

emotional, and cognitive development. It is a vital program and its reauthorization is of the utmost importance.

We did not draft this reauthorization in a vacuum. We held three public hearings in the Subcommittee on Children and Families, and we worked closely with all members, Democrat and Republican, of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. We also asked for input and recommendations from folks on the ground since we know that parents, child care providers, and early learning and developmental experts, know best how this program works and how it can be improved. It is my hope that the bill we're introducing today represents all of the good ideas that have been brought to us throughout this process.

It is noteworthy that the CCDBG program has not been reauthorized since 1996. The last time we reauthorized CCDBG was during welfare reform. At that time, the program was envisioned solely as a workforce aid—something to help moms and dads get back to work or school. This was, and remains, an important goal, but we have learned a lot since 1996. We know that child care can, and should, be constructed in such a way that benefits both the parent and the child: it should allow parents to go to work or school, but it should also give kids the building blocks to be successful in their lives.

What we know today, that we didn't 17 years ago, is that the most rapid period of development for the brain happens in the first 5 years of life. That is why it is so imperative that we ensure our children are in high-quality child care programs. While important, it is not enough to simply ensure that kids have someplace to go. We must also ensure that they go someplace that is safe, that nurtures their development, that challenges their mind, and that prepares them for school.

The current program is outdated. It does not go far enough in promoting and supporting high-quality child care programs. It does not do enough to safeguard the health and safety of children. It does not always ensure that children have continuity of care, nor does it provide sufficient protections for working families when their employment situations change. It does not focus enough on infant and toddler care. It does not require mandatory background checks for child care providers in this program.

So, today we are introducing a bill that makes needed changes to address shortcomings in current law.

Our bill requires States to devote more of their funding to quality initiatives, such as: training, professional development, and professional advancement of the child care workforce, supporting early learning guidelines, developing and implementing quality rating systems for providers, and improving the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers.

Our bill says that CCDBG providers must meet certain health and safety

requirements related to prevention and control of infectious diseases, first aid and CPR, child abuse prevention, administration of medication, prevention of and response to emergencies due to food allergies, prevention of sudden infant death syndrome and shaken baby syndrome, building and physical premises safety, and emergency response planning.

Our bill gives families more stability in the CCDBG program. It ensures that children in the program can get care for at least a year, even if their parent sees a change in their working status or income.

Our bill works to improve early childhood care by requiring States to spend a certain portion of their funding on infant and toddler quality initiatives. The bill requires States to develop and implement plans to increase the supply and quality of care for infants and toddlers, as well as children with disabilities and children receiving care during non-traditional work hours.

And our bill requires mandatory background checks for child care providers in the CCDBG program.

At the outset, I would like to say that most child care providers I have met and spoken with are wonderful, caring people committed to ensuring that the children in their care are safe and happy. This proposal is not meant to insinuate anything negative about our child care workforce.

Instead, it is simply meant to ensure that we are doing our due diligence to ensure that the adults entrusted with our children's day-to-day care are not murderers, child molesters, kidnapers, arsonists, drug dealers, or rapists. Background checks are required for many jobs and I believe they should be required for child care providers.

Every working parent with children, no matter their income level, worries about child care. What's affordable? What's accessible? Will my child be safe? Where can I get the very best care for my kid? The CCDBG program is supposed to give parents peace of mind. And for many families over many years, it has. But we can and should be doing more to improve child care for children, parents, and providers alike. It is long past time to revitalize, refresh, and reform this vitally important program.

Again, I would like to thank Senator BURR, Chairman HARKIN, Ranking Member ALEXANDER, and all members of the Senate HELP Committee for their hard work on this bipartisan proposal. It is my hope that we can move swiftly to get this bill passed out of House and Senate and onto the President's desk.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1144. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1145. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1146. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1147. Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1148. Mr. COWAN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1149. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1150. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1151. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KING, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1152. Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1153. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1154. Ms. STABENOW (for Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 588, to provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

SA 1155. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 1144.** Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, insert the following:

#### SEC. 12. TRANSPORT AND DISPENSING OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES IN THE USUAL COURSE OF VETERINARY PRACTICE.

Section 302(e) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(e)” and inserting “(e)(1)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a registrant who is a veterinarian shall not be required to have a separate registration in order to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice at a site other than the registrant's registered principal place of business or professional practice, so long as the site of transporting and dispensing is located in a State where the veterinarian is licensed to practice veterinary medicine and is not a principal place of business or professional practice.”.

**SA 1145.** Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize