

are being placed in situations which do not have that kind of care, the question is whether you should reward them the same as you do others that do have good health care. In this study, 40 percent of the health care provided infants in child care centers was potentially injurious. Fifteen percent of center-based child care for all preschoolers was so bad that the child's health and safety were threatened; 70 percent were mediocre. This is the study.

If you are faced with those, and you understand the dramatic problems that can cause in a child, then you ought to have some way to give the parents of children a means of determining that they can be assured they are not going to have their child damaged. Granted, family situations or whatever else is some of the best care, obviously, and loving and nurturing. A parent is probably better than most child care things you can do. But at least people ought to know that there is someone who is saying your child is not going to be injured in that care. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. COATS. We can all quote studies. I could also pull out the study that shows that children are at a much higher risk of infection and illness and even accidents in child care centers than they are in the arms of a next-door neighbor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for time just to make one quick point to my colleague here.

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

Mr. DODD. Just a quick point. I want to point out this amendment of ours is phased in over 5 years, so there will be plenty of notice and time here for providers to try to get themselves ready to meet quality standards. We do not rush this in; we allow time for providers and families to learn about and to prepare for higher quality care.

My second point is that accredited or certified settings cost a bit more. If parents want to place their children in those situations, given the fact it costs more, our providing a tax incentive with a bit more of a break makes sense. I thank my colleague for allowing me to make those points to my colleague.

Mr. JEFFORDS. If I may follow on that just very briefly, again, studies say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute so the Senator can finish his point and I can.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. I would like to point out that one-quarter of all parents contacted in a nationwide survey said they would like to change their present child care arrangements, but they cannot find or afford better quality care. This is big reason for this amendment.

We are trying to help people with limited resources by shifting the money where it will do best, provide access to best child care.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, just in response, I would say I think it sends a signal. It sends a signal if you have a State stamp of approval or certified group stamp of approval that your child is going to get better quality care there than if you do not have that. Yet, we know parents' preferences are, for a majority of parents, to place their children in situations where they don't have any State or certifying agency stamp of approval, but they are going to be looked at potentially as secondary care when it is not secondary care. It is in many cases superior care. Because they trust a relative, they trust a neighbor, they trust a family home care, even though it doesn't necessarily qualify for the certification standards. That is my concern with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, before he starts, I wonder if I might just make a point. As I understand it, each Senator has 8 minutes, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. CHAFEE. The hour is late. I hope everybody will stick by their assigned 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

TAXING SEVERANCE PAY

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, throughout the course of this day, Members of the Senate have offered amendments which on occasion were of considerable benefit to people of great wealth, to encourage them to make investments for the benefit of our economy. As we have just witnessed, on occasion during the day, Members of the Senate have offered amendments for people of modest incomes, to encourage their savings, help them with the high cost of living and raising children. Indeed, many segments of society will find in this tax legislation various forms of benefits—to help with retirement and health and the rearing of children.

Tomorrow, I will offer an amendment to the bill, not designed for those of high income and not specifically for those of moderate income. More particularly, it is designed for those of no income.

The leading cause of unemployment in America for the last decade remains large-scale corporate downsizing. Even in a healthy economy, because of the introductions of new technologies, requirements of new skills, changes in trading patterns, acquisitions, mergers, people who are competitive, people who get up every day and work hard and are devoted to their communities, their families and their professions, their jobs, through no fault of their own, can find themselves in a situation without employment.

Indeed, in the last decade 20 million Americans have been excused from their employment because of a large-scale corporate downsizing. But, in a considerable and rising tide of corporate responsibility, many of these companies have adopted the modern practice of giving severance pay to their employees. It is a chance, by the corporation, to give to the employee modest amounts of money upon their departure to reorganize their lives, seek new skills, move to a new location, start a business or go into retirement.

Indeed, in a recent experience in my own State of New Jersey, one of the largest corporations in America, AT&T, only a year ago laid off 40,000 employees in a single announcement. A third of those employees decided to start their own businesses. A third went into retirement. Indeed, only a minority ever found employment in the short term under similar circumstances, and they were all offered severance pay.

The problem, and it is the subject of my amendment tomorrow, is that while corporate America is offering this severance pay for people to continue and reorganize their lives in this competitive economic environment, the Government responds by taxing the severance pay up to a third, as if it were income. Imagine the circumstances. You have worked in a company all of your life and because of a merger or acquisition, a skill you may no longer possess, a change in the economy, even in good times you are excused from your employment, given \$5,000 or \$10,000, which you think goes best to continuing your education or opening a small business. Yet, when it is time to pay your Federal taxes, the Government takes a third of it from you, money that can make the difference in whether or not you can reorganize your life, move to a different place in the country to seek new employment, pay a tuition, or start your business.

The amendment I offer tomorrow is as simple as it is important. The first \$3,000 of any severance package offered to any employee in America whose severance package is less than \$150,000, if that person does not get reemployment in 6 months, up to 95 percent of their previous compensation, that \$3,000 is tax-free. The person should use it for what is best for themselves, their own families and their own future.

I know at a time when our economy is growing, unemployment is low, a time of relative economic prosperity, few people are thinking about those who are without employment. In which State in this country, in what community have we not witnessed, through these extraordinary economic changes that indeed are the signature of our time, the dislocations of the marketplace? The times when many Americans would gain employment at the age of 18 or 22 or 25 or 30 and remain with a corporation most of their lives, those

times have passed. The times when you gain skills in high school or college, and sought and obtained and retained employment all of your life with those skills, those times have passed. Even in good economic times, the length of employment with a single employer is shrinking. The consistency of employment with any employer is being reduced.

What I offer is a response, a chance to make this tax bill relevant to those 20 million Americans who may in the next decade find themselves in similar circumstances. There is not a Member of this Senate who faces this amendment tomorrow who does not have a chance to address the people of their own State in a critical way, not just the 40,000 people of AT&T in my native State of New Jersey, but the 2,000 employees of IBM in New York State who are suing at this moment, trying to establish by law that their severance package is not income.

In the State of Alaska, 1,200 people in the fourth quarter of 1996 were laid off; 88,000 people in the State of California; 22,000 people in the State of Illinois; 5,700 people in the State of Minnesota; 2,800 people in the State of Montana; 27,000 in Pennsylvania; 11,000 in West Virginia. In every State, in thousands of communities across this Nation, these dislocations have become a part of American life.

I am very proud that tomorrow this Senate will adopt a tax bill, one that I am proud to vote for, that addresses so many different economic concerns of this country. It has a reduction in capital gains taxes for middle- and high-income people that is needed to encourage investment. I am for it. I am going to vote for it. It has a change in the inheritance tax to allow families to retain family businesses in higher incomes, upper-middle-class families; IRA's to encourage families to save for education for their children's welfare. Each and every one a legitimate response to a real problem.

Mr. President, this is a problem, too. What is it we say to these people who want only to keep the money given them to reorganize their lives but are forced to share it with the Federal Government?

Tomorrow I will offer this amendment and ask for the support of my colleagues. Thank you for the time, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

Mr. FRIST addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

BALANCED BUDGET ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise to discuss an important balanced budget enforcement amendment that I will offer on behalf of myself, Senators CONRAD, ABRAHAM, and SESSIONS, tomorrow morning.

This amendment evolves from a very simple principle, and that is, once we get a balanced budget, that it stays balanced well into the future.

This amendment, based on existing enforcement mechanisms, has two key provisions:

First, it establishes a 60-vote point of order in the Senate against any bill that provides or would cause a deficit in the year 2002 or in any year thereafter.

Second, it requires that the President submit a balanced budget in the year 2002 and every year thereafter. To retain appropriate flexibility, this amendment suspends this point of order in times of war or in times of recession. This exact same exception is provided for in the existing enforcement mechanisms under the current law.

This amendment is also—I should add, because I think this is important as we bring forth amendments tomorrow—consistent with the bipartisan budget agreement.

The text of the bipartisan budget agreement specifically states that “agreed upon budget levels are shown on the tables included in this agreement.” Under the long-range summary table in the agreement, the agreement shows a budget surplus of \$1 billion in the year 2002 and \$34 billion in the year 2007. This means that we are projecting a balanced budget in 5 years and in 10 years. My amendment will strengthen our ability to abide by this agreement and keep spending under control in the future.

In the bipartisan budget agreement, the Congress, the President, Republicans and Democrats, joined together to balance the budget in the year 2002. But I believe that everyone would agree that we don't just want to balance the budget in just that 1 year, 2002, but we want to maintain balance every year thereafter. That includes the years 2003, 2005, 2010, 2020.

We must keep focusing on our long-term budget picture for one very important reason: to prepare for the baby boomers' retirement which is just over a decade away. We know that the budget agreement does not go far enough in addressing this long-term challenge.

In fairness, the authors of the agreement never claimed that it does. But as we approach this new demographic era that all of us know is sitting out there just about a decade away, we must be acutely aware of the situation. In fact, we know that right now, 200,000 Americans will turn 65 this year. But in 15 years, in 14 years, in fact, by the year 2011, 1.5 million Americans will turn 65 just that year and that trend will continue over the next two decades.

Simultaneously, as the elderly population is increasing, the number of younger workers who are working to support that elderly population is decreasing. In fact, today, there are 4.9 workers supporting every single retiree's benefits, that is today, that includes Social Security and Medicare. But in the year 2030, there will only be 2.8 workers supporting the benefits of a single retiree.

This dramatic demographic shift will bring significant economic, political,

social and cultural changes that will transform our society. If we continued on our current spending course, entitlements—that is our automatic spending programs—coupled with interest on the debt would consume all revenues in just 15 years, leaving not a single dollar left over for roads, for infrastructure, for medical science, for the national parks, for medical research and for defense of the country. I believe our balanced budget agreement will help ease this demographic pressure, but much more work lies ahead. We must begin sooner, rather than later, to deal with these problems fairly and effectively. This amendment addresses that problem.

It will keep pressure on Congress and the President to confront these inevitable challenges, this inevitable demographic shift. To those not familiar with the Federal budget process, this amendment will create a procedural hurdle, called a point of order, to prevent the Senate from considering bills that will increase the deficit. If a Senator raises this point of order, it will take a three-fifths vote of the Senate, that is 60 votes, to waive the point of order and pass the legislation, rather than the normal 51-vote majority.

After we have all worked so hard and so long to rein in spending, we should not allow the deficit to balloon out of control once again after that year, 2002. It is imperative that we preserve this achievement and restrict Congress' ability to overspend taxpayer dollars. We will offer this amendment tomorrow morning and, at that time, I will urge all of my colleagues to support this important amendment which addresses the inevitable demographic changes. I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of Senator FRIST's budget process amendment.

The Frist amendment seeks to establish a more stringent enforcement mechanism for the bipartisan budget agreement. I think it's important for Congress and the President to continue working after enactment of this year's two reconciliation bills to ensure that at least the unified budget is balanced in 2002 and years thereafter. The amendment would also require the President to submit budgets each year which do not cause a unified deficit in fiscal year 2002 or any year thereafter.

Specifically, the Frist amendment would establish a 60-vote point of order against any resolution or bill—including the budget resolution—that provides or would cause a deficit in fiscal year 2002 or any year thereafter. I think such a point of order will help Congress and the President remain vigilant about the deficit, particularly in years after 2002.

Frankly, I would have supported much more ambitious deficit reduction efforts this year. I would like to see the federal budget moving towards true balance—that is without counting the Social Security surpluses. I believe that is the real way to balance the