Elizabeth Hanford Dole (1936–), first woman Secretary of Transportation; Secretary of Labor; President of the American Red Cross.

Anne Dallas Dudley (1876–1955), key leader in passage of the nineteenth amendment, giving women the right to vote; Tennessee suffrage and political leader.

Mary Baker Eddy (1821–1910), the first American woman to found a worldwide religion, the Church of Christ, Scientist (Christian Science).

Ella Fitzgerald (1917–), singer.

Margaret Fuller (1810–1850), author, feminist, Transcendentalist leader, and teacher.

Matilda Joslyn Gage (1826–1898), feminist, suffrage leader and author.

Lillian Moller Gilbreth (1878–1972), industrial engineer and motion study expert whose ideas improved industry and the home.

Nannerl O. Keohane (1940–), political scientist and educator; first woman president of Duke University; first woman to head a major women's college (Wellesley) and research university.

Maggie Kuhn (1905–1995), founder of the Gray Panthers.

Sandra Day O'Connor (1930–), the fist woman Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Josephine St. Pierre Ruffin (1842–1924), leader and organizer of Black women's organizations; Abolitionist and anti-lynching crusader.

Patricia Schroeder (1940–), congresswoman who has pioneered passage of legislation helping women and families.

Hannah Greenebaum Solomon (1858–1942), founder of the National Council of Jewish Women.

PROVIDING FOR SEVERANCE PAY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 172, submitted earlier today by Senator DOLE.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 172) providing for severance pay.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be considered and agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The resolution reads as follows:

S. RES. 172

Resolved, That (a) an individual who is an employee in the office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate who was an employee in that office for at least 183 days (whether or not service was continuous) during fiscal year 1995, and whose service in that office is terminated on or after the date this resolution is agreed to, but prior to October 1, 1995, shall be entitled to one lump sum payment consisting of severance pay in the amount equal to 2 months of the individual's basic pay at the rate in effect on September 1, 1995.

(b) The Secretary of the Senate shall make payments under this resolution from funds appropriated for fiscal year 1995 from the appropriation account ''Salaries, Officers and Employees'' for salaries of officers and employees in the office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

(c) A payment may be made under this resolution only upon certification to the Disbursing Office by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate of the individual's eligibility for the payment.

(d) In the event of the death of an individual who is entitled to payment under this resolution, any such payment that is unpaid shall be paid to the widow or widower of the individual or, if there is no widow or widower of such deceased individual, to the heirs at law or next of kin of such deceased individual.

(e) A payment under this resolution shall not be treated as compensation for purposes of any provision of title 5, United States Code, or of any other law relating to benefits accruing from employment by the United States, and the period of entitlement to such pay shall not be treated as a period of employment for purposes of any such provision or law.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators LEVIN, KERREY, and KENNEDY.

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

THE LEVIN-DOLE MODIFICATION OF THE WELFARE REFORM BILL

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, yesterday I offered an amendment on the welfare reform bill to strengthen the work requirement in that bill. I have long believed that work requirements should be clear and should be strong and should be applied promptly. Able-bodied welfare recipients who are not in school or in job training should work—period. My amendment required that able-bodied individuals either be in job training, in school, or working in private sector jobs within 6 months of receipt of benefits, or else be offered and be required to accept community service employment. This requirement would be phased in over 3 years in order to give States an opportunity to adjust administratively.

This was a strengthening provision that was added relative to work and, while States are given the option to opt out of this particular requirement by notification to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, I hope and would expect that pressure from the American people, who overwhelmingly support strong work requirements, will convince their States to enforce this provision and not opt out. Senator DOLE, the bill's sponsor, accepted the principle and the goals of my amendment and it was adopted by a voice vote.

A few moments ago, on behalf of myself and Senator DOLE, a modification was sent to the desk and was adopted by voice vote. This modification to my earlier amendment will strengthen the amendment by requiring that work requirements apply to recipients 3 months after they begin to receive benefits instead of 6 months; and this accelerates the requirement by 3 months. That is the maximum. So if somebody is not in school or job training or in a private sector job and is able-bodied, under this requirement States will put in place within the next 3 years a requirement that community service jobs be offered to, and that welfare recipients accept, community service jobs within no more than 3 months of the receipt of their welfare benefit.

This modification of this amendment will also put this requirement into law 1 year sooner, after 2 years rather than 3 years. That also is a strengthening requirement.

The Daschle amendment, which was narrowly defeated last week, contained an even stronger provision which was added as a modification at my request.

Experience has shown we must be more aggressive in requiring recipients to work. As I said earlier, I believe this amendment is a firm step in the right direction.

I make a parliamentary inquiry, just to make sure. The modification I referred to in fact was not only adopted as part of the package, but also I ask whether or not there was a motion to reconsider which was tabled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With regard to the parliamentary inquiry, the Senator will suspend for a moment.

The answer is yes.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

THE DOLE-DASCHLE AGREEMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I support the Dole-Daschle agreement. This modification restores the Federal commitment to child care as an essential step in moving people from welfare to work. It also prevents an unacceptable tradeoff between job training for dislocated workers in the changing economy and workfare for those on welfare unable to find jobs in the private sector.

Provisions on child care help to improve one of the most troubling features of this bill. Rather than end the Federal commitment to child care and put the funds into a general pool, we have reached agreement that a specific allocation of funds to child care is essential if we are serious about moving people from welfare to work.

As a result of this agreement, fewer children will be left home alone and more families will be able to obtain the child care they need in order to take jobs to become self-sufficient.

I am hopeful the progress we have made on this issue will be preserved in conference with the House of Representatives. For welfare reform to be worthy of the name, it must not punish innocent children because they happen to be born poor. It must provide genuine opportunities for their parents to find jobs.

The agreement to drop the job training provisions from the welfare reform package is a major victory for America's workers. We have made good progress on separate legislation to consolidate and reform the existing Federal job training system. That effort will continue on a separate track. And I am optimistic that we can reach bipartisan agreement on this needed, far-reaching reform.

I commend Senator KASSEBAUM for her leadership.

The current agreement enables us to keep faith with America's workers and keep the promises that we have made to dislocated workers. Large numbers of men and women have lost their jobs or have been laid off as a result of international trade agreements, base closings, corporate downsizing, environmental protection, and other economic disruptions. They deserve the chance to pick up the pieces of their lives and start anew, and sensible job training and job education programs can make that possible.

Senator KASSEBAUM and many others on the other side of the aisle have worked closely with us in this effort, and I commend them for their leadership.

I remain deeply troubled by the potential consequences for the most vulnerable in our society—poor children—if this so-called welfare reform bill passes, but these modifications are certainly an improvement. These major amendments on child care and job training have eased some of the most objectionable features of the welfare bill, but I continue to have serious reservations about the remaining provisions.

I commend the leaders on both sides for their leadership shown on this issue.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

THE MEDICARE PRESERVATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to talk, I hope for the Presiding Officer's sake, briefly about the proposal—the general outline of the proposal—made yesterday by the Republican leadership called the Medicare Preservation Act of 1995. The details are not yet available. It is a general outline.

Mr. President, I must say had I given this speech 7 or 8 hours ago, I probably would have been a lot hotter than I am right now. I have cooled down since I watched the video replay of Speaker GINGRICH'S rather remarkable—and I would argue and observe, distasteful—representation of the Democratic view of Medicare.

At one point he said that Democrats are morally bankrupt. That is as if saying we ought to approach the American people about the truth, with the facts, with the courage and with trust, that they have the capacity to take the truth. I agree with that. I believe, in fact, if we are going to have the debate about Medicare that leads to constructive reform, that saves the system—and, by the way, as importantly, slows and fixes the percent of growth of all entitlements as a percentage of our budget—then we are going to have to come together present facts, tell the truth, and have the courage to do so. I do not disagree with Speaker GINGRICH's observation in that regard.

But, as I said, I was somewhat provoked when he said that Democrats are morally bankrupt, and that all we are trying to do is frighten 85-year-olds who are concerned about this program.

Well, Mr. President, 85-year-olds are quite nervous and concerned about what politicians are going to do with their Medicare Program, and I think understandably so. But it is not Democrats that are causing them to be fearful. They are fearful, I would argue, principally because they know something needs to be done, and they are not in the main sufficiently well funded personally to be able to cover the costs of nursing home care or, for that matter, most of the cost of modern health care. And they are nervous. They are fearful. They are no longer able to produce and enjoy income, and, as a consequence, they are extremely vulnerable to all kinds of statements.

So, again, I do not disagree with Speaker GINGRICH and other Republican leaders that were talking yesterday about the need to present facts, the need to present the truth, the need to have courage, and the need to trust the American people that they can handle the truth and the facts presented by politicians.

But, Mr. President—I want to be clear on this—my criticism of the Republican proposal is not that it does too much; I am critical of the Republican proposal because it does not do enough.

Let me emphasis that, Mr. President. I believe that the proposal, the general outline of the proposal, because it sees the problem through a 7-year budget deficit plan—and that is what it is—it sees this Medicare problem through the view of the next 7 years. There is a need to produce a sufficient amount of savings over the next 7 years, and in order to meet the balanced budget targets in the budget resolution, the law now requires that be done. There are instructions for the Finance Committee to produce legislation that will get that done.

There is a recommendation that will probably, all in all, in the end, be considered in reconciliation, unfortunately. But when you look at the problem for the next 7 years, you do not see the full size of the problem.

Indeed, the Medicare Preservation Act of 1995 says that it will preserve the system for current beneficiaries, protect it for future beneficiaries, and strengthen it through reforms that have worked in the private sector.

It may preserve it for current beneficiaries; it may strengthen it through reforms that have worked in the private sector. Both of those appear to be in the general outline. But by no measurement, unless you consider that the future only includes the next 7 years, does this proposal protect it for future beneficiaries. It does not do that. It sees this as a 7-year problem. It does not see it as a problem beyond that 7 years.

The problem that we have with entitlements—if anybody doubts that a Democrat is willing to propose something that solves this problem, former Senator Danforth and I last year, after the conclusion of the entitlement commission recommendation, made proposals that would have fixed this problem long term, that would have fixed not only the Medicare trust funds but would have fixed it so that we do not see health care entitlements as well as other entitlements continuing to grow and erode our entire Federal budget. Mr. President, that is the most important problem.

I think we are closer to consensus on many more things around here than would sometimes meet the eye given the intensity of the political rhetoric. One of the things I believe that Democrats and Republicans now share, at least in a general sense as to what our policies ought to be, is that our policies ought to promote economic growth. We now understand that unless we have gains in productivity, unless we have economic growth, it is rather difficult for us to do anything.

We see it in a recession. If you are in a recession, the revenues are down; you have to cut your budget; you do not have money for roads; you do not have money for schools; you do not have money for health care; you do not have money for retirement.

The source of our revenue, whether it is for retirement or health care or any other program that we fund, is the goods and services that are manufactured and produced by the American people, 117 million people in our economy. If they are productive and they are selling and our economy is growing, that is the source of our revenue. It is the source of Medicare revenue.

The distinguished occupant of the chair knows, not only a gifted surgeon but designated as a lead Senator I believe for the Republicans in coming up with some recommendations, understands that the entire source of revenue for part A comes from a payroll tax. We have a tax on payroll. We also have income taxes that provide currently about 69 percent I believe of the total revenue of part B, the physician services. In both of those cases, we have to have income. People are out there working in the workplace. We tax their wages to generate the money for part A, to pay hospital bills, and we tax their income to pay about 60 percent, or almost 70 percent—it was 75—