaign finance reform, grazing fee reform, tobacco issues that span the spectrum, a whole range of issues that he felt and cared very deeply about.

So, Mr. President, America has lost a fine public statesman today. America has lost somebody who came here for all the right reasons. America has lost somebody who I was fortunate to call a very close and special friend.

We will miss him. Along with Senator DOLE, I send my condolences to his family, and to all of those who have had the good fortune to know him, to love him, and to count him as their friend, too.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE WELFARE REFORM BILL

Mr. DASCHLE. The majority leader talked about his disappointment at the decision of the President to veto the welfare bill. Let me say, Mr. President, that I am very pleased with the action taken by the President yesterday.

The majority leader characterized the conference report as virtually similar to the Senate-passed bill. The majority leader did not note that the President said he could support the Senate-passed bill prior to the time it went to conference. He did not mention

that there was a significant level of bipartisan support for that bill as it left the Senate, controversial in many ways as it was.

We all recognize the need for reform. We all recognize that we have to build upon the reforms that we enacted over the last 10 years. We all recognize that we want to find ways to make work pay. But we also ought to recognize that we should not be punishing children as we attempt to do that. We also ought to recognize that in the name of flexibility we should not simply give carte blanche to States to renege on the responsibilities that every State must have to ensure that there is a welfare system that works.

No mention was made in the majority leader's remarks of the fact that there was no requirement in the conference report on welfare for the States to actually use for welfare purposes the Federal dollars that they are being provided for welfare. Under the provisions in the conference report, if they wanted to use them for infrastructure, they would be able to do that. If they wanted to use them for any other purpose they might have in their State budgets, there would be no prohibition on doing that.

You can talk about maintenance of effort. We actually reduced the level of maintenance of effort with no other requirement. By maintenance of effort we are simply asking the States, in coming years, to live up to the level of benefits they now provide.

Not only are they not required to live up to 100 percent of the benefits that they are now providing, the help that they are providing in whatever ways to children, the people who are attempting to break out of poverty, out of welfare, but the conference report would actually give them a license to drop from 100 percent down to 25 percent with no expectation in the future of how they will meet the requirements that they already have noted and have accumulated in their welfare budgets today.

There is no requirement in the conference-passed version of the bill to tell a welfare recipient who is waiting for some form of assistance that they will be receiving assistance at a certain time. In current law that time limit is 45 days. A State or county has to respond within 45 days. There is no such requirement in the current bill.

A prospective recipient of some form of assistance would have to wait 6 months, maybe have to wait 9 months, a year, 2 years. There is no limit on the extent to which recipients would have to wait for help.

So there are a significant number of very major differences between what we proposed in the work-first legislation, what we even passed in the U.S. Senate, and what came back as a conference report.

We want to make work pay. We want to ensure that children are not punished. We want to ensure that there is adequate funding for the kinds of

things that we know we must do. Frankly, the higher we go in welfare savings, the more concerned I am that all we are really doing is creating the pool of resources necessary to pay for the huge tax cut that Republicans continue to insist be a part of any budget.

I do not know how we can do more in all the areas that we have agreed upon in the budget negotiations, whether it is in child care, whether it is in providing adequate nutrition, whether it is in providing real skilled opportunities for those who are on welfare today, job skills and training skills and the things that would make them more employable, how we can do all of that, and still save \$60 billion, which coincidentally just happens to be an amount that would be very helpful in creating the pool necessary to make the tax cut work in current budget deliberations.

So, Mr. President, what the President vetoed is a far cry from what Democrats had proposed. It is a significant departure from what the Senate had gone on record in support of. I must say, were we to bring the bill back in its current form, we would have more than enough votes necessary to sustain the veto the President demonstrated yesterday.

So we are prepared—because we are not satisfied with the status quo either—to go back to work to find ways to address the significant deficiencies that currently exist in this bill. Let us make sure that we can find a bipartisan way to address welfare reform prior to the end of the year. But let us do it right. Let us ensure that the guarantees for children are there. Let us ensure that we find a way to make work pay. Let us ensure that we are able to provide the child care necessary so that parents can leave their homes for work. Let us ensure that—as much as we want to provide flexibility to the States—that they are not going to renege on their responsibility they have to make sure we have the infrastructure in place to ensure that this is more than just a piece of paper that we all feel good about on the day we vote again.

I yield the floor.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF H.R. 4

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as he had indicated he would do, the President has now vetoed H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1995. As the bill passed the Senate, December 22, 1995, with a margin of only 5 votes, 52-47, there can