

## QUALITY CHILD CARE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, in responding to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, as also addressed by the Senator from Connecticut, let me state that I share the goal of seeking ways to provide quality child care. This is something that I have supported, have worked on with the Senators. Clearly, as we are looking particularly at welfare reform, we are going to have increasing need for child care. We all want that to be quality child care.

The goal that I had when we worked on the ABC bill several years ago was to make sure that the options available to parents for child care were not limited in any particular way. I was concerned about certification requirements. I was concerned about quality standard requirements because, clearly, at that time, and it is still the case today, the choice of the majority of parents relative to child care for their children is not a child care center but taking care of that child in the home, often by a neighbor, by a friend, by a relative, placing their child in a family child care situation, whether it is a church or a home or some other entity.

Several Senators on this floor have talked in the welfare debate about training welfare mothers in projects or allowing them to be child care providers as other people under welfare will be seeking work. All that makes a great deal of sense. My concern with the Jeffords amendment is that it gives preferential treatment to just one choice, and therefore places those other forms of child care at a disadvantage. It doesn't take away options, I concede that, but it does place them at a disadvantage because you are biasing the choice.

Now, it is a worthy goal to attempt to encourage a better quality care. But, of course, every time we get into this debate and discussion, it is always the State that defines what the quality care is, and the concern is that what is quality care to a State agency or a State bureaucracy is not the same standards of quality care that a parent might choose for their child.

In a sense we are getting back to the same argument as we had before, and that is who is in a better position to determine what is best for the child in the interest of the child. Is it the parent who is in a better position to determine what their child needs in terms of child care and what the quality of that care is, or is a Government entity in a better position, or a piece of legislation able to describe what a better quality child care would be?

So in this provision we are giving a preferential treatment to only one kind of child care, and that is child care selected by less than a majority of parents who place their children in child care. The latest figures I have are that 32.9 percent of parents place their children with relatives for child care, and those parents will not qualify, necessarily qualify for a bonus. They may

not have the education, meet the educational criteria. They might not meet what the State determines as the quality criteria for their child, but as a parent I can tell you I would much rather place my child with a relative than I would with a child care center.

Mr. DODD. Will my colleague yield for a second?

Mr. COATS. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. DODD. We are very sensitive to these concerns, as my colleague has raised these issue on numerous occasions. I should have stated at the outset that the Senator from Indiana chairs the Subcommittee on Children and Families, on which I have been proud to serve as ranking member. He has been instrumental for so many years in helping children and families. I hold him in high regard on this issue.

If I can read this briefly from the amendment for my colleague from Indiana—the terms credentialing and accreditation are used to refer to formal credentialing and accreditation processes by a private nonprofit or public entity that is State recognized (minimum requirements: age-appropriate health and safety standards, age-appropriate developmental and educational activities as an integral part of the program, outside monitoring of the program/individual accreditation/credentialing instruments based on peer-validated research programs/facilities meet any applicable state and local licensing requirements, and on-going staff development/training which includes related skills testing). There are several organizations and a few states that currently provide accreditation and/or credentialing for early childhood development programs, child care and child care providers.

That language was drafted with help by religious and non-profit groups. We specifically provide that they may create standards. We have really gotten away from the notion that standards must be set at the Federal level. Centers and providers certified and accredited by private nonprofits would qualify for the tax credit.

Mr. COATS. But the Senator would agree, would he not, that it does provide a preference that is not available to many providers of child care that might be perfectly acceptable providers of child care for the children of those parents?

Mr. DODD. I do not disagree. There is an incentive. You still get the credit for using a non-accredited provider, but you simply get a larger one if you use one that has been accredited or certified. Our goal here is to try and get standards up for all child care setting, whether a home-based care program, a church-based care program, or a public setting.

I am not arguing that a parent or a grandparent can't provide terrific child care. But, we just want to make sure that at least we are encouraging quality standards, whether State established or private nonprofit standards,

to increase the opportunity for that child to get the proper kind of care.

Mr. COATS. I understand the motivation. My concern is that there will be a large number of child care providers who will not meet those standards, will be put in a position that is less preferential than those who do meet the standards, and yet the standards might not necessarily be what the parent determines to be the best care and the best nurturing for that particular child.

For instance, let us say a child care provider does not read, cannot read. Would that person ever be able to qualify for the standards? Probably not, because we are talking about a developing child. Yet, if the Senator had the privilege, as I and many of us did, of attending the national prayer breakfast this year, Dr. Ben Carson, head of neurosurgery at Johns Hopkins University, one of the world's foremost neurosurgeons, was raised by a mother who could not read. After I saw what product came out of that child rearing, I would want my child raised by his mother. Yet, obviously, the Senator's bill would not take away that choice, but clearly that individual would not qualify, with those standards, for the preference given under the Jeffords amendment.

You used the words "nurturing" and "caring." Nurturing and caring, as we learned in our hearing on development of the brain and other hearings on child care, is the most important aspect of early child care. It is not flash cards, it is not introducing kids to computers, it is the one-on-one bonds that are formed. Yet, we are putting those people at a different level. We are saying they really don't qualify for the higher accountability standards because they have not had the training, they have not had the education, they have not met the standards of whatever group sets those standards.

I am simply saying I think the parents ought to set the standards. I think the parents ought to determine what is in the best interests of the child without a bias against someone who they deem is best in favor of someone who happens to meet the standard set by a particular group.

It is a dilemma. I understand what the Senators are trying to do because that is a goal I think we ought to work toward. But I think it does so by sending a message that this level of child care that meets the standards is better for your child than the determination that you might make in terms of having a relative, of having a neighbor, of having someone down the street who doesn't necessarily qualify. That is my concern.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COATS. I will be happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. JEFFORDS. There is nothing the Senator says that we disagree with. But if you take a look at the studies that give you an idea of children who

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

#### TAXING SEVERANCE PAY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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