

Cal. May he have as many years on the field as our "iron man," Senator STROM THURMOND, has had in the Senate. He could run that record way up there.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I mention as an aside and not part of the statement that my colleague from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, is calling me every 5 minutes, 10 minutes. We are going to try to arrange so that the people who want to be at that game can catch the 5:30 train.

There are Members of the Senate and others who want to attend that game, so we are trying to work out some agreement for the Democratic leader where either we could have debate on welfare reform for those who would be watching it on television, or maybe take up a nomination that has been pending for some time and some of my colleagues on the other side would like to take up. I thank the managers.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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.

RECESS

Mr. DOLE. Under a previous order, we had agreed to stand in recess between the hours of 1 o'clock and 2 o'clock so that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle might have an opportunity to discuss welfare reform. I am advised there are no speakers and no speakers asking for recognition between now and 1 o'clock. Rather than sit in a quorum call, I suggest we now recess until 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:00 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:27 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GRAMS).

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, it is with enthusiasm I rise to support the Democratic alternative on welfare reform. I support it with enthusiasm because it is firm on work, provides a safety net for children, brings men back into the picture in terms of child support and child rearing, and at the same time provides State flexibility and administrative simplification.

Mr. President, I am the Senate's only professionally trained social worker.

Before elected to public office, my life's work was moving people from welfare to work, one step at a time, each step leading to the next step, practicing the principles of tough love.

This is the eighth version of welfare reform that I have been through as a foster care worker, as a child abuse and neglect worker, a city councilwoman, Congresswoman, and now U.S. Senator. Each of those previous efforts in times have failed both under Democratic Presidents and under Republican Presidents. It failed for two reasons. One, each reform effort was based on old economic realities, and, second, reform did not provide tools for the people to move from welfare to work, to help them get off welfare and stay off welfare.

I believe that welfare should be not a way of life but a way to a better life. Everyone agrees that today's welfare system is a mess. The people who are on welfare say it is a mess. The people who pay for welfare say it is a mess. It is time we fix the system.

Middle-class Americans want the poor to work as hard at getting off welfare as they themselves do at staying middle class. The American people want real reform that promotes work, two-parent families, and personal responsibility.

That is what the Democratic alternative is all about. We give help to those who practice self-help. Democrats have been the party of sweat equity and have a real plan for work. Republicans have a plan that only talks about work and can not really achieve it.

Democrats have produced a welfare plan that is about real work, and we call it Work First because it does put work first. But it does not make children second class. Under our plan, from the day someone comes into a welfare office, they must focus on getting a job and keeping a job and being able to raise their family.

How do we do this? Well, first, we abolish AFDC. We create a temporary employment assistance program. We change the culture of welfare offices from eligibility workers to being empowerment workers. Instead of only fussy budgeting over eligibility rules, social workers now become empowerment workers to sit down with welfare applicants to do a job readiness assessment on what it takes to move them to a job, stay on a job, and ensure that their children's education and health needs are being met.

Everyone must sign a parent empowerment contract within 2 weeks of entering the welfare system. It is an individualized plan to get a job. The failure of individuals to sign that contract means they cannot get benefits. Everyone must undertake an immediate and intensive job search once they have signed that contract. We believe the best job training is on the job. Your first job leads you to the next job. Each time you climb a little bit further

out of poverty and at the same time we reward that effort.

Yes, this is a tough plan with tough requirements. It expects responsibility from welfare recipients. Everyone must do something for benefits. If you do not sign the contract, you lose the benefits. If you refuse to accept a job that is offered, you lose the benefits. If, after 2 years of assistance, you do not have a job in the private sector, then one must be provided for you in the public sector.

No adult can get benefits for more than 5 years in their adult lifetime, but if you are a minor, you are able to stay in school and receive benefits.

So, yes, we Democrats are very tough on work. Everyone must work. Assistance is time limited and everyone must do something for benefits. If you do not abide by the contract, then you lose your benefits.

What else do we do? We provide a safety net for children. We not only want you to be job ready and work force ready, we want you to be a responsible parent. We want you to be able to ensure that as part of getting your benefits, your children are in school and that they are receiving health care.

Once you do go to work, we will not abandon you. We want to make sure that a dollar's worth of work is worth a dollar's worth of welfare, and while you are working at a minimum wage, trying to better yourself, we will provide a safety net for child care for your children, nutritional benefits will continue, and so will health care. We want to be sure that while you are trying to help yourself, we are helping your children grow into responsible adults.

I do not mind telling people that they must work because I do not mind telling them that they will not only have the tools to go to work, but that there will be a safety net for children.

This is what the Republican bill does not do. It does not look at the day-to-day lives of real people and ask what is needed to get that person into a job.

People we are telling to go to work are not going to be in high-paid, high-technology jobs. We know that that mother who wants to sign a contract that requires her to work will be on the edge when it comes to paying the bills.

She does not have a mother or an aunt or a next door neighbor to watch her kids. She needs help with child care to move into the work force.

The Republican bill does not provide enough money to pay for real child care. Suppose that mother lives in suburban Maryland or Baltimore city or the rural parts of my State? She does the right thing; she gets about an entry-level, minimum-wage job.

She is going to make about \$9,000 a year, but will have no benefits. She might take home, after Social Security taxes, \$175 a week. But if her child care costs her \$125 a week, that leaves her \$50 a week for rent, food, and clothing.

So that means, under the Republican welfare bill, it is like jumping off of a

cliff into the abyss of further and further poverty. Our bill wants to help people move to a better life. The Republican bill will push them into poverty through its harsh, punitive approach.

How do we expect this woman to support a family on \$50 a week? There would be no incentive to do that. Welfare reform is about ending the cycle of poverty and the culture of poverty. Ending the cycle of poverty is an economic challenge. It means helping create jobs in this country and then making sure that our country is work force ready and that welfare recipients are job ready.

But it also must end the culture of poverty, and that is about personal responsibility, that is about bringing men back into the picture, that is about tough child support, saying that if you have a child, you should support that child and rear that child.

We believe that the way families will move out of poverty is the way families move to the middle class, by bringing men back into the picture, having two-parent households, by ensuring that there are no penalties to marriage, to families, or to going to work.

So, Mr. President, that is what the Democratic alternative is. That is why I support it with the enthusiasm that I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am very concerned about the direction in which the welfare debate is now headed. I come to the floor at this point in time, not to discuss any specific aspect of welfare reform or my views on it. I come, not to cast aspersions on the Republican approach nor to praise the Democratic approach. But I wanted to express my concern that the welfare debate is headed in absolutely the wrong direction, the direction of partisan bickering.

As far as I know, there has been no real effort by the other side, or by this side, to try to work out a compromise solution. We have had our task force. The Democrats have been talking about their approach. I understand the Republicans have had their groups talking about their approach. We now have a bill on the floor. We have a Democratic substitute. Then there is the Republican proposal.

I must tell you, I think this is absolutely the wrong way to go. I think welfare reform is much too important to the American people and to the taxpayers to be caught up in some kind of partisan warfare.

We are tougher than you.

No, we are tougher than you.

We care about kids more than you.

No, we care about kids more than you.

We are going to give the States more flexibility.

No, we are going to give the States more flexibility.

It pains me to see this happen because I believe there is enough similarity between the Republican bill and the

Democratic bill to work out a compromise, but not if it is done in the heat of partisan bickering, which I believe is starting to take place right now on the welfare bill.

Several years ago my State of Iowa decided to do something about the welfare problem in our State. We set up task forces, set up pilot projects around the State to try to find out what would work and what would not work. This went on for several years. As a result of these experiments, the State legislature in Iowa a few years ago pulled together a welfare reform bill and passed it through the Iowa legislature.

That bill was passed with the support of conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats. As I have often said, it was supported by Pat Robertson conservative Republicans and Jesse Jackson liberal Democrats. Only one person voted against it, because it was put together in a bipartisan fashion. Folks from both sides of the aisle worked together to fashion a legitimate welfare reform bill.

It passed and was signed into law by Governor Branstad. We have now had about 2 years of experience with it and it is working. We now have the distinction in Iowa that we have a higher percentage of people on welfare who work than any State in the Nation—Iowa. We doubled the number of people on welfare who work. Doubled—went up by almost 100 percent. Our caseload is down. And the expenditures per case are also down by about 10 percent.

So the number of people on welfare is down. The cost per case is down. The number of people working is up.

Last of all, of the States that have gone out and tried to do welfare reform, Iowa, according to a New York Times article that I read, Iowa is the only State that has actually cut people off of welfare. It is the only State that said, "Here is a contract. We signed the contract. If you, welfare recipient, do not live up to your part of the contract, it ends." Iowa has done that.

I do not believe Wisconsin or any other State has been touted as having done such a thing. So it is working in Iowa.

I say that because it was not done in a partisan fashion. It was done in a bipartisan fashion. I believe for welfare reform to work nationally, it must also be done in a bipartisan fashion. That is why it pains me to see what is happening on the floor of the Senate today.

I was looking in the Congress Daily of Wednesday, August 9. It quoted the majority leader, Senator DOLE. It said that Senator DOLE said that President Clinton and he were talking privately a couple of weeks ago about working out a bipartisan solution on welfare reform. DOLE said, "He pulled me aside and asked me if there was a chance and acknowledged that there are some similarities between the Democratic and GOP bills."

I took that at face value. So on that same day, August 9, I wrote a letter to

the majority leader and to the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE. I am going to read for the RECORD what I said in that letter.

I said:

DEAR MR. MAJORITY LEADER: I am writing you regarding our extremely important efforts to reform the welfare system. We clearly have agreement that the current welfare system is failing those on it and taxpayers who have to support it and it needs fundamental reform. You have put forward a comprehensive reform plan, the Democratic leader has done the same, Senator Bond and I have introduced a plan as has Senator Gramm and other of our colleagues. And while there are significant differences between our plans, I feel strongly that there is enough common ground that there is no good reason why we can't fashion a bipartisan approach that would garner overwhelming support in the Senate and among the American people.

In Iowa, we did just that. Democrats and Republicans worked together, ironed out their differences and came up with a bipartisan plan. It passed with just one dissenting vote in the legislature and was signed into law by Governor Branstad. And it is working. The number of welfare recipients working and on their way off welfare is up 93 percent. And welfare awards and total payments are down.

I feel strongly that we should not let welfare reform fall victim to politics. As I'm sure you agree, the American people don't care what political party reforms welfare; they just want it done. They want to be assured that their tax dollars are being spent responsibly. I'm concerned that if we don't begin now working together to iron out our differences that when we come back in September we may be no closer to agreement than we are now and the chance for bipartisan agreement lost. Therefore, I ask that before we leave for recess you and the Democratic Leader appoint a bipartisan task force to begin work on forging a welfare reform bill that has strong support across party lines. I believe this would be constructive and could well lead to a package of tough, effective reforms emphasizing work of which we can all be proud.

Thank you for your attention to my request. I look forward to your reply. I am sending a similar letter to the Democratic Leader.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I did not hear back from either the majority leader or minority leader. I do not say that in any way derogatorily. I know we have been gone. People have been busy. That is not my point. My point is that I still urge the majority leader and the minority leader to step back just one step. I request that the majority leader appoint six people and that the minority leader appoint six people and that they take the remainder of this week and this weekend to see if we can work out a bipartisan approach, to see if they can agree on something and bring it back to us the first of next week.

I believe this would be the best approach to take. I think we could step back from this partisan bickering that we are going to encounter here in the next few days. It is going to come. I think we already hear the opening strains of it—this bill is better than yours, this and that. The American people are sick and tired of that kind of partisan bickering, especially when

it concerns welfare. I believe there are enough similarities that we can work out a bipartisan agreement. It will not be all of what we want. It will not be all of what you want. But I believe it can garner enough support to be a truly bipartisan effort.

On August 7, I read again for the RECORD, Senator BREAUX from Louisiana had the following statement. He said:

"I think we ought to work together.

So we have a decision to make as to whether we are going to cooperate and work on this together—

Meaning welfare reform.

or make political points and get nothing done. That is an option. But if that option is exercised, I suggest the real losers are the American people and the American taxpayer. We will make short-term political points for short-term political gain. But in the long run, the real losers will be the taxpayers and those who are on welfare who will not have had an opportunity to have a program passed in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. President, as I said, the State of Iowa, of which I am proud to represent, did it in a bipartisan fashion. It showed that it could be done and showed that it can work.

Why is it that we cannot do it here? Why can't the majority leader and the minority leader appoint five or six people each? We have business on our calendar that we can spend the rest of the week on. We have appropriations bills and other things that we can consider in the meantime.

I repeat: There has been no serious effort in the Senate to reach some kind of bipartisan cooperation on welfare reform. I am not blaming that side. I am not blaming our side. I am just saying that it is a fact. Neither side has tried to reach across the aisle to form a bipartisan consensus. But I think that is what we ought to do.

I suppose maybe it is too late now. I do not know. All I can say is, I take this time to express my concern about the direction this debate is headed.

I wish an amendment were possible or something. I guess the tree is full. No amendments are possible. I wish there was some way we could express ourselves with a Sense-of-the-Senate resolution to get a bipartisan group together to work on this.

I think it is too bad. I think the losers are going to be the American taxpayers and the losers are going to be people on welfare because it is going to be caught up in partisan bickering. Partisan shots being taken here on something I consider to be equally as important as the health care debate or anything else we debated around here.

I guess maybe I would not feel so strongly about it had I not seen what had been done in the State of Iowa 3 years ago when both sides reached across the aisle and worked out a bipartisan welfare reform program. And the fruits have shown that it is working.

I do not think any welfare reform bill can work unless it has that same kind of bipartisan support. So again I call

upon the majority leader and I call upon the minority leader to step back one step, appoint six people from each side, and let us take the rest of the week to see whether or not we can reach some kind of bipartisan agreement and bring it back on the floor next week. If we could do that, we would save ourselves a lot of time and we would save a lot of partisan bickering, and I think the American people could at last be justly proud of something that the Senate is going to do this year.

Mr. President, I want to take some time here for a second, because I want to demonstrate what happened in the State of Iowa with welfare reform. As soon as I get my easel set up here, I want to show it for the record here. I apologize to the President for taking the time, but I want to show graphically basically what had been done in the State of Iowa here.

First of all, in the State of Iowa, these lines show what has basically happened with our cash welfare grants. The yellow line is 1994; the green line is 1993; the blue line is 1992. We can see that the cash welfare grants have basically stayed about stable over these years.

Look at what is happening now under the new programs since Iowa passed this. It is going down, constantly going down. The total expenditures have gone down considerably since we passed our welfare reform bill. This is one measure of how it is succeeding.

Now, again, I mentioned we now have the distinction in Iowa of having a higher percentage of people on welfare who work than any State in the Nation. Prior to the welfare reform bill passing, we had about 18 percent of the people on welfare working. We now have about 35 percent. I mentioned it is about a 100 percent improvement on that, people on welfare working. They get the jobs skills they need to get off welfare. So in terms of workfare, it is working. Here is the caseload.

I think this chart is interesting, Mr. President, because it shows what everyone in Iowa understood. Both Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, understood that in changing the system, there was going to be an increase in the caseload immediately. Everyone knew that, and they accepted that. Because, for example, prior to this point in time, if you had an automobile worth more than \$1,500, you were not eligible for welfare. We took a lesson from the State of Utah. Utah had gotten a waiver to allow persons to have a car valued to \$8,000 and still be on welfare. We raised ours to \$3,000. So there are a lot of people that maybe had a car worth \$2,000 or \$2,500 or \$3,000 before that were not eligible. Now they are eligible.

So this is why this caseload went up. We knew that was going to happen in the beginning. But we were confident enough in our bipartisan approach that we knew once that happened initially, it would come down drastically. And

that is exactly what has happened. Our total caseload over the last 2 years has gone from around 36,000 down to around 34,000. So the number of people, the total number of people on welfare has dropped after that first initial increase.

I mentioned the average grants were down. The average grant per family has gone now from \$373 down to \$336. That is over a 10-percent decrease, I guess, in the average grant per recipient.

So the caseloads have gone down, and the average per family has gone down, and the number of people on welfare has declined. I think this is really the most important one of all: The number of people on welfare who are working has almost doubled.

So, again, that is what happened in Iowa. But I think it only happened because people on both sides of the aisle got together and did it in a bipartisan fashion. And that is what I hope we will do here. I do not think it is too much to ask that—today is what, Wednesday—Thursday, Friday, over the weekend, next Monday, a bipartisan group from both sides of the aisle get together, appointed by the respective leaders, and report back a bipartisan approach to this.

If not, then I am afraid the remainder of this week and probably the first of next week, we are going to be involved in some very serious partisan bickering—who is going to be toughest, who is going to be the best for kids, and who is going to be the most lenient on States, on giving States flexibility. There will be a lot of hot rhetoric and a lot of partisanship. And in the end, the American taxpayers and the people on welfare are going to lose.

So I just make one final plea to the majority leader and to the minority leader to appoint six people each, work it out in a bipartisan fashion, and report it next week. And let us take it off the partisan table.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I think we all would like to have a bipartisan approach to welfare reform. I, for one, am a little discouraged.

I remember the President's rhetoric in the campaign when he talked about changing welfare as we know it. For 2½ years, as my colleagues will remember, we waited to see the President's welfare reform bill, to see how he was going to change welfare as we know it. And when we finally, after 2½ years of prodding, got to see the bill, it had three characteristics that came as a shock to most people.

First, it spent more money; second, it provided more benefits to more welfare recipients; and, third, it hired more Government bureaucrats. I do not believe that is what America has in mind when America is talking about reforming welfare.

Now, in my mind, there are really two issues in welfare reform. One issue, and the most important issue, had to

do with the people who are involved. I want to change the system because never in history have we taken so much money from people that are pulling the wagon and given so much to people riding in the wagon, and made both groups worse off simultaneously.

Since 1965, we have spent \$5.4 billion on our current welfare system, and since nobody knows what a trillion dollars is, let me try to convert it into English. If you took all the buildings, all the plants, all the equipment, and all the tools of all the workers in America, they would be worth slightly less than what we have spent on all means-tested welfare programs since 1965.

What has been the result of this massive expenditure of money? Well, the result has been that we have made mothers more dependent, we have driven fathers out of the household, and we have denied people access to the American dream. If we love these people, if we want them to be our equals, not just in theory but in fact, it seems to me that we have to reform the welfare system. And I am hopeful in the end we will have bipartisan votes in making that happen.

Here are the reforms that I think we need. I think we need a mandatory work requirement. I think able-bodied men and women on welfare ought to get out of the wagon and help the rest of us pull. If the best job somebody can get in the private sector pays \$4 an hour—there is dignity in working at \$4 an hour—we can supplement their income, but they will be contributing toward their own independence, toward their own well-being.

If somebody cannot get a job in the private sector, then they can pick up trash along our streets, they can help clean up our parks, they can wash windows on our public buildings. But, again, they will be participating in the communities they live in. They will be part of building a better country. And I believe that they will be richer, freer, and happier for it. I think able-bodied men and women ought to have to work the number of hours that their welfare check will bring at the minimum wage.

When we started this debate, which has largely been a debate among Republicans, unfortunately, we did not have a binding mandatory work requirement in the bill, we did not have a pay-for-performance provision in the bill. So from the point of view of the Federal Government and a mandatory work policy, we had a peculiar situation where we asked people to work; but if they did not work, we did not have a mechanism that took away their check.

I am proud to say that has been changed. We now have a very strong work requirement. I am very proud of that. I am very supportive of it.

The second thing we need to do is to stop inviting people to come to America to go on welfare. People ought to come to America with their sleeves rolled up ready to go to work, not with

their hand held out ready to go on welfare.

The original bill that came out of the Finance Committee continued to invite people to come to America to go on welfare and literally would have allowed someone to come to America today as a legal immigrant and go on welfare tomorrow.

I am proud to say that after a tremendous amount of work, that that is something that we have changed. Our bill now has people come to America to work, not to go on welfare, and I think it is a dramatic step forward.

We do have a dispute about how large the scope ought to be of block granting. Should we just give AFDC back to the States and a few training programs, which is what the current bill does, or should we give food stamps, housing subsidies, all training programs back to the States and let the States run them? That is something we are going to have to settle on the floor of the Senate. I think the more leeway we give to the States, the more flexibility we give to the States, the better we are going to do.

The remaining issue that prevents us from having a consensus among Republicans in the Senate—which is an indispensable ingredient, in my opinion, to building a bipartisan consensus and passing this—bill, is, what do we do about illegitimacy? I believe this is the biggest problem in the bill.

One-third of all the babies born in America last year were born out of wedlock. Under the current trend, illegitimacy could be the norm and not the exception in America by the turn of the century. I think anybody who is not frightened by this prospect fails to understand that no great civilization has ever risen in history that was not built on strong families. No civilization has ever survived the destruction of its families, and I do not believe America is going to be the first.

We have a system today that subsidizes illegitimacy. If someone is on welfare and they take a job, they lose their welfare. If they marry someone who has a job, they lose their welfare. But if they have another baby, they get more cash payments.

I am totally committed to the principle that we have to break the back of illegitimacy in America. We have to give people incentives under the welfare system to be more responsible. We have to stop giving people more and more money to have more and more children on welfare. I think this is an indispensable ingredient.

No one is saying that when children are here and they are needy that we are not going to help them. No one is saying we are not going to provide children with services and with goods. But what we are saying is, it is suicidal to go on giving larger and larger cash payments to people who simply have more children on welfare in return for more and more cash money. That is a system that has to be changed.

We also have to do something about the perverse incentives that exist

today where a 16-year-old can escape her mother, can get almost \$14,000 in pretax equivalent worth of income simply by having a baby. By having a baby, they can qualify for AFDC, food stamps, housing subsidies, gain independence of their mother and then gain additional cash payment by having more and more children.

This is a system that has to be changed, and, again, the objective is to change behavior. When babies are born, we want to help them. We want to give them services, we want to give them goods, but we are not going to continue to pay people cash money in return for having more and more children on welfare.

This is an area where there is a deep division in our party. I believe there is room for consensus. I am willing to work with other Republicans and with Democrats to find that consensus. But we are not going to end welfare dependency in America unless we want to deal with illegitimacy. This illegitimacy problem creates a permanent demand for welfare, and if we are going to deal with the problem, if we are going to end welfare dependency in America, we are going to have to do it by addressing illegitimacy. You cannot reform welfare, you cannot, in the President's words, "end welfare as we know it" unless you are going to deal with illegitimacy.

I am committed to the principle that we have to end welfare as we know it. I share the President's commitment. His program does not fulfill his commitment, something not unusual in Washington, DC, but I believe illegitimacy has to be addressed. A welfare bill that does not address illegitimacy is not worthy of its name.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to improve the welfare reform bill before us by voting for this very important amendment known as "Work First."

Before the August recess, it was a relief that the majority leader agreed to wait until September for us to debate welfare reform so we have some time. This is not a subject where we should pretend that legislating is like ordering fast-food. Welfare reform is about very serious issues—the budgets for the States we represent and how many billions of dollars will be spent or cut from those budgets; the rules qualifying families for assistance or denying them assistance; the safety net for children, and whether it will survive; and other difficult questions about taxpayers' dollars, people's lives, and yes, values. The Senate should take the time to produce legislation that justifies the word "reform" next to the word "welfare."

I hope that the recess provided time for each Senator to reflect on these

major questions that we have to answer when we act on welfare reform. I hope we will do that with our heads and our hearts. I hope we will think about the stakes involved in welfare reform, for the people we represent, for our States, and for children.

For a long time, I assumed welfare reform would be one of history's endeavors that both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate would produce together. After all, we presumably want changes in the welfare system to take root and bring about real, long-lasting results that most Americans expect from all of us.

And let me be clear, the Congress and President should deliver on welfare reform. It has been 7 years since we enacted any kind of significant change to the welfare system. We know it is time to attack the problems with welfare again, with much more emphasis on personal responsibility and on work. This is our chance, but with an obligation to deal with realities.

When I think of what West Virginians expect from welfare reform, the answers are in this amendment, the Work First plan. It does something Democrats sometimes have a hard time doing. We want to bury the past. Out with the confusing name for welfare assistance, AFDC. Out with welfare's invitation to some people to live on the dole forever, while their fellow citizens struggle to make ends meet by working and scrimping. Out with the excuses for not working when you can work.

Simply put, Work First ends welfare as we know it, and creates a new but temporary assistance program for parents with children. A fundamental change will be made from the first day: Work First requires parents to sign a tough contract—a Parental Empowerment Contract—in order to get benefits. This way, every parent will know from the beginning that the rules and expectations are completely different. Work First will require work from every able-bodied parent, but also offer job placement, training when necessary, and child care so that the work requirement can be met in the real world.

Work First is tough, but fair. We expect parents to work, but we also expect America to still be a place that protects its children—the majority of our population that gets help through welfare spending, and who are getting forgotten and ignored in the political halls and talk shows where welfare is debated. As any parent knows, children need decent shelter, clothing and food, and Work First includes the mechanism—through vouchers—to care for some of these needs. We should not be punishing innocent children because of their parent's irresponsibility or bad luck.

Work First also retains the partnership between the Federal Government and States. The country as a whole has a stake in the future of each and every child regardless of where a poor child is born—in the hollows of West Virginia

or the neighborhoods of Houston, Chicago, or Kansas City.

Also, simply converting welfare spending into 50 or more block grants for the States is not exactly real reform. I can completely understand why some Governors in office for the next few years are eager for the money. I was a Governor for 8 years, but I also remember what happened in my State when the block grants created by Congress in the early 1980's stopped keeping up with need, by design. That is when Governors have to find other programs to cut or raise local taxes or just watch people and small children show up on the grates.

Having been a Governor, I want to see a welfare reform bill pass that gives States a lot of flexibility. But I also think some basic principles should hold in every State. The entire country should take on the same challenge to promote work, responsibility, and protect children.

This alternative before the Senate, Work First, is tough where Americans say they want welfare to be tough. Actually, back in 1982, when I was Governor, I struck a tough, but fair deal with many of the adults getting welfare in West Virginia. With our high unemployment then, I said if you cannot get a paying job but still need a welfare check, fine, work for that check. The term is "workfare." West Virginia's experience is also a reminder that we do not have to demonize everyone on welfare. Many of the West Virginians in my State's workfare program said they liked the approach. They hated having to resort to welfare, and with something productive to do—from cleaning streets to jobs in government offices—they felt better about themselves. Again, let us be sure we remember that a lot of people are on welfare out of desperation. If they can get the basics—certain skills, some information, some child care—they are going to work.

I know it is tempting to just pretend that everything will get better if we just send a check, with no-strings attached, to Governors. It would be nice to pretend that Governors will just take care of it. It is not that easy.

I do not think we should talk down to Americans about what it takes to get real results from welfare reform. Poor mothers and fathers need child care just as much as the middle class. Think about it—we put parents in jail for leaving their children alone at home.

Some poor Americans simply have to get more education and job skills, too, so they qualify for jobs that earn a decent living for the rest of their lives. And when it is time to cut off the parents, it is not right to pretend children do not exist.

There are differences between the majority leader's bill before the Senate and this Work First amendment. Differences with real, human consequences. Differences in how honest we are willing to be about what it will

take to deliver on the promises and the political rhetoric of welfare reform.

Americans are not exactly crusading for block grants as the prescription for welfare. They are expecting more than just a different place to send the money. We are here to think about the kind of country we can be and should be. We are here to be honest about what it will take to move millions of poor Americans from welfare to independence. And I think we are here to regard every child in this country as important as the next one, no matter what State he or she happens to grow up in.

The Democratic plan, Work First, has some essential elements, including honesty about what it takes to achieve real change in the welfare system and how to keep children from being the ones punished. I hope it will get a serious look from everyone in this body over the next days or however long it takes us to finish this legislative debate on welfare. If there is a middle-ground, let us find it and work out our differences. And I urge every Governor to take a close look at these issues again—and think about the next 10 to 20 years in our States, not just the next couple of years. If welfare reform turns out to be Congress' slick, painless way to slash the Federal budget and leave States holding the bag, we are leaving some painful work for our successors and for the people in our States.

We still have a chance to pass a bill to be proud of and one that is honest about welfare, poverty, parental responsibility and other values, what it takes to work, and the children, who are two out of three people on welfare. That is what should determine our votes and action before reporting to Americans that we have passed a bill that actually reforms welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

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

Mr. BREAUX. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. CHAFEE. I will be glad to.

Mr. BREAUX. I ask the Presiding Officer, what is the order of the day at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no restrictions on debate.

Mr. BREAUX. No one is in charge of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no control of time.

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I will take this time in order to make some comments about where we are and what I hope the ultimate result will be.

I want to start off by saying there is no disagreement that the welfare situation in this country is a mess. There is no argument from any Democrat that I know who would stand up on the floor of the Senate and say welfare programs are just fine and we should not do anything to change any of them.

I think most Americans, whether they be independents, Democrats or

Republicans, would agree with the statement that welfare does not work very well for those who are on it, nor does it work very well for those who are paying for it. It is a program that really cries out for major reform. I think that is what this body is charged with doing, coming up with a reform package that we can send to this President that he will sign, so when this Congress draws to a closure, we can say one thing that we did that will benefit future generations and the very stability of this country is that this Congress, when we had a chance, was able to come together in a bipartisan fashion to reform the current welfare system, which we all agree does not work.

It does not work, as I said, for the people who are on it nor for the people who are paying for it. Therefore, there is no disagreement on the fact that we have a major problem facing us and that we should do something about it.

Then, of course, the question that divides us is how do we go about reforming the system? Some have said we in Washington, working with the States in the past, have not solved the problem so we are going to give it all to the States. We are just going to walk away from the problem. Let us think of a phrase we are going to call it. How about block grants? That sounds pretty good. People like that term. Let us say welfare reform is going to be a block grant. I think most Americans would say, "What do you mean?" They will say, "The Federal Government has not solved the problems, so we are going to let the States do it." I guess most people would say that makes sense. The Federal Government has not solved it so let the States do it.

Let me talk for a moment about that. This is a problem that cannot be solved by the Federal Government here in Washington by ourselves, nor can it be solved by the State governments, nor the county governments nor the city governments, nor in my State of Louisiana by the parish governments by themselves. This is a problem that cries out for all branches of government, Federal, State and local, working together, to come up with a real solution.

Block grants are like taking all the problems that we have with the welfare program and putting them in a box, then wrapping it all up, tying a bow around it, and then mailing that box of problems to the States, saying: Here, it is yours. It is a block grant.

It is a block grant of problems with less money to help solve those problems. That, I think, is not a solution. It is an additional problem. The real solution is to say that each State, of course, is different. I have heard my Republican colleagues say that. I totally agree with that. States should have the authority to be innovative. What works in my State of Louisiana may not work well in the State of California. What works well in New York may not work well in Florida or Louisiana or any other State. So, clearly,

each State has an absolute right and a need to be able to be inventive and to be able to come up with solutions to the problems that are unique and will work in that State that may not work in some other State.

But that does not mean the Federal Government walks away from any responsibility to participate in solving the problem. What some would suggest is that a block grant means we in Washington are going to have to raise the money and pass the taxes and then ship the money to the States and say, "Do what you want with it, it is a block grant; no restrictions, almost no guidelines, and spend it as you want." That is an abdication of our responsibility as legislators who are looking after the interests of the American taxpayer.

I admit we in Washington have certainly not solved the problem by ourselves very well. I admit the States have not solved the problem by themselves. Therefore, I would argue that any solution has to be a joint venture, if you will, a partnership, if you will, between the States coming up with their best ideas about what fits and the Federal Government coming up with our ideas and the financial help in order to solve those problems. It has to be a partnership. It cannot be a walking away and shipping the problem to the States. That is the first point I want to make.

The second point is that the States have to participate. We use this phrase, "State maintenance of effort." There are some, particularly my Republican colleagues, who advocate we are going to let the States pretty well do what they want with this block grant but then we are not going to require them to put up any money.

States have always, in the true partnership, had to participate in solving the problem. That means raising local money through their tax system, putting up a portion of the money going into the welfare program so it can be used to help solve the problem, matching it with Federal funds. The Republican proposal, as I understand it, says no, we are not going to do that. The State does not have to put up anything if they do not want to. They can just walk away from the problem financially and say, "We are going to take all the money from the Federal Government. We are going to do what we want with it. And, by the way, the money we used to spend on welfare, maybe we will pave the roads this year, or maybe we will give all the State employees a raise this year. Maybe we will build some bridges this year. But we are not going to use it for the people who are in poverty in our own State."

That is not a partnership. That is an abdication of the responsibility that I think that we have, as Federal legislators and State legislators, to work together to solve the problem.

There should be a clear maintenance of effort by the States. We in Washing-

ton cannot say you have no obligation to do anything. That is a defect that I think is very clear in their proposal which needs to be worked on. We will offer amendments to say the States have to be able to participate in helping us solve the problem. We cannot be responsible for raising all the money and the States have no requirement to do so and expect that to solve the welfare problem in this case.

In addition, one of the other concerns I have is that the legislation the Republicans are proposing takes middle-income job training programs and makes them into welfare programs. Why, I ask, is it appropriate for programs that work to help dislocated workers, to help in vocational-technical training schools that train people, students in this country, programs that are used for dislocated workers who everyday are finding their job is taken away from them through downsizing, and we have programs to help retrain and relocate those people—why are we taking those type of programs, which are basically programs that have done a wonderful job to help middle-income families in this country, and make them into welfare programs? I think that is a serious, serious mistake.

Do we need to reform those programs? Do we need to consolidate them? Absolutely. But we do not need to turn job training programs into welfare programs. It does not fit. It cannot be forced to fit. You cannot put a round peg in a square hole no matter how hard you push, without doing grave damage to the block that you are trying to push it into. And the same thing, I think, happens here.

Their proposal tells middle-income families that have had to get retraining because of dislocation and being laid off that all of a sudden those programs that were meant for you are going to be used by welfare recipients and you are going to be left out. What about the middle-income families that those programs were designed for when they find out these programs all of a sudden are going to be turned into welfare programs? I think it is bad policy. It needs to be corrected. It is not a solution to the problem. In fact, it aggravates the problem, and it needs to be addressed.

Child care is another concern I have that I think we have to address very seriously. How do you tell a teenage mother with two children, we are going to make you go to work but, by the way, there is no money for child care? There is not a Governor that we have talked to, Republican, Democrat, independent, or maybe not certain what they are, that has not said that this is a very serious problem. It is a serious defect in the Republican proposal, to require the States to put three times more people to work but to give them less financial assistance in order to make it happen, to give them less money or in fact no additional money whatsoever to pay for child care.

What is going to happen to the children? Who is going to take care of a 2-year-old or a 1-year old if we put the mother into a job, which I think is absolutely essential? The best social program we can pass is a good job. But with that requirement that someone goes to work, there is going to be an obligation somewhere that somebody does something with the children. Are they going to be left home alone, unsupervised, getting into trouble, or causing more problems from the standpoint of health than they were before?

So they have a very serious defect in the sense that the child care provisions are very deficient. It is one thing to say we are going to put three times more people to work. But you cannot do that unless you address what is going to happen to the child care provisions. That needs to be addressed. It needs to be worked on. It cannot in fact be a real reform bill unless child care is addressed.

Another issue is the so-called family cap. I have heard some Members give speeches that it is time for people who have been riding in the wagon to get out of the wagon and start helping pull the wagon. That is a nice little phrase, and it sounds pretty good. But when you are talking about throwing babies and children out of the wagon into the street, that is not what America is all about. That is not what this country stands for. Sure, make the people who can afford to pull the wagon, who are strong enough to pull the wagon, go to work. There is no problem with that. But do not throw babies and children out of the wagon into the street and say that is welfare reform. That is not.

Children and babies do not ask to be born. They did not ask to come into this world. There is a parent somewhere—in fact, two—that had something to do with bringing that child into this world. Punish them. Require them to go to work. Require them to take training. Require them to be responsible. Force them to live in adult supervision. Force them to live with their parent or parents if there are some. But do not penalize the innocent child who did not ask to be born. What kind of a country are we that we are going to say if you are a teenage mother and you have another child, you are not going to get any help for the child? Why penalize the child? That is creating more problems, not solving any problem.

So I suggest that this is a major defect with the Republican proposal that has to be addressed. I cannot imagine any Member of this institution saying they are going to reform welfare by telling a newborn baby that it is not going to get any help because its mother made a mistake and it has been born into this world, and they cannot afford to take care of it. So it is out of luck. Go into an orphanage, or be put up for adoption. I think we have to be wiser than that in seeking solutions to what welfare reform ultimately has to be all about.

So that does not solve the problem. That is a defect in their proposal to say that we are going to solve the illegitimacy problem in this country by terminating any assistance to people with babies who are born into this world. That does not stop illegitimacy. That does not help solve the problem. It creates more problems, not less. It absolutely has to be addressed.

While I said what I think is wrong with the pending Republican proposal, I do think that there is a recognition in a bipartisan fashion that we have to do something. Our plan is called Work First. It abolishes AFDC. It starts off by saying there is no more AFDC. Every time a person comes into a welfare office, they have to sign an employment contract in order to receive any benefits. That contract is going to require them to do certain things. It is going to start moving them into the work force.

We put time limits on how long someone can be on welfare assistance in this country, but we protect the child. We protect the children. We protect the babies who are born into this world. Require the mother to live at home, or require the mother to live in an adult-supervised home if there are no parents. Require them to move into the work force. Put on time limits. Yes, do all of those things. But, yes, also provide child care as we require people to move into the workplace, as we do that.

So it is one thing to sound tough and to talk tough. But as we all know, talk is cheap. It does not solve the problem. This problem is not going to be solved on the cheap. It is going to be solved only with thoughtful ideas and tax dollars being spent more wisely than we have spent them in the past in a recognition that we do need to make some dramatic changes.

I want to say something else, too. I will conclude with this: As I said in the beginning, this is a problem that the Federal Government cannot solve by itself and the States cannot solve by themselves. This is a problem that Democrats cannot solve by ourselves and Republicans cannot solve by themselves because we do not have enough votes, quite frankly, to pass our bill without some help from the other side. On the other hand, I suggest that the Republican Party does not have enough votes to pass this bill that will be signed into law without our participation.

So we are sort of joined together because we have to be. We have a choice here. We can start talking to each other. We can start cooperating on some of these key issues that I mentioned. We can see where we can come together and devise a proposal that makes sense that can be adopted. It may not be everything that I want or the distinguished senior Senator from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, the manager of the bill, wants; or it may not be everything that the Republican leader or Senator CHAFEE, who is on

the floor, wants. But I think there is enough common ground here to help address these differences in a way that we get a compromise that works. By the way, compromise is not a dirty word. It is a coming together of different opinions in order to accomplish something that makes sense.

Therefore, when we talk about fair compromises in the interest of solving the ultimate problem, that is what this body is supposed to do. Very few times in this world in anything do we get our way all the way all the time. And this legislation, welfare reform, which is so important, is an area that cries out for some bipartisan cooperation, working out our differences, because I am afraid that if we do not do that, we will do nothing. If we are not willing to meet somewhere in the middle on these difficult problems, we will have accomplished absolutely nothing.

Some will say, "But we have a good issue for the next election." I suggest that the best issue for all of us is passing a real welfare reform bill that gets the job done.

I think all of our colleagues on this side are ready, are willing, and I think we are able to sit down in the sense of compromise and come up with a proposal that in fact gets the job done.

With that, at this time, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, may I just express the appreciation of all Members on this side, and I think on both sides, for the thoughtful comments of the Senator from Louisiana. He has worked so very hard on the bill now before us as a second-degree amendment that Senator DASCHLE and he and Senator MIKULSKI have put together. It is an effort to meet concerns that are shared on both sides of the aisle. He is right. We have succeeded in moving this subject forward when we have been together.

The Family Support Act passed out of this Chamber 97 votes to 1. We had a clear consensus, a clear set of agreements. And we have been hearing repeatedly on the floor of programs that State governments have put in place which seem to be taking hold.

The Senator from Iowa was speaking just a few minutes ago about the proposal of Iowa, which passed, as he said, 98 to 2 in their legislature. That is the program under that Family Support Act with bipartisan support that came from this Chamber out to the States. We have something to show. It would seem such a loss to give all of that up at this point.

I thank the Senator. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. I want to join with the Senator from New York. Those were very thoughtful remarks by the Senator from Louisiana. I hope we can get a bill out of this Senate that will really

make some real progress in welfare reform. So I think the Senator from Louisiana has made a constructive contribution. I express my appreciation to him.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I want to add my kudos to the Senator from Louisiana for his comments. I share his sentiment that welfare reform needs to be bipartisan in nature. And we have had discussions off the floor that both sides have moved from the initial introductions of legislation, even here in the Senate, and have moved more together.

I think the Dole bill, as introduced, comes more toward a common ground. And I hope—in fact, I am optimistic—that with some refinements, we can get bipartisan support for the Dole package. I admit that the Democratic leader's package has moved significantly from past welfare reform efforts that we have seen here on the Senate floor from the other side of the aisle. That is a constructive move in the direction of real reform.

I have a few questions, if the Senator from Louisiana will just take a few questions, about the bill that is on the floor. I know he was very involved in drafting it.

I guess it is more of a concern that I have where I sort of see that the bill falls a little short, and where we might be able to move again in a more constructive way forward.

Let me start out with three basic areas. One is the exemptions to the new Temporary Employment Assistance Program. The Temporary Employment Assistance Program is a new program replacing the old AFDC program, which is the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, which generally is conceived as welfare, the cash grant to a mother, in most cases, single moms with children. That program is eliminated under the Democratic leader's bill and replaced with what is called the Temporary Employment Assistance Program. But in the bill, there is provided a whole laundry list of exemptions to the time limit on that program.

I guess I have a problem that the exemptions are so broad that it looks, to me, that there are very few people who would actually be limited in time, under this program, to the 5 years. And let me just read through some of the major exemptions.

No. 1 is an exemption for high unemployed areas. High unemployed areas in the bill is defined as an area that has an unemployment rate of 7.5 percent or higher. I believe just about—

Mr. BREAUX. Will the Senator yield? It is 8 percent.

Mr. SANTORUM. OK.

Mr. BREAUX. We changed the date.

Mr. SANTORUM. That is under the revised legislation. I know even at 8 percent, because I have seen figures, most major communities, at least in 1994, would not have met that criteria, and would have been over the 8 percent. So no recipient in that city, for

the period of 1994, anyway—and my staff is now looking to see how far back that goes—no person who lived in the city of New York, for example, would have had any of that time they spent on welfare count toward that 5-year limit.

I know there are many cities that have had unemployment rates of over 8 percent far back for many years, and none of the people would be considered as time limited.

Many of them would—

Mr. BREAUX. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I see that as a problem.

Mr. BREAUX. I think the discussion is good. What our Work First bill says is we require people to go to work. We know that if you live in a high unemployment area—we pick 8 percent because that is the same number that applies in the food stamp program. That is why we adjusted it to 8 percent. But we do not think it makes any sense to push a young mother out into the street if there are no jobs available in that area. These people, however, would operate under the same rules as everybody else. They are expected to engage in job search. And if, after 2 years, even in this high unemployment area, they are not working, they are then expected to perform workfare, community service in return for their welfare benefits.

So when we are saying there are some areas where there are not any jobs available, these people still have to engage in job search. And then, after 2 years, if they are unable to find a job, they have to perform community service or engage in workfare in their local community. They still have to do something, in other words, to get the benefits.

Mr. SANTORUM. Would that be part of what we would consider your—I guess it is called the Work First employment block grant? Would that be under the Work First employment block grant, after the 2-year transition in that program?

I am just trying to understand.

Mr. BREAUX. It is a legitimate question.

The short answer is yes, it is a requirement that after the 2 years, they have to engage in community service, workfare programs, located in that community.

In other words, what we are saying is there is no free lunch. They are not going to be able to continue receiving benefits for not working if they are capable of working.

Mr. SANTORUM. Even if they are in a high unemployment area—I am going through the other exceptions here—even if their children are living with other than a parent; even if you have a child who is ill or incapacitated, irrespective of all of these exemptions, after 2 years, you have to go into some sort of community work program?

Mr. BREAUX. I would say this is one of the areas that perhaps we agree on, State flexibility, because the State

would have the flexibility to make that determination on what best fits the people in their State, would have the flexibility to determine the conditions and the time restraints that would be effective in their particular States. Some States may be different than others.

Mr. SANTORUM. Does that apply just to those exemptions or the high unemployment exemption also, so if the State of New York, for example, did not want the people to go to work in New York City? Or is that an automatic? Is there no State flexibility there?

Mr. BREAUX. The point I make in response is that in the high unemployment areas, the 8 percent or above, they have to go to work. I mean, that is a requirement. They would have to engage in workfare or community service or whatever.

Mr. SANTORUM. Now, my understanding is also that one of the limitations on this workfare program is that after 2 years, you then go into the Work First employment block grant program, which requires you to perform—is it 20 hours, is that correct, 20 hours of some sort of work?

Mr. BREAUX. Twenty hours. It actually goes into effect not after 2 years; it goes into effect after 6 months. So that is a requirement that starts from the very beginning of the program after 6 months, not after 2 years. The community service, the 20 hours of community work or workfare in their local community, is something that is kicked in very early in the program, not after 2 years, but after 6 months.

Mr. SANTORUM. I guess then my question is, let us say you have someone who is a single mom with a couple of children, and she is on the program for 2 years and has been in job search and doing things that are required under the temporary employment assistance part. She hits her 2-year limit and then is required, to continue on with those benefits, to work.

Now, my understanding from the participation requirements is that 30 percent of your caseload would be in that situation, is that correct, in the year 1996? So you are talking about 30 percent would be in this transition program, temporary program, and then would eventually get into the block granted work program? Is that your understanding?

Mr. BREAUX. I am not sure I understand the direction the question is leading to in the sense that—

Mr. SANTORUM. My understanding is you have participation rates. We have participation rates in our bill and you have participation rates in your bill.

Mr. BREAUX. If I can respond to the Senator, I think the Senator may be misreading the amendment that is pending with regard to participation.

Mr. SANTORUM. Now I ask maybe a broader question.

How many people who go into the welfare program have to participate in

this new program as designed by the leader's amendment? What is the participation—I know what it is in our bill. We eventually get up to 50 percent, but we do not have exemptions.

Mr. BREAUX. I think the Senator will find what we are trying to do in both our bill and his is similar in that regard. We are talking about participation rates. We are talking about really work rates, not participating in a program.

We feel we have enough programs out there. We are not judging the success of our bill on people participating in programs, but on participation in actual work. We go from 20 percent up to 50 percent in actual work, in jobs, in earning their benefits that they are receiving—not participation in the sense of participating in a job training program, but actually require working; they move from 20 percent up to 50 percent in a work program, actually working.

Mr. SANTORUM. So, again—and my analysis here may be a little dated because I know you have revised your bill and I may not have the current analysis. That is why I am trying to understand.

So those who are required to work, in 1996, at least according to our 30 percent of the State caseload, would have to be working in 1996?

(Mr. THOMAS assumed the chair.)

Mr. BREAUX. That is correct. That is working; not in a program, actually working.

Mr. SANTORUM. That goes up to 50 percent by the year 2000.

Mr. BREAUX. That is correct.

Mr. SANTORUM. And it is up to the State to determine who those people are that should be working or should not, which 50 percent. It is a State flexibility issue?

Mr. BREAUX. Very similar to the Republican proposal.

Mr. SANTORUM. That is the point I was trying to make. On this issue, it seems like there is some agreement that 50 percent is a fair figure and allows for some State flexibility in considering the fact that roughly a third of the parents who are on the current AFDC caseload are disabled in one way or another. They have a disability or their children are disabled or there is some problem where they would not be a good candidate for work and, therefore, would not be required under the bill to have a work requirement. We allow the States the flexibility to determine that.

Mr. BREAUX. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SANTORUM. Yes.

Mr. BREAUX. We allow the States flexibility because we believe, again, in maximum flexibility, but we have exemptions that are exemptions with which I think most people would agree. You are talking about people who are ill, incapacitated, someone with a child under 12 months old. There are certain exemptions we feel should be there and spell those out, but we still have the

work requirements from 30 to 50 percent. That is locked in with some exemptions.

Mr. SANTORUM. Let me understand this. Maybe we are a little more different than I thought we were. What you are saying is you take the entire caseload of people that are on welfare, and you say a certain number of them are ineligible because of an incapacity. I think that is the term the current welfare law uses, "incapacitation." We figure that that number is roughly a third. So you take them out of the mix before you apply the 50 percent standard?

Mr. BREAUX. Well, it is 20 percent. That is correct. It would start from 20 percent up to 50 percent.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thirty. I think it is 30 in 1996, up to 50 percent in the year 2000, just according to the numbers I have here.

Mr. BREAUX. On the work rates; the Senator is correct on the work rates.

Mr. SANTORUM. Right. So what you basically take is, let us say, 65 percent of the people who come into the program, and then by the year 2000, half of the 65 percent must be in some sort of work program.

On the Republican side, we do not make that initial separation. What we say is that 50 percent of the entire caseload, and it would be up to the States' discretion, and I am sure they, in all likelihood, because of the expense of someone who has an incapacity of some sort, would not require them to work.

Mr. BREAUX. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield.

Mr. BREAUX. Does not the Republican bill have an exemption for moms with children under 1 year old?

Mr. SANTORUM. That would be the one exemption, but there is no exemption for someone who has a disability or something like that.

Mr. BREAUX. Will you disagree with that being a viable exemption?

Mr. SANTORUM. My feeling is we should allow the States complete flexibility to deal with this issue instead of the overall goal of what percentage of the entire caseload should be in work. I think 50 percent is fair of the entire caseload, given the fact that we know a substantial number cannot work. It is usually around a third. That is what we found. We are even giving more of a fudge factor of another 15 percent or more of people who can work, but we are not going to require them to work or the State required to put them to work.

Mr. BREAUX. Will the Senator yield? Apparently you made some decisions that exemptions from the national level are acceptable.

Mr. SANTORUM. I said that would not be my preference. My preference would be to have no exemptions at the Federal level. We allow the States the ultimate flexibility to determine who is going to work and who is not, given the standard of half, which is a fairly

generous standard where usually only around a third has a disability problem that would make them ineligible for work.

We do allow, I think, a fair amount of flexibility. I just want to understand the difference, and the difference is that you would require half of two-thirds to work. We would require half of the entire caseload.

Mr. BREAUX. I respond to the Senator by saying under our bill, we are even tougher on those who are capable of working, because we are requiring by the year 2000, 50 percent are required to work. That is 50 percent of those eligible.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is saying his 50 percent is looking at the whole broad range, a larger group saying 50 percent of them. We are saying that when you find the people who are able to work, let us make sure you get them to work. I think we are even tighter than you are on that particular point.

Mr. SANTORUM. I do not know how you can be tighter if you have a million people—let us assume we have a million people in the welfare system in Pennsylvania, which is high, but let us say we have a million people, and we say 50 percent of those people have to go to work. That is 500,000 people.

Under your standard, we say 667,000 are technically under your new program because the other 333,000 are ineligible right from the start, and if you take half of 667,000, you are now down to 333,000, not 500,000. So we are going to have, in the case of a million, we are going to have 120,000-some more people working, required to work than under your bill.

Mr. BREAUX. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I will be happy to.

Mr. BREAUX. I think what we are establishing by our conversation, and I think it is helpful in understanding the two approaches, is that we both have requirements of people who are now on welfare to go into the work force. Even the percentages, I think, are ultimately the same: 50 percent by a date certain.

We both have exemptions as to who should not be forced to work. Ours are more broad. We have people who are incapacitated, mothers with children under 1 year old. You have fewer exemptions.

I think the key point that needs to be made here is that we require these people to be put to work, and we are going to help the States fund the programs that put them to work. The concern that I and other Democrats have about the Republican proposal is that it is an unfunded mandate in the sense you are telling the States they have to meet these goals, but not providing them any financial assistance in order to meet it. That is a bigger question, and I think is a legitimate question for discussion: How are the States going to meet these goals with less help than they are getting now?

Mr. SANTORUM. I will be happy to answer that question. I would really

defer to the Governors of the States that have come to us and have been very strongly in support of what we have been putting forward. How they are going to do it is, we are going to release them from all the Federal strings attached to the current program.

What Governors will tell you is they can run a much more efficient program than we can out of Washington through the States. I happen to believe—I had a conversation just this past week with my Governor from Pennsylvania, Tom Ridge, a former Member of the House, who feels very strongly if given the opportunity to design their own program, given the existing amount of AFDC dollars coming through, existing amount of what was the Jobs Program coming through, which is what is in the Republican bill, they cannot only design a better program, put more people to work, get more people off the rolls, get people back into productive work in Pennsylvania at less money, that without the hoops they have to jump through here at the Federal level—I know the Senator from Oregon put up a chart earlier today about all the things you have to do to process someone through the system—we now provide that flexibility for them to be able to design their own system, which we hope and I believe will be a lot more efficient.

It is a good question. It is one I think most Governors would say they would like the responsibility, the opportunity to design a program based on. I know the Senator from Iowa was up here just within the last couple of hours talking about what they have done in Iowa and the fact they have cut caseload, they have cut the amount of money in the program. Why? Because they got a waiver to allow them to run their own program. So we have seen, even with the limited waivers that have been allowed already, programs that have spent less money, that have put more people to work and have been better for the taxpayers and people in the system. I think we have seen a history that we can do this if the States are given the opportunity to design a program.

Mr. BREAUX. If the Senator will yield on that point, Governor Thompson, who I think has done a good job of trying to reform welfare in Wisconsin, when he testified before the Finance Committee, made the point very clearly that some States are able to do some of these things because they have the financial wherewithal to do it. But there are an awful lot of States, when they face a 50-percent requirement of putting people to work with less money coming from the Federal Government, they are simply not going to be able to do it.

That is why the concept of a partnership, where the Federal Government puts up a certain amount and the States put up a certain amount, a requirement that the States participate financially, is so important.

I think the discussion is good. I think there are some areas for us to meet in the middle. When I talk about a compromise, I am talking about not just agreeing with the Dole bill. A compromise is your side moving a little over to the middle of this aisle and our side moving toward the middle on some of these things—we have some common goals and we are close, I think—in order to reach an agreement that the President can sign and that will ultimately be reform. I hope to continue to work with the Senator from Pennsylvania to reach that goal.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield the floor?

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. While the Senator from Louisiana is here, I want to say I very much appreciated this exchange. It made me feel like we are back in 1988.

There are two things to say. One is that there is a participation requirement in existing law of 20 percent. It was put in the law in 1988—to be phased in to 20 percent—with the clear expectation that as the program took hold, the jobs program, it would move forward. In a bill before the Finance Committee—which the administration has abandoned, and I grant that—we moved that rate from 20 percent, as anticipated, on schedule just about, to 35 percent in 1998, to 40 percent in 1999, to 45 and then 50 percent in the year 2001.

What we lose in so much of what is on the floor right now is the specific Federal funding to do this. Governors and mayors will look up in despair in 5 years.

I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, there will be on the desk very shortly now the estimates for the proportion of children on AFDC, welfare, in 1993. These are estimated, but they are fairly accurate. In Philadelphia, at any point in time, 44 percent of the children are on AFDC. In the course of a year, 57 percent are.

Now, those numbers overwhelm the system. Thirty years ago, when it would have been 10 percent at one time and 13 over a time, you could say, all right, Philadelphia, PA, you take care of this problem. I have watched it come that these numbers overwhelm the city. These problems are so much deeper.

On last Saturday in Baltimore—the Senator from Connecticut will be interested in this—there was a kind of public celebration as they blew up the Lafayette Public Housing Complex in downtown Baltimore. It happened in Newark a year ago. It first appeared in St. Louis, where the Pruitt-Igoe Houses were blown up in 1972. In the city of Baltimore, it was announced, and the mayor had the plunger, and they had T-shirts, and they made the most of it. They described the housing as “warehousing the poor.” When it was built, it was a model complex. It got awards everywhere. What a nice way to live, right downtown, and I think they could see the harbor. They

are going to replace them now with townhouses. Eighty-five percent of the persons in the townhouses will be on AFDC. Each will have a case manager from the Johns Hopkins School of Social Work. They will be very carefully attended to and all these things. There will be townhouse case managers. How many townhouses? There will be 317.

Those are the realities. How many hundreds of thousands of children in Baltimore will be eligible? I plead to a Senate that does not hear me on this. These numbers of people receiving welfare benefits are beyond the capacity of the States and local government. Cutting off the Federal commitment that we have had for 60 years is an action bordering on mindlessness. And I make the case with no very great expectation of persuading anyone.

Thank you, Mr. President. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania. This morning, the Senator from Oregon and I were going over these numbers. If Philadelphia is 57, Detroit is 67. New York, which is larger, is 39.

Mr. SANTORUM. If the Senator will yield—

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from New York that I think he makes a strong point that work programs are expensive to administer. They are very expensive to administer.

I chaired the Republican task force last year in the House as a member of the Ways and Means Committee that drafted a bill that was different from the bill that passed the House, but it provided a substantial amount more money for work programs. In fact, I think over the 5-year period in the bill that I, in a sense, authored, we spent \$12 billion more, understanding the expense of doing so. So I have some sympathy with what the Senator is saying as to the problems States are going to confront.

I am telling you, from the perspective of governors who I have talked to, they feel comfortable that if we removed all of the restrictions, which in a sense in the Republican bill we do—there are some, but very minimal—if we remove the restrictions in place, they believe they can get sufficient savings to be able to run a work program in addition to the current AFDC program. I am hopeful that they can. I have my own skepticism. I hope they can. Given the budgetary realities, I think that is going to be something we are going to challenge the Governors to do.

If we did nothing with the AFDC program—that program is not doubling every couple of years or so. This is not a program projected to dramatically increase, and it is not that we are not keeping up with the skyrocketing costs. I do not have the numbers in front of me—and correct me if you have them—but my understanding is that I think, in the next 7 years, AFDC was to go from \$16 billion to maybe \$18 billion, something like that—maybe \$19

billion. It is an increase, but it is not like the numbers on AFDC are growing like we have seen on SSI and some other programs. In fact, we are seeing a lot of people on AFDC moving over to the SSI.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Which is 100 percent Federal money.

Mr. SANTORUM. And more, because the benefits are more generous. I suspect we will see more people moving from the AFDC rolls, in an attempt to claim some sort of disability to get into the SSI.

I suggest that given the fact that this program is not rapidly increasing in many States—maybe New York and Pennsylvania being two of them—we will see a leveling off and maybe even a decline where we have in those States an opportunity to get work into these programs and get significant cost savings. And we have provided in this bill a growth factor of \$1.5 billion, I think, over the next 7 years for the higher growth States to tap into more money to be able to deal with the increases in AFDC population. So we have not completely turned our backs to the possibility of growth.

We hope that with the combination of the Governors being able to redesign programs with some limited additional assistance from the Federal Government, we can handle those States that are having growth problems in AFDC.

Mr. BREAUX. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. Yes.

Mr. BREAUX. Here is my problem with the Republican proposal. We both have the requirement that States put 50 percent of the welfare recipients into work by the year 2000. We are the same on that essential provision. But the difference is that your proposal does not provide the States with the funding to do that.

Here is my concern. It is that if they do not have the funding to do that, they are not going to be able to meet that target. Your response to that, as I understand it, is that we are going to eliminate the redtape we now have imposed upon the States.

Now, my question is, what type of redtape are we going to be eliminating that would give the States the extra funding that they need in order to put 50 percent of the recipients to work?

What type of redtape elimination is going to add up to those type of dollars in order to meet the 50 percent requirement that we both agree is an appropriate target?

Mr. SANTORUM. Obviously, they can redesign the entire program. They can redesign eligibility criteria. They can do a whole host of things that put requirements in that we do not have now.

For example, you mentioned the work requirement. Several States have put in an immediate work requirement. I think it is Wisconsin that did, and we saw the number of people on welfare drop, by some enormous number like 20 or 30 percent, like that because people did not want to sign up and work.

I think we will see, and I think Governors believe if you make welfare into a system that is a dynamic system where people are going to have their lives changed, turned around, back out, it is sort of—I think of the Wizard of Oz. When Dorothy got to the Wizard of Oz, before they saw the wizard, they went in and the scarecrow got stuffed full of hay and the tin man got all shined up.

If you see this as this program where you come in and try to change peoples lives as a dynamic process, in a shorter scope as opposed to one that is more of a long-term maintenance kind of system, you will see people opting out in some cases, so we have lower caseloads.

We have seen that happen in States that put those kind of requirements in place, and we will see people on for less periods of time, because if the system works well—I remember debating this in the House—if the system works well, people will not end up in the welfare system, because if it works well, we will get them ready for jobs and get them back into job placements.

That, to me, is what we have to sort of change—the entire psychology of what is going on here. I think what we have done is give States the flexibility to do that in a way that we have seen in other experiments works very, very effectively.

Mr. BREAUX. If the Senator will yield for a comment, I appreciate the Wizard of Oz analysis. I am afraid it is more like an Alice in Wonderland approach.

Mr. SANTORUM. I have small children.

Mr. BREAUX. Hopefully, we will see the merits of each other's approach before the day is over and reach an accommodation that does get the job done.

Mr. SANTORUM. I will be happy to yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania.

I was enjoying and benefiting from the thoughtful colloquy between the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Louisiana, and, of course, as always, benefiting from the thoughtful comments of the Senator from New York.

I will say two things about what I just heard. One is that it is from this kind of thoughtful colloquy that, hopefully, a bill will emerge that has a strong bipartisan base of support. We will see whether that happens.

Second, I say to my friend from New York who raised the question a moment ago of whether anybody is listening, I am listening. I have always found the Senator from New York to be right on target on these matters. Sometimes the role of the prophet is not to have the masses behind him, but if you speak the truth, ultimately they will come to you. I think that is where we are today.

Mr. President, I rise to support the substitute that is now pending offered

by Senator DASCHLE, Senator BREAUX, Senator MIKULSKI and many others. I am privileged to be a cosponsor of the so-called Work First plan, which really represents a genuine attempt at welfare reform.

Mr. President, before I speak about this pending substitute, I do want to say a few words about the colloquy that we have just heard and the comments of the Senator from New York.

This is a real test for this Chamber, for the body politic, as to whether we can do what is right and what is reasonable on the question of welfare. I have yet to find, and I will be glad to present an award to, anybody who can present to me an elected official who will support the status quo regarding welfare in America today. No one does. Everyone is for reform of one kind or another. The question is what kind will it be.

Do we have the capacity to break out of the business of competing images, even our own perspectives—sometimes accurate, sometimes skewed—on what is causing this dreadful problem not just of poverty but of the underlying problem of babies being born in increasing numbers to mothers who are not married, and who do not have fathers?

That is the main way people get on welfare, because it is aid for dependent children. One of the most frequent ways that one qualifies for welfare, is when one is born in a situation where one's parents cannot support them. Over and over again in the millions—not the thousands, but the millions—there are children being born to parents unmarried and therefore needing welfare.

These are central challenges, not just to our capacity to be reasonable and to break through the competing images and politics and to do something thoughtful, to prove that Congress can legislate, break through the politics, shake up the system, make it work, make it reflect the values of the American people as the American people are so convinced it does not now—that is, the welfare system does not now reflect their best values.

Mr. President, this is a welfare program that started with such good intentions in the 1930's and now is disparaged by those who benefit from it and by those who pay for it. It is a program that has grown very, very large—billions and billions of dollars every year.

Part of what is at work here is our ability to prove as elected representatives of the people of this country that we are capable of changing the status quo if they are not happy with it. A problem that took 60 years to get into will not be solved in 6 days or maybe not even in 6 years. The effort did begin with the Family Support Act, which I consider to be an act of genuine welfare reform. I believe that the Daschle substitute which is before the Senate continues that work.

To me, with the prevailing mood in this country of questioning the credibility, the legitimacy, the effectiveness

of Government to step out and deal with real problems, part of the test that we are facing in this welfare reform debate is a more general one, which is, are we capable of truly dealing with this program that has gone off the course, bringing it back to be cost effective, to be helpful to people who are beneficiaries of the program, and to better reflect our values?

Let me deal with that second point. Part of the great public anger about welfare is the perception, too often accurate, that it does not reflect the best of American values. When programs of our Government, particularly ones as central and large as this one, do not reflect the values of the American people, we lose their support. It is as simple as that.

What is a great basic American value? We speak about it so much it loses its meaning. It is work. It is work in the broader sense, in the sense that this is an impulse that drove so many of our parents and grandparents and great grandparents before them to come to this country. Not just, of course, the dream of political freedom which impelled millions of Americans—millions—to emigrate to America, but the dream of economic opportunity, the understanding of people who came from feudal, oligarchic, unfair economic systems where they had no opportunity that America was the country where, if you worked hard, there was nothing you could not achieve. The welfare system seems to have turned this on its head, motivated by good intentions, charitable intentions at the outset, and created a system that does not encourage work, that seems at times to reward the opposite, and that offends the great majority of people who are out there, working hard, who, too often in the last decade or two, do not see their standard of living going up but do see themselves paying large tax bills and believe in their minds, understandably, that a lot of that money they worked hard for goes to people who are not working as hard, not reflecting the values of work in this country.

Family, in this society and other societies, the core unit, the basic, primal sense of responsibility, the kind of natural division of familial labor between man and woman, mother and father, is destroyed in our society in numbers, as the Senator from New York has pointed out, that we do not find—I have heard him say this—in other societies. Increasing numbers, more than a third of the babies, as I said before, are born in this country every year with no family, a mother living alone without a father, a desperate situation causing all sorts of problems for our society including contributing greatly to the problem of crime and violent crime.

But the point I make here, as I speak about values, is that of the basic value of parents caring for their children. Let me focus on the fathers, whose absence is the cause of so many millions of mothers having to go on welfare, fa-

thers not accepting and carrying out what we would think would be the most fundamental, uncomplicated, natural sense of obligation: to take care of their children.

So, this program, as it exists, offends some basic American values. It challenges us to bring the program into line with those values, to gather more support, to open the way for the American people to return to their basic nature, which is to be charitable, which is naturally to want to help people who cannot help themselves. But the majority of American people, I am afraid, feel that welfare, as it exists now, takes advantage of their good natures. I think part of the challenge that we have is to break through and reform this program, genuinely reform it so it reflects the values held by most Americans and once again liberates their better natures to care for those who cannot care for themselves.

I will make one final point in this opening, general part of my statement, Mr. President, which is this. The Senator from New York touched on this as he talked about the extraordinary percentages of children in various of our cities who are at one time or another on welfare, AFDC: 47 percent, 67 percent. These are astounding numbers, but they bring me to make this point.

I want to urge my colleagues here to go forward with a certain sense of humility and caution, understanding that as we reform welfare we are not dealing here with widgets. We are not dealing here with constructs of wood and metal and paper. We are dealing here with people, and particularly with millions of children—if I may say so, millions of God's children—whose fate it was, through no act of their own, to be born poor, to be born, in the majority of cases, with only one parent accepting any responsibility for them.

So, as we go forward, understandably in the direction of reform, I hope we will remember that it is these children who are going to be affected and that they are innocents. Let us innovate, let us demand, let us come down hard on those whose misbehavior is the cause of this system that in so many ways has failed. But let us not punish the children. And let us not leave the streets of our cities and towns full of children for whom no one will take responsibility. We do not want a country like that.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield for just a question?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Certainly I will.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I know he would be aware, he is speaking so well, so feelingly and wisely, that in 1992 the number of children born to unmarried women was 1,224,876 souls, one and a quarter million children in 1 year.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I say to the Senator, the numbers are overpowering. Of course, remember, as we think of the accumulated welfare rolls, we are talking about those children, in a sense, times 18—it comes out to a little bit less—but until they reach the age of

majority. That tells us two things. One is the extraordinary number of children involved here. And second, the extraordinary cost of the program. I saw a number about a year or two ago that said in any given year we spent \$34 billion on children born out of wedlock. That is an amazing number, \$34 billion. That is the accumulation of funding to support children from birth to 18.

So this program needs reform, but let us do it with a sense of humility and understanding about the human impact of what is happening here.

Mr. President, let me come now to the so-called Work First plan, introduced by Senator DASCHLE and many others of us. I think this is real reform that would improve the lives of welfare beneficiaries, break the cycle of dependency, better serve the taxpayers of this country, and better reflect the values of the American people. The primary welfare program in this country, AFDC, is failing in what ought to be its most important task—moving welfare beneficiaries into the work force. We have seen some improvement as a result of the jobs program coming off of the Family Support Act. This Work First plan continues that improvement by changing the strategy and devoting the resources for moving real people into real jobs.

This proposal would also give welfare beneficiaries some genuine incentives to break the cycle of poverty, give them the same incentives that we have associated with characteristic American values instead of trapping them, enslaving them in dependency by discontinuing current programs that reward single parents who do not work, do not marry, and have children out of wedlock.

These are steps that many of us on this side are united in taking because the existing system really does contradict our most cherished values and contributes to society's most serious problems. The Work First plan actually replaces the AFDC program, so welfare as we have known it will not exist if the Daschle substitute is adopted. It replaces AFDC with a Temporary Employment Assistance Program that is focused on putting people to work. It gives States the flexibility and the incentives they need to successfully move people into the private sector for jobs.

It also addresses two of the key causes of welfare dependency that I have spoken about. Through child support enforcement it finally forces deadbeat dads to assume at least their financial responsibility, and it starts a major national campaign to reduce out-of-wedlock births, particularly to teenagers.

Mr. President, others have said it but I will say it again, and it is very important to say. While preserving the kind of guarantee that those who are genuinely poor and unable to work will receive some benefits, the minimum assistance consistent with what I have described as America's best charitable

nature, the Work First substitute ends unconditional welfare benefits. Each person receiving assistance will have to sign an individualized personal empowerment contract. This is something new that has come up from the States.

As the Senator from Iowa indicated earlier, if the recipients do not comply with the contract—in other words, you do not just get the benefit but you have to promise in a signed contract to do some things in return, including, of course, looking for work from day one on welfare—then the beneficiaries will lose some, and ultimately could lose all of their benefits if they do not comply with their end of the bargain—mutual responsibility.

While the contract may include some training for education, the emphasis is going to be on work experience. All recipients will be required to search for a job from day one. Eligibility for benefits is going to be limited to 5 years, although children whose parents reach this time limit will still be eligible for vouchers to enable them to receive basic sustenance. This I think reflects the principle, the value, that I described earlier, which is that these are kids. These are innocent kids. Let us not punish them more than they deserve while we are trying to solve this problem, and unintentionally create a greater problem for our society.

States under this Daschle substitute must focus this program directly on placing people in private sector jobs. As has been discussed in a colloquy between the Senators from Louisiana and Pennsylvania, the bill requires States to have at least 50 percent of their caseload working by the year 2001. It moves away from telling States how to succeed and instead rewards results. States that have high private sector job placement rates will receive a financial bonus.

Mr. President, the work requirements in this bill are tough, and just as important, they are funded. We understand that child care assistance is the critical link between welfare and work. Unlike the alternative proposal, this substitute gives States the child care funding they need to put people in jobs and move them off welfare.

Mr. President, I noted a discussion among my colleagues a short time ago about the importance of trying to achieve a bipartisan result. I could not agree more. I recall the Senator from New York indicated the overwhelming bipartisan support for the Family Support Act of 1988.

As you look at these bills, as I have, there is a lot that holds them together. There is a lot in common. I hope we can build on that common base in the next week as we move toward passing legislation. In some ways, it has actually been quite gratifying to watch the bills change, and in this sense, watch Senator DOLE's bill as it has evolved. The first major change, as I see it, was related to the so-called participation requirements in the original version of

Senator Dole's bill. These requirements for the States did not require the States to move beneficiaries into jobs, as I read the original proposal. That has now changed. And work standards very much like those included in the Daschle substitute are now included in the Dole bill. And there, I hope, is one common basis from which we can build.

Mr. President, the Daschle substitute also tackles the critical problem of teen pregnancy. Unmarried teen parents are particularly likely to fall into long-term welfare dependency. More than one-half of welfare spending goes to women who first gave birth as teens.

This legislation, among other things, requires teen mothers to live at home and helps communities establish supervised group homes for single teen mothers; that is, second-chance homes.

Mr. President, within the last couple of years, I have been so perplexed by this problem of babies being born to unmarried mothers. I have spent some time visiting programs in Connecticut, visiting with teens, trying to understand how this has happened, how these numbers have skyrocketed as they have. I do not have any conclusive answer. But one thing I found in some of my conversations with young women who have had babies while they were teenagers is when you ask them, "Why? Why did you do it," it is very interesting. Almost every time I have had this conversation, the mothers will say, "I love my baby, but I wish I had waited." Of course, in that, they are acknowledging that it is not only the child born to the unwed mother in poverty that suffers. It is the mother, whose dreams are severely restricted as a result of suddenly having a child to care for.

But once you get beyond that, and they say they wish they had waited, and you ask why this happened, some just give the obvious answer. "I did not use birth control." I found others saying that they did it intentionally. They had the child because they wanted to get out of their homes. They wanted to be independent. And they knew that if they had a baby, they could receive welfare payments and that would be the basis for establishing their independent residency. Obviously, that is a sad and sorry commentary—I shall leave it at that—as a motivation for bringing a child into the world.

But this Daschle substitute gets to that problem by removing that motivation, by requiring teenaged mothers to live at home or live in the supervised group homes, if their home is not a suitable environment, and by requiring teenaged mothers to remain in school or in a training program, all as a condition of receiving welfare benefits. No longer will there be a blank check regardless of the behavior of the recipient. Instead, we will demand mutual responsibility. Society will try to take care of your child. We will try to help you out of dependency, but only if you make the effort yourself.

Finally, Mr. President, this Daschle substitute incorporates very strong child support enforcement legislation which Senator BRADLEY and others introduced earlier this year. I was privileged to be a cosponsor of it. I was attorney general of the State of Connecticut, before I was honored to be elected by the people of my State to serve in this body. One of my responsibilities was enforcing child support orders. I was startled, as I went through the files—thousands of them—to see the degree to which men who had fathered children refused to accept fiscal responsibility, financial responsibility for those children, and found 100 different ways to try to avoid or make excuses for not doing so.

The legislation that is part of the Daschle substitute will make it easier for States to locate absent noncustodial parents; that is, parents not having custody of the children, almost always the fathers. It will also make it easier for States to establish paternity. Science has been a great help here in facilitating the establishment of paternity through blood tests, and also establishing a court order and enforcement of court orders. The tough child support enforcement system will help keep millions of children out of poverty and off welfare. It is a simple statement. It is as simple as the fact that when babies are born to unwed mothers, they are much more likely to end up on welfare. But the fact is that if fathers took care of the children, society would not have to do so and the welfare rolls would go down.

Of course, these tough child support enforcement laws will send a message of responsibility to would-be deadbeat parents, deadbeat dads. In an era of skyrocketing out-of-wedlock births and rising teen pregnancy rates, child support payments must become a clearly understood, highly visible, and unavoidable fact of life for absent parents. In other words, these absent parents must live in fear of their local prosecuting attorney or attorneys general coming after them to make sure that any money they earn will go in a substantial degree to supporting the children they have fathered.

Mr. President, I will have an amendment that I will introduce later in the proceedings that expands the effort to deal with teen pregnancy, building on some work done by Kathleen Sylvester of the Progressive Policy Institute establishing a highly visible national campaign to cut the rate of teenage births, setting goals for States, giving them some money to innovate with programs to cut the rate of teen pregnancies, and rewarding them as we do with regard to placement of people in private-sector jobs when they achieve a reduction in teen pregnancies.

One of the dreadful facts that comes out as we go over this problem of teen pregnancies is that a remarkable percentage of the babies born to teenage mothers have been fathered by men

who are considerably older. So the vision that we may have of two reckless teenagers casually creating a baby is not the norm. As I understand it; it is men who are typically older than these teenaged girls who, in a setting that is often abusive, exploitive, or overpowering, are fathering these children in acts that from a legal point of view are pure and simple statutory rape.

And there is not much we can do from Washington to deal with that except to—and my amendment will have some element to it that will—try to encourage the States, the local prosecuting attorneys, the district attorneys to be very aggressive in working with the welfare authorities to once again take statutory rape as a serious crime and to prosecute it, understanding that this is done to deter adult men from committing a sexual act that will result in a child born to poverty, who to a devastating degree is likely to end up a part of the criminal problem in society.

So I hope we can begin to take from these statistics of the ages of the men who are fathering too many of the children born to teenaged mothers, some attempt to build a genuine national effort among prosecuting attorneys to look at the seriousness of a crime that in an age of permissiveness has been winked at, which is statutory rape.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I think this Daschle substitute, the Work First plan, is true welfare reform. It does demand responsibility from parents while providing continued protection for children, and it does address the two key causes of welfare dependency—teen pregnancy and unpaid child support. It does reflect the values of the American people. And it does take on the welfare status quo, building on the work of the Family Support Act, and really does amount to genuine welfare reform. I understand that over the next week we will hear conflicting views on this subject. But I can only echo the sentiments expressed earlier in this Chamber, let us cut through the politics, let us get to the heart of the problem. And let us see if we can, as happened in 1988, resoundingly adopt a true welfare reform proposal. I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his extraordinary, moving, judicious, serious comments. I know his capacity for sometimes biblical patience, and I also know his capacity for indignation when things have gone on for too long. We have been too long on the subject.

In 1971, a Republican President, President Nixon, had proposed a guaranteed income as a substitute for this subject. It was H.R. 1 in the House of Representatives. And it happened that on February 8, 1971, all three of the then major news magazines—and still those—had the subject of welfare on

their covers. News Week on its cover had welfare. "WELFARE: There Must Be a Better Way," it said of the President's program, "It will constitute a humanitarian achievement unrivaled since the New Deal." It was not humanitarian enough for Democrats; too humanitarian for some Republicans.

The cover story of Time was devoted to "The Welfare Maze." It began: "The U.S. welfare system is a living nightmare that has reached the point of the involuntary scream and chill awakening." That is how Time began its issue.

The cover story of US News & World Report: "Welfare Out of Control—Story of Financial Crisis Cities Face."

Now, in that year, sir, the illegitimacy ratio for the nation was 11.2 percent. It is now three times that, the number of children born in that circumstance. Where we have 1,225,000 today, in 1971 it was 400,000. It is three times, almost, that ratio. The ratio has increased by a factor of three, the number of children by a factor of three. That is the central phenomenon.

I think the Progressive Policy Institute has been very helpful in this regard. There is this phenomenon of statutory rape. As deviancy gets redefined, we do not think much of that anymore. But it is still law.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. That is right.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. What would the Senator hypothesize? Would the Senator hypothesize that the households in which the children grow up no longer have anyone who will defend them? "You can't come in here. And you will please go out there and close the door behind you."

Lee Rainwater, a whole generation ago studying the public housing in Pruitt-Igoe in St. Louis, wrote an essay on the feeling within a household, "Can you say no to someone who wants to come in?" A thought that perhaps would not occur to many persons here. Close your door at night, and that is it. Close yours, and I close mine.

The French sociologist, Henri Bergson spoke at the turn of the century of society becoming a dust of individuals—no ties. I think this new data on ages of the fathers suggests that. I think you are absolutely right; if anybody could mobilize the attorneys general, the Senator from Connecticut could. I will certainly support that amendment. I look forward to it. And I thank you for your comments. I know the Senator from Pennsylvania would agree we are trying to reach some understandings here. We have understandings. And where we have different assessments, well, that is why we have the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I very briefly want to thank the Senator from New York for his kind words. He has made here what is to me a very important point, a very stunning point, and I just want

to repeat it if I may, which is that there is a way in which the collapse of the family opens the door, in the metaphor that the Senator has used, to the further collapse of the family. And we are, of course, generalizing here. There are many circumstances where this does not take place. But if you have a situation where babies are born to unmarried women and there is no father in the house, then as the baby, if it is a girl, grows up, will the mother be able to alone protect the child from a man who may be a predator? And I understand it is much more complicated in many cases than that.

But there is a way in which nature has created this unit, and we all have our roles to play in it. The single, poor mother may be ill-equipped to alone defend her child, against a man whose intentions are not good. The Senator is right, we do not enforce these statutory rape laws anymore, but they are statutory. These acts are illegal, and they are illegal for a good reason. The consequences are disastrous, and I think if we can put some fear out there by more vigorously enforcing these laws, we not only will be doing what is right, but we may actually have an effect on the rate of out-of-wedlock births.

I thank the Senator from New York. I personally thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, not only for the thoughtfulness of his earlier comments, but for the kindness of yielding the floor to me. I went on a bit longer than I expected to, but I appreciate very much his kindness to me.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, for his thoughtful comments and for his kind remarks about me. I look forward to working with him and others in, again, trying to craft what I believe will be a bipartisan solution to this problem. We may not get the resounding vote that we got in 1988 in this Senate on this measure, but I think the measure that passes in the Senate this year will be quite significantly more dramatic than what we did in 1988. When you stretch the envelope, you leave more people behind. There is, in a sense, less consensus.

I think it would be easy to craft something that is watered down that could get everybody's vote here, but I do not think we would accomplish what we set out to accomplish, which is truly reforming the welfare system.

I am hopeful we can stretch the envelope, be bipartisan and really help millions of Americans get out of poverty.

I rise to just finish up on some of the comments and discussion I was having with the Senator from Louisiana. He asked, really, the question that is asked probably most about the Republican proposal, which is how are States going to be able to put people to work and run these work programs and, at the same time, do that, which is very

expensive, with a flat amount of funding, given that some States are going to see increases in poverty population? I mentioned the fact those States that do experience increases, we do have a pot of money there that would help them.

What about just dealing with the increased cost of providing for a work program? I cite an example of Riverside, CA. The Senator from New York, on many occasions, has cited Riverside, CA, as an example of an existing program that seems to be having some good results in a work-related program, the GAIN program, and other Members on the floor have done the same thing.

I just state for the RECORD that in Riverside, and I will add Grand Rapids and Atlanta, those three programs combined, which have gone into a program that is a work program that requires a substantial investment of time and energy on the part of the welfare recipient, is this dynamic program that I believe the States would go to under the Republican proposal.

In those areas, what we have seen is a dramatic cost savings. So, assuming that this could be replicated on a State level, we are seeing flat funding, yes, but in these three communities that put this program in place, this work requirement and other kinds of dynamic turnover off the welfare roles back into productive society, there was a 22 percent reduction in AFDC—22 percent reduction in AFDC. Not flat, not an increase. They saved 22 percent in costs. Their caseload went down 16 percent overall. Food stamps went down 14 percent.

So to suggest that we have to pump in more dollars to accomplish this purpose of putting people to work I do not think meets with the numbers. And, by the way, Riverside, CA, had a 9 percent unemployment rate at the time. So we have the exemption for anything over 8 percent that you do not have to go to work, you do not have to go to work in the temporary assistance program. You can do it.

I can tell you, I come from southwestern Pennsylvania. We have had some very tough economic times and continue to have them. I can tell you there are lots of people who say, "Look, there are jobs out there, you just have to go out and find them and be willing to work and go do it. It proves the case that, No. 1, there are jobs out there and you can save money in the process and run a better program that is being lauded by both sides of the aisle.

So the numbers of what we have seen of what has been successful in this country prove that you can run a program with less money, get people off welfare into work even in high unemployment areas. I think what we have seen is you have these programs that really do focus on the individual, and they provide what the individual needs. That is not a check the first of the month and, "Thank you, ma'am," and

out the door, but it is care and concern and cooperation and an intensive desire by the people in the system to see that person who walks through that door who has had a tough run of luck in a problem situation get that kind of assistance they need to turn themselves around.

I have another comment I want to make about the discussion I had with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just to make a unanimous consent request for staff on the floor?

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield the floor.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Debra Wirth, a fellow in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of the welfare debate.

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

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, what we talked about was the 8 percent figure as any area of what I thought was a Bureau of Labor Statistics area, which is a geographical area defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as an area they will then determine the number of people, the percentage of people in that area that are unemployed.

If those areas are above 8 percent, in the Democratic leader's bill, those people who reside in those areas that have an unemployment rate of over 8 percent, that time in which they live in those areas of high unemployment does not count toward their 5-year limit. In fact, it can be indefinite.

What I found out was that, yes, it was 7.5, they raised it to 8, but they eliminated the requirement that they had to be a defined Bureau of Labor Statistics area, that the State could now define what the area would be. It could be an entire State. It could be a portion of the Bureau of Labor Statistics area. It could be a neighborhood.

What it does is it makes this determination completely arbitrary on the part of the State, potentially even indecipherable, because you could have literally neighborhoods picked out or communities picked out.

I think it is poor policy, but I think it creates a huge loophole in this whole area of exemptions from the time limit on welfare, not a step in the right direction. They gave with one hand and took away with the other. They gave by increasing the unemployment rate from 7.5 to 8 percent, and then they said we will define where the area is, we will not use the current Bureau of Labor Statistics area, we will let the States determine what they mean. That really does take away any real change in that policy.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. SANTORUM. I will be happy to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Does not the Bureau of Labor Statistics—who does the survey right now on unemployment, officially?

Mr. SANTORUM. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. WELLSTONE. And the Senator is concerned they continue to do the surveys? I do not quite understand the Senator's position.

Mr. SANTORUM. No, no. In the Democratic leader's bill, what they have done with their most recent modification is eliminate the boundaries for determining who would be eligible for the exemption from the 5-year limitation. And so—

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to address the Senator from Pennsylvania directly.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I will check this out and have an answer for you directly, but I believe the actual surveys of household unemployment are done by the Bureau of the Census and the data is analyzed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. And I think you are on to a point which should be resolved. I will do my best to do so. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator from New York. There are two additional points I wanted to make. No. 1, I stated before there would be many cities that, for potentially the foreseeable future, unfortunately, people in those cities would not be subject to the time limit under the Democratic leader's bill. I point to the cities of New York, which has an 8.7 percent unemployment rate; Los Angeles, which has a 10.6 percent unemployment rate; there is an 8.2 percent unemployment rate in Washington, DC; Detroit has a 10.8 percent rate. Those are a few cities where the unemployment rate exceeds 8 percent. As a result, under the bill put forward by Senator DASCHLE, none of the people living in those cities would have any of their time limit being worked off during those periods of high unemployment.

So you could have, potentially, in a city like Detroit, which has historically had very high unemployment rates, no time limit for people who live in those cities. You are not talking about small or insignificant welfare populations. You are talking about New York, Los Angeles, Detroit, Washington, Miami, and many others. You are talking about a very large percentage of the caseload that will never, potentially, be time limited or will be time limited to 10 or more years. That is a big loophole in this bill, let us make no mistake about it. I believe that needs to be addressed.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. What the exception is saying—I agree that in the big cities you have an unemployment rate at 8 percent and many higher. That does not tell us anything about self-employment, part-time workers, discouraged workers, which is much higher. Why is the Senator so troubled by

this when it could be a mother with small children who could be penalized if they live in a community with high levels of unemployment—unofficially defined unemployment? You keep calling that a loophole? Why does he see it that way?

Mr. SANTORUM. What I think is important in this whole debate is an understanding that the work requirement provision in the bill is not a penalty, it is an opportunity. It is an opportunity for people who have not had the chance to go out to find work, in many cases to be placed in a work program so they can go out and be productive and learn skills and, in many cases, because you have people who have never had jobs before, they can learn what it is to get up in the morning and get their children ready for day care, or for someone else to come into the house, and get yourself to a work site, work an 8-hour day, and get home and again provide for their children. That is an experience that, unfortunately, many people in our society have not experienced. That is a very valuable one. I add that it is something many people in our society have never seen a parent do. They have no idea what it means to grow up in a house where they never saw that happen.

So it is important that we provide to everyone the opportunity to work and that we require it, in a sense, and that we say that this is a temporary program; this is not a program that is going to go on and on. Welfare is not a maintenance system where we provide for people in poverty for indefinite periods of time, but it is a dynamic transitional program that prepares people to get from a position where they cannot work, or they are not prepared to work, to a position where they will and do work. That is lost if you provide what I call "impoverishment zones," not "empowerment zones," where you basically tell a group of people that because you are in a big city that has high unemployment, we have no expectation that you will ever be able to find work, and therefore you can stay on welfare. But the rest, everybody else, we will change the system for you. But you in Detroit and you in the City of New York, you cannot make it, and we do not believe you can, so we are going to sort of write you off.

I do not want to write anybody off. I think everybody should have the same level of expectations. As I cited before the Senator from Minnesota came to the floor, the Riverside, CA, example, where during the period of time of the GAIN program they experienced a 14 percent drop in food stamps, a 16 percent drop in caseload, and a 20 percent drop in AFDC, and they had in excess of 9 percent unemployment. People were getting off the rolls, getting to work, doing the things that many on both sides of the aisle said is a successful program.

So I believe it must happen. I think to write off particular areas of the

country because of difficulties in unemployment is an unwise move.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. Yes.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. In making a thoughtful point and comment, he would be aware that the GAIN program in Riverside, CA, is a program developed under the Family Support Act?

Mr. SANTORUM. There have been many experiments done under waivers under the Family Support Act.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. If I may put it in question form. He might know that in the summer of 1992, President Bush visited Riverside and was making a point that it seemed to be working and is catching on. I rushed to the floor with a photograph of President Reagan signing the Family Support Act and shaking hands with then-Governor Clinton, who was head of the Governors Association at that time. He and the Governor of Delaware, now our colleague in the House, worked together on a bipartisan basis. I just wish that we would be conscious of this. I do not ask the Senator to agree. But I am saying we have something working, and we may miss it.

Mr. SANTORUM. If I can, I say to the distinguished Senator from New York that there are isolated instances where the current law is working and, I think, from social science evaluations, modestly working. We have come in welfare to expect that modest improvement is as good as we will ever get. Maybe that is the case. I am not satisfied with that as a benchmark for the ceiling. I think what we need to do is, as I said, to stretch the envelope.

While the Family Support Act of 1988 did create a window of opportunity for certain areas to get waivers and to try new things and to engage in work and other kinds of things, which we believe on this side and I know many on the other side believe is the way to go, we believe it needs to be more dramatic, that we need to do more and try new things. That is what this Dole-Packwood bill does, I think, and does it in a very dramatic way.

The final point I want to make is on the cost side. I know the Senator from Minnesota is here. I say to my colleagues on the Republican side, it is getting rather lonely over here. There are plenty of opportunities to speak on this issue. I hope that those who have comments will come to the floor and make their comments and debate this very important issue. There are no speakers on this side at this point. I say to those listening, if you have statements you would like to make, this is a good time to come down and make those.

I say, with respect to the cost estimates on this program, what we see is really a cost-neutral program on the part of the Democratic leader's bill when it comes to welfare spending. The bill saves, over 7 years, roughly \$20 billion. But \$19 billion of the \$20 billion in savings is in food stamps. So what we

see is what most on that side would consider welfare and SSI and AFDC and child care. A lot of those—in fact, most of those go up in spending. What we see is most of the savings really being gathered out of the Food Stamp Program. I say those, over a 7-year period, are rather modest compared to what the Republicans suggest. I think we had about 50 percent more in savings under the Food Stamp Program.

So it does not meet with what I think most would see as what is necessary to get Government spending under control.

I say that even under the Republican bill, spending goes up dramatically in virtually all these programs. I know the block granted AFDC Program does not go up and the child care program does not. But the rest of the programs—the SSI, Food Stamp Program, everything else—goes up at very dramatic rates. In fact, we are talking about a very minimal reduction in the spending on welfare in this country. If this was being judged solely based on how much money we are saving on welfare, I think both proposals in the eyes of the American public would be considered a failure. This is not a big cut in welfare spending. We are just barely curving the rate of increase in welfare.

I think given the dramatic nature of these proposals, that may be the best we should do. As I had the discussion with the Senator from New York, transitioning people, making the program a dynamic system is expensive. We are turning a system where you basically have someone behind a computer cranking out checks to people who come and show up and verify certain things, and they get a check or stamp and leave. That is not a lot of time consumed by that person, not a lot of effort involved.

When you are taking that system from a maintenance processing system and turning it into a system where you actually sit across the table from someone and try to figure out what their problems are and how you can help them and what we need to do to change their lives, that takes energy, it takes time, it takes resources.

To suggest that we can change welfare at the time that we can slash it or cut it dramatically, I think would be unwise. We have not done that on this side. In fact, I have not heard a lot of comments on the other side about how we are slashing welfare. The reason is because we are not. Welfare is going to grow fairly dramatically over the next 7 years.

It will be different. It will be different than anything we have ever seen. I think it is worth a try. We may come to the point in time where we look at what has happened with this bill, if it is successful, and I believe it will be, and all the attempts will be made and all the different projects will be tried by the different States, you might find out we get modest gains at best, or we get no gains.

We may have to step back and say, is it worth it? You have some writers in this town who are suggesting that we should just give up. That it is not worth trying any more. It is not worth spending the money. We may be there.

I think it is worth a try of a different way, and what we have suggested here in this bill is a dramatically different way of dealing with this problem. It is truly ending welfare as we know it. Welfare will no longer be the image of someone showing up and receiving a check, but almost go back to the image of the Depression when we had the WPA—can the Senator help me?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. The WPA and PWA.

Mr. SANTORUM. And programs where you saw it more as a dynamic program where people were there to do things, to make a positive contribution to their community.

I am hopeful that is what will result in this. I am very optimistic that we can find, I think, very solid support from the Republican side and a significant number of Democrats to pass this Dole bill or something very similar to it and do it while being very kind, I think compassionate, in the truest sense of the word, compassionate with the people who find themselves involved in this system, and at the same time respectful of the people who work hard and pay taxes to fund the system. I yield the floor.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Carolyn Clark, who is a fellow, be admitted for the duration of the debate on welfare reform.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Nevada, I will be relatively brief. I wanted to analyze the Daschle bill and I wanted to talk about why I think the differences between the Daschle bill and the Dole bill make a difference. I also wanted to talk about some of the weaknesses in the minority leader's bill, or at least raise some questions.

Again, I think there is hardly any comparison when I look at the two. I think—and it is hard when you ask a Senator to yield, and the Senator from Pennsylvania certainly did that—it is difficult to really get into the debate, so let me try and first try and respond to some of what was said.

When I hear Senators come to the floor and talk about how optimistic they are and how they think this will be such a huge change, I sort of think to myself that part of the problem is they are not really passing legislation that is going to affect them or their children.

I think part of the problem, and I will try and stay away from the harshness, I think the point can be made we would do better if we had less hate and more debate. I do not come here to the floor with malice.

But, it does seem to me, Mr. President, that some of my colleagues just

want to ignore some unpleasant facts, some unpleasant realities.

My colleague from Pennsylvania talked about opportunities. Well, we will take the minority leader's bill. If there is an 8 percent officially defined unemployment, there are many more people who are working part-time who are not counted. There are many people who are discouraged workers who have dropped out. If you have that high of an unemployment rate—by the way, in some of our cities it is higher than that, than there is not really an opportunity for a single parent, usually a mother, to find a job, but she gets cut off welfare anyway, regardless of the employment conditions in the community.

How can that be called an opportunity? That is not an opportunity. Of course, part of what is bogus about this reform effort is that if you look at the job opportunity structure and you look at some of the communities where we have large numbers of welfare mothers, the unemployment level is so high, the under-employed level is so high, that, as a matter of fact, there is no evidence whatever that the jobs are going to be there that these women can support their families on.

So in the absence of that evidence, with those kind of high rates, it is hardly unreasonable to say if you cannot obtain the opportunities, the employment opportunities, because they are not there, then we are certainly not going to cut you off of assistance for yourself and your children. That is what this is about. That is really what this is about.

Mr. President, as I look at the Daschle bill on the floor, I do think there are some very significant and positive features about this piece of legislation. I think the main feature, Mr. President, that I want to zero in on has to do with maintaining the commitment to children to make sure that there will be benefits for some of the most vulnerable citizens in this country.

Today at caucus, and my colleague from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, is free if I say this and as he listens it seems that it was too personal and he did not mean for this to be public, I want him to cut me off. He said something that has stayed with me most of this afternoon. Senator MOYNIHAN said the last piece of legislation that President Kennedy signed publicly, was a piece of legislation we all had high hopes for: This was deinstitutionalization.

It made sense as a philosophy. We would take people in the mental hospitals and we would basically move them out and then there would be community-based care. But we never did that. What we wound up with in all too many communities in this country was an ever larger population of homeless people. We see that all over the country.

Then the analysis was there that it was a lack of affordable housing. What

Senator MOYNIHAN said today during the caucus meeting was really the answer to the question: We did it. We passed that legislation. But, we did not follow through on the commitment, and that is what happened.

He then went on to say, and this is exactly how I feel about this debate, that we should not pass a piece of legislation that ends the basic commitment that there will be support there for families, for single parents and children. The support has got to be there, it will not just be block granted to States who can pretty much do what they want to do.

It does not matter whether there is a recession or not or what kind of resources are invested, if we end that kind of commitment, that is a commitment we made as a nation, then I will tell you exactly what is going to happen. It is easy for Senators to tell us this is an experiment. "Gee, we think this is going to do a lot better." It is not them. It is not their families. I will tell you what is going to happen. I will predict it. We will have many more children among the ranks of the homeless. And then we are going to ask ourselves the question: How did that happen?

We did it. That is exactly what the Dole bill does. I do not think it is the intention of the Senators, but that is exactly, that is precisely what the effect of this are going to be.

To the credit of the minority leader, that commitment is maintained in his bill, at least for 5 years. And it is important.

There is a second issue which is, I think, maybe one of the most important features of the Daschle bill, the Work First bill. The Daschle bill provides childcare. That is, if you are going to say to a single parent—almost always a woman; quite often men who should be there with support are not there—you work, and she has small children, what about the children? Where is the commitment of resources to child care? Actually, what we are doing here in the Congress, for those citizens who are watching this debate, is we are cutting investment in child care.

So, we are saying to parents: You go to work. You have small children. That is it. And we do not provide any support for child care. By definition, please remember, in spite of all of the scapegoating and all of the stereotypes, there is not a welfare benefit in this country that is even up to the official definition of poverty, and now we are saying to single parents, almost always a woman: You go to work and we do not invest any resources in child care. The Daschle bill does make that investment.

You cannot have welfare reform—all you have out here right now, at least with the Dole bill, is reverse reform. You are saying to a parent: You go to work. It does not matter if you have small children. We know you are poor. You work, and there are no resources

for child care so you can afford decent child care for your children.

That is antifamily. That is antifamily. I challenge any Senator in here, how would you like it if you were the single parent of low income, told you had to work—and you wanted to work. There is more dignity in work. And you hoped it would be a decent job. There is nothing you would like to do more, but there was no way—let us not kid ourselves. In a lot of these communities where we have large populations of welfare mothers, there are not an abundance of jobs that pay anything near what Senators make, or even middle-income salaries. So we are not going to be talking about, by and large, high-wage jobs. You are told, "You take the job. It does not matter."

And you say, "OK, I want to work in that job, and it is \$6.50 an hour and I will do it and I want to." And then you are told, "By the way, but when it comes to your two children who are under 3, there are no resources for child care. You figure out what to do." And you cannot afford it. That is why many mothers get off welfare and then go right back on.

The minority leader's bill makes a commitment to child care. I do not know how my colleagues on the other side, in all due respect, can deal with that contradiction.

The third feature I think is important is that, in the minority leader's bill, there is the transition so people are not immediately cut off Medicaid. I do not remember the precise provision of the majority leader's bill. I ask the Senator from New York, is there a transition period of time for Medicaid in the Dole bill?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I would say I do not know. There is, of course, a 1-year transition in the current law of the Family Support Act. We will find that out.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Because my understanding is the Daschle bill allows for the currently provided year of transitional Medicaid, plus an extra year of transitional care on a sliding scale basis to ease the transition.

I do not think that in the Packwood-Dole bill, there is such an allowance for that second year of transition.

It seems to me, now we have a situation where we are saying it does not matter what the unemployment level is in your community and, in addition, it does not matter from State to State, what States decide to do. It does not matter whether there is a recession. It does not matter how many children are born into poverty. It does not matter what the population growth is going to be. It does not matter whether or not there is going to be a commitment of resources to child care. By and large, we are ending our commitment to low-income children. And in addition, you have 6 months, that is it, that is the only guarantee you have of being able to keep your Medicaid.

This is called reform? These women and their children are in a worse posi-

tion than when they all started. The Daschle bill is a significant improvement over that.

I say to my colleagues, we should not be so reckless with the lives of children. That is what I do not understand. I have colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, who are friends. I understand the political climate in the country. I understand some of the scapegoating. But I cannot understand how men and women of such good will can be so reckless with the lives of children.

The minority, the Daschle bill, as I understand it, does not block grant food stamps. There is a reason for that. The Senator from New York knows this history well. What happened—and it was President Nixon, as I remember, who really took the final initiative in making sure there was a national standard. Although the Federal Government was going to pay that bill, States got to decide what would be the level of benefits and many States had the level of benefits pegged at an extremely low level. Much to the shame of the United States of America, we saw it on television with documentaries about Hunger USA. We saw children with distended bellies, and we learned about scurvy and rickets and malnutrition and hunger among children in America.

Therefore, President Nixon led the way and we set national standards and we had a national food stamp program. We are a national community. We made a national commitment to children. Now we are going to back away from that? The minority leader's bill does not back away from that commitment, nor should it, Mr. President.

Questions to raise. Maybe my colleague from New York, or colleague from Tennessee, can help me out on this. Again, I raise these questions more in a constructive way. This is just out of intellectual integrity that I want to raise these questions about the minority leader's bill. I cannot cheerlead on everything.

There still is this feature in this legislation that, as I understand it—we can get technical—it is in the Dole bill, it is in the Daschle bill, that now counts LIHEAP benefits as income, low-income energy assistance. So what happens is, for the purpose of calculating food stamp benefits, LIHEAP benefits, low-income energy assistance, gets counted as income and this becomes this classic choice of eat or heat. I do not know why we are doing that. That is the question I raise.

The second question somebody has to ask on the floor of the Senate, I talked about earlier the importance of making sure we do not back away. It is my understanding—and I quote from an Urban Institute study—of all families that have become dependent on welfare systems, about 43 percent receive benefits for less than 24 months. But at any point in time there are many more long-term recipients, for example, more than 75 percent of families on

welfare, at any point in time, are on for more than 60 months.

So if it is an aggregate 5-year period, I have some very serious concerns about what we are doing because I think quite often the pattern is that a mother—by the way, mothers do not need Senators to tell them that they ought to work. Most are—75 percent within 2 years—are off welfare and are working.

Now, the problem is that all too often what happens is, think about this: You go to work, and you try to work out a child care arrangement. But you cannot afford it. Then you go back to welfare. By the way, for the low-income people, the monthly expenses of child care is not like 7 percent. It is 35 percent, or 40 percent of income. Or you go to work again.

When Sheila and I were younger, we did not have much money at all. We had this experience. You find out. It is the most horrifying thing in the world when you leave your child, whom you dearly love, with a child care center and the conditions are awful.

By the way, according to the national reports on the state of child care, we are not investing resources in child care—not just for low income, but for middle income. You get paid more money to work the zoos than you do to take care of children in the United States of America.

Mr. President, so what happens? You are supposed to be there at 5 to pick up your child. You show up at 4, and you find the conditions are awful. So it did not work. Now you are back to welfare. Or, Mr. President, remember, you are a single parent. You get sick or your child gets sick, and your child is sick more than a week. You get laid off work. This happens all the time.

So I will raise three questions and then get a response. I am really very worried about this 5-year period because it seems to me that if, in fact, the Urban Institute is right and more than 75 percent of families on welfare at any point in time will receive welfare for more than 60 months, we are cutting a lot of people off, who are mainly children, Aid to Families With Dependent Children, the children who do not give the big campaign contributions, the children who are not the big players, the children who are not the heavy hitters, the children who do not get on television with their ads. They are the ones that some of these proposals treat so harshly, though I must say again I believe that the minority leader's bill, thank God, is at least a significant improvement over Packwood-Dole.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to have these data at this point?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I would be. I will yield for that.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I am happy to.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senator directly.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. It happens that we presented this data in the debate that was a truncated debate in August. The Senator is exactly right in what he has said. But there is more to say. This was the work of Donna Pavetti at the Urban Institute—the Urban Institute was established under the auspices of President Johnson in the 1960’s—of “distribution of total time on welfare.”

The Senator is absolutely right. About 27 percent of welfare recipients are on for less than 1 year. About 40 percent are on for less than 2 years.

We do not know as much as we should. We have been very poor about gathering data. We, in the last Congress, enacted a Welfare Indicators Act, which I spent 14 years trying to get passed, that will start giving us an annual report on the subject.

So this is data from the Urban Institute. A number of people who go on AFDC are two groups. There is this group that is on for 2 years or less, 40 percent, 41 percent. We know who they are. They are married women whose marriages breakup. They need some time to get their affairs together. And they do. A very refreshing counsel of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corp., when we were drafting the Family Support Act, was to say, do not bother with these good people. The Senator is absolutely correct—at any given time 76 percent, three-quarters, of the persons on welfare have been there more than 5 years.

The Urban Institute also went on to estimate the number of families affected by a 60-month time limit, a 5-year time limit. Between the year 2001 and the year 2005—2001 you can reach out and touch that—1.4 million families will have exceeded the 5 years. By 2005, 10 years from now, 2 million families will have exceeded the 5 years. This assumes the caseload does not grow. That is half the caseload.

You were kind enough to mention what I had said in our caucus today. I said it earlier on the floor. In 10 years time we will wonder where these ragged children came from. Why are they sleeping on grates? Why are they making life miserable for themselves and others? What happened? We will have a city swarming with pauper children, penniless and without residence. You said it could not happen. It happened to the mentally ill. And half the families in 10 years will have been dropped by a 5-year time limit.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator so hugely. And this is the point.

Mr. President, I would ask these tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL TIME ON WELFARE

Time on welfare (in months)	New entrants (percent)	All current recipients at a point in time (percent)
1-12	27.4	4.5
13-24	14.8	4.8
25-36	10.0	4.9
37-48	7.7	5.0
49-60	5.5	4.5
Over 60	34.6	76.3
Mean Duration (in years)	6.10	12.98

Source: Urban Institute, 1995.

NUMBER OF FAMILIES AFFECTED BY A 60-MONTH TIME LIMIT, FY 2001-FY 2005
[in millions]

Fiscal year	Families currently receiving benefits	New entrants	Total families
2001	1.34	.08	1.42
2002	1.41	.24	1.65
2003	1.37	.43	1.80
2004	1.29	.61	1.90
2005	1.19	.77	1.96

Note: This table assumes that the caseload remains at its current level of 4.35 million families headed by an adult over the next 10 years.

Source: Urban Institute, 1995.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the President for allowing me to ask the Senator to yield.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I have more to say, more of a critique. But I think that what the Senator from New York just said was very powerful. I cannot add to that at this time.

I would yield the floor to the Senator from Rhode Island. I ask the Senator from Nevada, will the Senator from Rhode Island then speak?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I believe the Senator from Rhode Island was told he would be in sequence after Senator WELLSTONE, and that our good friend from Nevada knows that. We look forward to our most distinguished, revered colleague.

Mr. PELL. I thank my colleagues and my friends, one and the same.

I am very glad that the Senate has resumed debating the matter of welfare reform. And I am encouraged that the first few days of this debate—both before the August recess and again today—have been composed largely of thoughtful concerns and constructive suggestions about what can be done to make the current system work better and cost less.

In reviewing the legislation before us, however, we must each decide for ourselves what it is we believe about the current welfare system and how it can best move people from dependency to self-sufficiency, and from poverty to a living wage.

I continue to believe that our welfare system should provide temporary—I emphasize the word temporary—financial assistance to those in need. There are millions of people who fall on hard times; losing a job, getting divorced, or becoming widowed should not be a ticket to poverty. Welfare is there largely to help women and children get back on their feet—and to protect them from hunger, homelessness, and desperation in the interim. In this respect, welfare is a compassionate and

needed social program and I support its continued existence.

But there is also no question that the system has, at times, been abused, and that it has been viewed by some welfare recipients as a free ride with no concomitant responsibility. These individuals, whom I believe to be a minority of welfare recipients, have nevertheless prompted understandable wrath in many other Americans who work hard, play by the rules, and do not receive any Government assistance. I understand their anger at what they perceive as a Government handout, and I think there is considerable merit to their claim that this abuse must stop.

In fact, many of us who believe that welfare has a role to play in helping people get a hand up also believe that certain responsibilities go along with Government help. I strongly believe that those welfare recipients who are able to work should work, and that every American should understand that our Nation’s welfare system provides a safety net, and not a way of life.

But with that said, the question arises “how do we get people to work?” Do you simply impose a requirement that they must work to receive benefits or they will no longer receive them? And what do we do if they try to find a job but can’t due to high unemployment, a lack of skills or education, or an inability to find anyone to care for their infant child? Do we simply say that if they do not work they will receive no benefits?

To me, Mr. President, that approach is too harsh and far too unlikely to produce the results we seek. What we want to do, what we need to do, is create a system that moves people off of welfare—for good. A system that gives them the tools they need to find a job, get employed, and stay employed at a living wage. Only then—and perhaps it will take some additional investment by both the Federal Government and the States—can we end the cycle of dependency and poverty that keeps generation after generation on welfare and discouraged from seeking to work.

The Democratic alternative—the Work First bill—addresses many of these issues in a thoughtful and comprehensive way. It fosters the transition from welfare to work by providing health care, and, when needed, access to affordable child care services. And it provides a reasonable period of time for people to move into the workforce.

In fact, the Democratic alternative involves welfare recipients in a full-scale, full-time search for real employment; a job they can be proud to have. Its Work First Employment Block Grant makes one and only one demand on States: an increasing number of their welfare recipients must find a job and keep the job. How the State does that is up to the individual State.

Mr. President, on another matter, I am distressed to see that the Dole bill lumps vocational and adult education

with welfare reform. Simply put, education is not welfare. Vocational and education programs are not, and should not be considered welfare. And while I certainly endorse enthusiastically the idea of a welfare recipient undertaking education as a means of obtaining a good job to move off of welfare, I do not think that this welfare legislation should tinker with existing education or vocational education programs, and shall oppose their inclusion in this legislation. In fact, we have already reported a comprehensive education and training bill from the Labor and Human Resources Committee, which I supported. It is a very important bill, and ought to be considered independently and in its own right.

Mr. President, there are a number of other parts of the Democratic bill that I think are crucial to our effort to reform the welfare system. I strongly believe in ensuring the ability of all who financially qualify to receive welfare, and thus do not support the concept of a limited block grant. Such an approach, adopted by the Dole bill, would leave millions of women and their dependent children with no financial assistance at all. And further, it would prevent them from participating in the new system we hope to create—which will give them the tools to get off of welfare once and for all.

Mr. President, as we undertake the very difficult task of reforming our Nation's welfare system, we may be tempted to seek simple answers to complex questions or be moved by rhetoric rather than fact. In my view, two basic principles should guide us in these discussions: fairness to taxpayers and compassion to those in need. I hope that my colleagues will share this view and spend the time and care necessary to make the right changes, not simply any changes.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. May I just once again say it is a great pleasure to have the opportunity twice in one week to express my great appreciation to the Senator from Rhode Island, who has very cogent remarks on education and carries weight in this Chamber. None has done so much as he in a generation of legislating. He is revered, respected. I hope and trust he will be listened to.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. PELL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I see the majority leader on the floor.

Before the Senator from Rhode Island leaves, may I say a few words in his direction?

Mr. DOLE. I just want to get a unanimous-consent request.

Go ahead.

Mr. REID. Mr. Leader, I will just ask him to stay.

If the Senator from Rhode Island would stay at his desk for a couple minutes.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. I say this has been cleared by the Democratic leader.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur on the Daschle amendment numbered 2282 at 4 p.m. Thursday.

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

Mr. DOLE. That will be tomorrow.

For the information of all Senators, there will be no further votes today. However, Members who wish to debate the Daschle amendment are urged to do so this evening.

Also, Members should be aware, prior to the close of business Thursday, the two leaders will ask consent to limit the remaining amendments in order to the welfare bill to finish the welfare reform bill by Tuesday or Wednesday of next week.

And there will also be after the vote, depending on the vote on the Daschle amendment, additional votes and debate tomorrow evening.

But we are trying to accommodate a number of our friends who want to attend the very historic baseball game tonight in Baltimore to see Cal Ripken, Jr., break the record of Lou Gehrig. So we hope that all those who are able to go will be very cooperative the rest of the week.

I thank the Senator from Nevada.

TRIBUTE TO CLAIBORNE PELL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wanted to take this opportunity, as unprepared as I am, to say a few words about the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

I had been planning the last couple of days to prepare a statement and come to the floor and give a speech that reflected my feelings about the Senator from Rhode Island. But, coincidentally, we are on the floor at the same time, and I want this time to be used while the Senator is on the floor and direct these remarks to him personally.

I cannot recite a great deal about the Senator from Rhode Island. I know the Senator from Rhode Island graduated from Princeton University, one of the premier schools of this country, cum laude. He also attended Columbia University. It is my understanding he has about 50 honorary degrees that have been awarded to him over the years. He served in the U.S. Coast Guard. He is an author.

I often, after having come from the House to the Senate, tried to determine how this Senator from Rhode Island had the ability to communicate in the way he does, in such a gentlemanly way but yet with so much authority and wisdom. Probably the basis for that, more than any other thing, is his service as a member of the U.S. Foreign Service.

In my time in Washington, being a Member of the House and the Senate, if

there is a group of people that I think represent this country better than any other group, it is those people who are in the Foreign Service. Wherever I go, whether it is here in Washington meeting with them, or around the world, I find a group of people who are tremendously underpaid and highly educated and overworked and do a better job than anyone else representing our country as Foreign Service officers. Senator PELL served for 7 years in the U.S. Foreign Service.

I think that is the foundation, the background that has allowed him to do the many things he has done in the way he has done them.

It has been said many times on this floor that it is an honor to be able to serve with a man of CLAIBORNE PELL's ability, and certainly that is true.

Mr. President, it is also true that it is not only an honor to serve with him, but to be associated with him. I was in the Senate dining room with some constituents and, of course, people walk in who are known all over America. But the person sitting with me asked me if they could meet Senator PELL. Why? Because he felt his ability to go to college was made possible as a result of his having obtained a number of Pell grants. I took him over. The only Senator he wanted to meet was CLAIBORNE PELL of Rhode Island, because it was his feeling that he is responsible for his having been able to get a college education.

That is the way, Mr. President, that not only thousands but millions of young Americans would feel if they would direct their attention to Washington; that is, their ability to be educated as a result of the foresight of Senator PELL setting up Pell grants, allowing young people who ordinarily would not have the ability to go to college to be educated.

I, 6 years ago, on more than one occasion, went to Senator PELL and said: "I think that your service is needed here in Washington and we need you very badly."

I am one of many, many people that went to Senator PELL and told him that. I was right; we did need his service for another 6 years, and his service has certainly been as dedicated these past 6 years as it was the prior 24 years.

I appreciate the Senator waiting on the floor to allow me to impart my admiration and respect and love. There is no one in the Senate that deserves more attention and credit than the senior Senator from Rhode Island. As I go through life, there will be no one who has given me more pleasure serving with in any capacity of Government than the Senator from Rhode Island. So on behalf of the Senate and the people of America, I extend my appreciation to you.

Mr. PELL. I thank my colleague and friend for his kind words and appreciate them more than I can say.