

ISTEA bill. Does the Senator want to go ahead now on that to discuss something? I understand he is not going to present any motions or anything but discuss it.

Mr. BYRD. Not at the moment. I may come back shortly. But I do thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his kind offer.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

CHILD CARE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, today the White House is sponsoring an all-day conference on child care. I believe the President and First Lady have correctly identified this as an important issue to families, and particularly to working families in America. A number of experts have been invited to testify and to participate in panel discussions throughout the day.

This is an important but yet also a very complex issue. The complexity of the issue is that there is one segment of our population that seriously needs high-quality day care in order to work—work that for many has been required through welfare reform. Others work out of economic necessity; both mother and father need to be employed. And again for others, who are single parents raising their children, they need to provide the financial wherewithal to do that. The focus on the child care conference at the White House correctly focuses on this segment of our population.

The conference will focus on three questions: how to increase access for child care; how to make it more affordable; and how to guarantee the quality of child care so that children will be safe.

But, what the conference did not focus on was another segment of the population, in fact a majority segment of the population, the nearly 50 percent who do not have both parents working and another 25 percent who do not work out of the home full time. One of the questions, unfortunately, that will not be discussed at the White House today is how we can ensure that we are not discouraging or sending the wrong signals to the second segment, those parents, those mothers who stay home and do not work and those parents who keep one parent at home raising the child while the other works or they

take separate shifts or they have worked out arrangements to raise their own children.

There is a legitimate need, I believe, to address the first question, how we provide child care for working families, for single mothers, for welfare mothers and others. But there is also a legitimate and essential question that needs to be discussed along with that, and that is what can we do to help those who have made the decision to stay at home?

We have recently had some exciting developments concerning infant brain development, about the much earlier than originally thought development, the connection of synapses that occur, the billions of these connections that occur at very, very early ages and how important it is to recognize that and to make sure that children receive the correct upbringing, stimulation and so forth to foster that development.

Again, unfortunately, there has been little discussion along with that about the critical nature of the emotional development of the infant, because, after all, as many experts have told us, it is the emotional development of the infant that is the fuel that drives the automobile, to use a metaphor. Unfortunately, there has been little discussion about this in the recent child care debate that focuses on those early years and the need for correct and effective childhood development. Recently, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Children and Families, I held a hearing in which we heard testimony from Dr. Diane Fisher, who is a practicing clinical psychologist. I want to quote from her:

Imagine a brilliant, stimulated, optimally educated child who is lacking in self-esteem, self-control, identity or discipline. This in fact is what we are hearing about in our schools today—privileged, indulged children who are wired to the Internet but without a moral compass or a sense of connection to the adults who are supposed to be present in their lives.

Our committee heard about how mothers are biologically hard wired to form a close emotional tie with their children; that this bonding experience is not a quick experience, something to be accomplished in a matter of weeks or even months, but something that is a gradual process that proceeds slowly and over time. Anybody who is a parent knows that. We don't need studies or experts to come and testify as to the kind of bonding that takes place between parents and children, particularly mother and child, in those first critical early months and years and then throughout their growing experience for the next 15 or 20 years or so.

For the last 15 years I have been involved, first, as the ranking Republican on the Early Childhood, Youth and Families Committee in the House of Representatives during my service there and in the last 9 years as chairman or ranking member of the Children and Families Subcommittee here in the Senate. Over that time I have listened to and read and personally vis-

ited experts in the field—sociologists, psychologists, child development experts, and so forth—who have impressed upon me the absolutely critical element of the emotional attachment, the emotional connection, the bonding process between mother and child with infants, and mothers and fathers with their children, and how absolutely essential this correct attachment is for successful childhood development.

Most of this is not accomplished through a complex formula. It is not accomplished through a lot of educational training, academic training, or how-to books. It is accomplished intuitively by a mother motivated by love and enjoyment of that child. It takes an enormous amount of love and motivation to want to pay attention to the subtle cues that an infant or a young child sends on a moment-by-moment, hour-by-hour, daily basis. Frankly, it is very rare to find a caregiver who is either able or motivated by that same degree of love and attention and motivation to pay that kind of attention to a child. Often they have a number of children to look out for, and it is just keeping some semblance of order in the child-care facility that becomes the paramount challenge for the child-care provider.

We talk a lot about and they are talking today at the White House a lot about the term quality. Often that is used by the experts, or those who are discussing this, as a code word, "quality" meaning we need more control, we need more regulation, we need more oversight of child care facilities.

The quality of child care, for those children, especially children 0 to 3, is more than just having developmentally appropriate materials or an effective well-located site staffed by trained individuals that is important in child care, although it is only one form of child care, but quality is, I believe, more clearly related, and according to the experts we had testify before our committee, more clearly related to love and nurture and, as such, I believe, we have to recognize that it is a child's mother, a child's father that are in the best position to offer that love and nurture to their children.

As one mother told me, and this is someone who holds an advanced degree in family therapy, an expert in the field of raising children, she said a baby, a young child, needs to be adored. There isn't a child care provider in the world that can adore my child like I can adore my child. Only a mother can truly adore a child, provide the kind of nurturing that children need when they are growing up. We know that and most American people know this.

A recent Gallup poll for the Los Angeles Times said 73 percent of the American public believes too many children are being raised in day care and not nearly enough are being raised by their mother at home, and children fare best when raised by their mother at home. That figure was up from 68

percent who responded that way in 1987.

If we truly believe in quality child care, then I believe we should focus much of our attention, not just on ways in which we can provide improved quality care for children in day care settings, for those mothers who have no choice, for those families that have no choice, for those welfare mothers who have no choice but to move into the workplace, but we should also provide equal attention to those initiatives that can make it easier for families to have at least one parent remain at home, those families that can juggle their work schedules so that the primary care for their child is from parent to child rather than from paid provider to child.

The White House is going to be issuing a number of initiatives, according to reports, about how we as a society, both the private sector and the public sector, can provide assistance for child care facilities to improve the quality and access to child care. But shouldn't we also be discussing the positive family friendly policies that can provide assistance to those who have the ability or make the choice to stay at home with their children, like extended job protected leave?

As a Republican conservative, I broke with many of my fellow colleagues on the issue of family leave. I believe it is an important provision to guarantee that mothers have the choice of taking at least 12 weeks after the child is born to be with that child, but beyond that, the initiatives of part-time work, flextime, comptime, job sharing, telecommuting, and other corporate policies which a majority of families would prefer if they had the option, because many parents are willing to work less and provide more care for their own children if it is possible for them to do so and still maintain economic viability.

According to a 1991 survey sponsored by the Hilton Hotel Corp., two-thirds of Americans said they would take salary reductions in order to get more time off from work. There is another way we can focus Federal attention appropriately on making it easier for families to provide care for children at home: Tax fairness.

In my time in the Congress, I haven't agreed on too many issues with former Representative Pat Schroeder, but one thing she said that I did identify with and I have always remembered is she said you can get a bigger tax break for breeding racehorses than you can for raising children, and she was right. The Tax Code over the years has penalized parents for spending time with their children by narrowly linking tax benefits to day care expenses and provisions on the other side of the equation. The dependent care tax credit, for example, is constructed in such a way that the more time a child spends in day care and the higher, therefore, the family's day care expenses, the greater the tax benefits.

Mr. President, I don't want to ignore the reality that growing economic and cultural pressures make it difficult for parents to spend as much time with their children as they would like. We all face that problem. Tying tax benefits to day care expenses makes matters worse, not better. It penalizes parents for caring for their own children by redistributing income by those who make extensive use of out-of-home professional day care services. Tax benefits which favor day care over parental care should be replaced, I suggest, by increasing benefits for all families with young children.

While I fully expect that the White House Conference on Child Care will emerge with new policy recommendations, such as equal standards for quality care or the expansion of the military model of child care in the private sector, I would caution that we need to pay equal attention to the facts that we have learned about the critical importance, especially in early years, about the need of strong attachment between mother, father and child.

We also must ask the question: Are there policies which we can support and provide leadership on that will, in fact, make that attachment a true priority? Because if we have learned anything over the past couple of decades, it is how critical that attachment between child and family, mother and child, father and child is and the uncomfortable fact that for many, quality child care, though important, can never be an effective substitute for parental attachment.

I hope, Mr. President, that in this day of focus on provision of child care, we can also focus our attention on what true quality care is and look for ways in which we can initiate and implement policies in the Congress and in the workplace that can provide mothers and families with this very, very important and essential element to successful child raising.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ABRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. President. I also thank the Presiding Officer for giving this Senator the opportunity to speak at this point as opposed to presiding. I appreciate his consideration.

UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to address the direction of our country's relationship with the People's Republic of China. As we speak, the Clinton administration is busily preparing for next week's state visit of Chinese President Jiang Zemin. A state visit is the most formal and ceremonial diplomatic event hosted by the United States. It involves champagne receptions and flattering toasts.

While United States-Chinese relations are crucial and important for both countries, I believe it would be in-

appropriate for President Clinton to welcome the Chinese leader in a state visit at this time.

The United States, the world's leading free nation, should not give a red carpet welcome to China's Communist leadership until we see greater strides on human rights, religious freedom and other issues in that country. Rather than a ceremonial visit, we should be holding a working visit with the Chinese leadership, concentrating on the very real issues which exist between our two nations.

In my view, the President should put specific demands on the Chinese leadership, calling for improved human rights policies and an end to weapons proliferation.

Mr. President, China's record of human rights abuses and repression of religious faith is long and disturbing.

Peaceful advocates of democracy and political reforms have been sentenced to long terms in prisons where they have been beaten, tortured, and denied needed medical care.

Women pregnant with their second or third child have been coerced into abortions.

Religious meeting places have been forcibly closed.

Tibetan monks refusing to condemn their religious leader, the Dalai Lama, have been forced from their monasteries; some of their leaders have disappeared.

The President's own State Department Report on Human Rights confirms these allegations.

And recent claims by the Chinese Government that Catholics in particular are few in number and not mistreated have been directly contradicted by the Vatican.

According to the Vatican news agency, Chinese reports simply ignore the existence of 8 million Catholics loyal to the Pope, as well as China's violent actions in closing down secret churches and arresting religious leaders.

China also has engaged in weapons proliferation that endangers our national security.

Although China signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and agreed to abide by the terms of the Missile Technology Control Regime in 1992, violations of both agreements continue. Especially worrisome are Chinese sales of weapons technologies to countries which are trying to develop weapons of mass destruction, countries which America regards as rogue nations.

Chinese weapons exports also have more directly threatened Americans here on United States soil. Companies associated with China's Communist People's Liberation Army the PLA, have been caught attempting to sell smuggled assault weapons to street gangs in Los Angeles.

The Clinton administration's response to these dangerous actions, in my judgment, has been inadequate to say the least.

Last December, the administration welcomed China's Defense Minister,