The Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, again, for the sake of my colleagues’ schedules, I do not think this will take that much time. I know there are some Senators who want to speak. I think it is a relatively noncontroversial nomination. I certainly do not need 2 hours. I do want to speak on the nomination of Dr. Wade Horn to the position of Assistant Secretary for Family Support at the Department of Health and Human Services.

This is a very important position. Once confirmed for this position, Dr. Horn is going to have authority over the administration of the Federal welfare, child care, child welfare, foster care, and adoption programs. He is going to have considerable influence in the upholding and authorization of the so-called welfare reform legislation.

These are issues that all of us care about. But, as my colleagues know, much of my own background, in addition to teaching, was community organizing. Most of that was with poor people. And much of that was with single-parent families, almost always women, sometimes men. Unfortunately, when marriages dissolve, or when it comes to the responsibility of raising children, it disproportionately falls on the shoulders of women.

I have devoted a lot of time to these issues. I really believe that, for me, if I have a passion, it is around the central idea that every child in our country should have the same opportunity to reach her or his full potential. That is what I believe. I suppose all of us do. Maybe people have different ideas how we realize that goal, but, for me, that is the core value that informs me as a Senator. And I am for everything—public sector, private sector—that makes that more likely, more possible, and I am opposed to whatever makes it less possible.

In my opinion, Dr. Horn’s views about the causes of the circumstances of these families—especially single-parent families, almost always headed by women—as well as a number of his stated proposals as to how to address these circumstances make him not the right choice to serve in this position. I do not think he is the right person for this job.

I hasten to add that I have met with him. I am sure that this discussion in the Senate Chamber is of great interest to Dr. Horn. As I say, I have met with him. He was more than obliging to come the other day. I think we had a very good discussion. And I do not say that as a cliche. He responded in writing to a number of questions I sent to him following the conversation.

I think he feels just as strongly about these issues as I do. I think he would fight against any policy he thought would be harmful to low-income families, especially poor children. I do not want to caricature him. We have an honest but fundamental disagreement about the best way to move families in this country from poverty to self-sufficiency.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and the signatures of more than 90 organizations that oppose this nomination.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:


DEAR SENATOR: We are writing to urge your opposition to the nomination of Wade Horn as Assistant Secretary for Family Support at the Department of Health and Human Services. We ask that you investigate the writings and philosophy of Mr. Horn and that you question him thoroughly when he comes before the Senate Finance Committee for confirmation.

The HHS Assistant Secretary for Family Support, the country’s top family policy post, will be making important decisions and recommendations on many critical public programs which serve predominantly lower-income children and families, including welfare, childcare, child welfare, child support, adoption, foster care, child abuse and domestic violence. The person who holds this job will also influence the Administration’s positions and activities dealing with next year’s authorization of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) programs. This person must be able to understand and promote the needs of ALL families in our society.

Wade Horn wants the government to promote marriage by penalizing families where the parents divorce, separate, or do not marry. He also wants the government to tell unmarried mothers to surrender their children for adoption. There is very little “support” for families in these sentiments.

With Wade Horn as Assistant Secretary for Family Support, we fear a Department of Health and Human Services that will penalize, and promote discrimination against, families headed by a divorced, Separated, or never-married parent or where both parents live in the home but are not married. Horn has written that single parent families should be denied public benefits whose supply is limited—such as public housing, Head Start, and child care—unless all married couples have been served first. Horn has written that cohabiting parent families should be denied any welfare benefits at all, and kept at the end of the waiting list for other benefit programs.

Due to divorce, separation, death, abandonment or their parent’s never-married status, more than half the children growing up today will spend some of their childhood in a single-parent family. An increasing number of children live in two parent families where the parents delay marriage, choose not to marry or are prevented by law from marrying. Horn advocates penalizing all these children.

By supporting Wade Horn’s nomination as Assistant Secretary for Family Support at the Department of Health and Human Services, President Bush’s campaign call to “Leave No Child Behind” rings hollow. If the President’s true intention is to support all of America’s families and children, rather than judging and penalizing many, he should appoint an individual who can work with Congress, our states and our own dedicated organizations to ensure that we will be more—not less—compassionate when dealing with our children and families living at or near poverty.

Sincerely,

Abortion Access Project
ACORN
AIDS Action Committee
Alternatives to Marriage Project
American Ethical Union
Applied Research Center
Arizona Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Association of Reproductive Health Professionals
Boston Coalition of Black Women
Boston Women’s Health Collective
Business and Professional Women/USA
Center for Community Change
Center for Reproductive Law and Policy
Center for Third World Organizing
Center for Women Policy Studies
Center on Families, Parents and Public Policy
Chicago Jobs Council
Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women’s Network
Children’s Foundation
Choice USA
Coalition Against Poverty
Coalition for Ethical Welfare Reform
Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights
Coalition of Labor Union Women
Colorado Center on Law and Policy
Communications Workers of America
Community Voices Heard
Displaced Homemakers Network
Displaced Homemakers Network of New Jersey
Empire State Pride Agenda
EMPOWER
Family Economic Initiative
Family Planning Advocates of New York State
Feminist Majority
Finding Common Ground Project at Columbia University
Grassroots Organizing for Welfare Leadership (GROWL)
Hawaii Coalition for the Prevention of Sexual Assault
Hawaii State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Hesed House
inMotion, Inc.
Institute for Wisconsin’s Future
Iowa Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Jewish Women International
Los Angeles Coalition to End Hunger
Make the Road by Walking
Massachusetts Welfare Rights Union
McAuley Institute
Men for Gender Justice
MICHAELS
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
National Association of Commissions for Women
National Black Women’s Health Project
National Center on Poverty Law

July 25, 2001

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

14435

NOMINATION OF WADE F. HORN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FAMILY SUPPORT, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Wade F. Horn, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, Department of Health and Human Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, again, for the sake of my colleagues’ schedules, I do not think this will take that much time. I know there are some Senators who want to speak. I think it is a relatively noncontroversial nomination. I certainly do not need 2 hours. I do want to speak on the nomination of Dr. Wade Horn to the position of Assistant Secretary for Family Support at the Department of Health and Human Services.

This is a very important position. Once confirmed for this position, Dr. Horn is going to have authority over the administration of the Federal welfare, child care, child welfare, foster care, and adoption programs. He is going to have considerable influence in the upholding and authorization of the so-called welfare reform legislation.

These are issues that all of us care about. But, as my colleagues know, much of my own background, in addition to teaching, was community organizing. Most of that was with poor people. And much of that was with single-parent families, almost always women, sometimes men. Unfortunately, when marriages dissolve, or when it comes to the responsibility of raising children, it disproportionately falls on the shoulders of women.

I have devoted a lot of time to these issues. I really believe that, for me, if I have a passion, it is around the central idea that every child in our country should have the same opportunity to reach her or his full potential. That is what I believe. I suppose all of us do. Maybe people have different ideas how we realize that goal, but, for me, that is the core value that informs me as a Senator. And I am for everything—public sector, private sector—that makes that more likely, more possible, and I am opposed to whatever makes it less possible.

In my opinion, Dr. Horn’s views about the causes of the circumstances of these families—especially single-parent families, almost always headed by women—as well as a number of his stated proposals as to how to address these circumstances make him not the right choice to serve in this position. I do not think he is the right person for this job.

I hasten to add that I have met with him. I am sure that this discussion in
Again, I always put “reform” in quotes. Just as single moms were the focus in 1996, single dads could very well be in the spotlight next year. I do not think that, in itself, is a bad thing. I doubt whether there is anyone among us who would argue against the importance of where fathers fit in with families, about the importance of investing in the needs of low-income men, just as we should be concerned about the needs of low-income women.

Mr. WELLSTONE. A lot of the organizations listed include women and children organizations and, in particular, organizations that do the down-in-the-trenches work dealing with domestic violence. That is what I want to talk about. It does not get discussed enough.

In this disagreement, I want to address, in particular, Dr. Horn’s focus on “marriage promotion and responsible fatherhood policies.” He is a prominent advocate of “marriage promotion and responsible fatherhood.” Some of these ideas are going to be central to the reauthorization of welfare “reform” next year.
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Mr. WELLSTONE. A lot of the organizations listed include women and children organizations and, in particular, organizations that do the down-in-the-trenches work dealing with domestic violence. That is what I want to talk about. It does not get discussed enough.

In this disagreement, I want to address, in particular, Dr. Horn’s focus on “marriage promotion and responsible fatherhood policies.” He is a prominent advocate of “marriage promotion and responsible fatherhood.” Some of these ideas are going to be central to the reauthorization of welfare “reform” next year.

Again, I always put “reform” in quotes. Just as single moms could very well be in the spotlight next year. I do not think that, in itself, is a bad thing. I doubt whether there is anyone among us who would argue against the importance of where fathers fit in with families, about the importance of investing in the needs of low-income men, just as we should be concerned about the needs of low-income women.

Mr. WELLSTONE. A lot of the organizations listed include women and children organizations and, in particular, organizations that do the down-in-the-trenches work dealing with domestic violence. That is what I want to talk about. It does not get discussed enough.

In this disagreement, I want to address, in particular, Dr. Horn’s focus on “marriage promotion and responsible fatherhood policies.” He is a prominent advocate of “marriage promotion and responsible fatherhood.” Some of these ideas are going to be central to the reauthorization of welfare “reform” next year.

Again, I always put “reform” in quotes. Just as single moms could very well be in the spotlight next year. I do not think that, in itself, is a bad thing. I doubt whether there is anyone among us who would argue against the importance of where fathers fit in with families, about the importance of investing in the needs of low-income men, just as we should be concerned about the needs of low-income women.

Mr. WELLSTONE. A lot of the organizations listed include women and children organizations and, in particular, organizations that do the down-in-the-trenches work dealing with domestic violence. That is what I want to talk about. It does not get discussed enough.

In this disagreement, I want to address, in particular, Dr. Horn’s focus on “marriage promotion and responsible fatherhood policies.” He is a prominent advocate of “marriage promotion and responsible fatherhood.” Some of these ideas are going to be central to the reauthorization of welfare “reform” next year.

Again, I always put “reform” in quotes. Just as single moms could very well be in the spotlight next year. I do not think that, in itself, is a bad thing. I doubt whether there is anyone among us who would argue against the importance of where fathers fit in with families, about the importance of investing in the needs of low-income men, just as
at home. You need to marry this man. You need to stay married to this man. What if this man has battered her over and over again? How can so many Senators who supported the Violence Against Women Act, where we finally have begun to address this issue, now not express concern about these kinds of proposals? By the way, if we can afford to give families with children an extra thousand dollars a year, then by what logic can we possibly suggest that other families with children should be made poor simply because their parents are unmarried? Think about it for a moment. Why should a child, no fault of his own or her own, just because that child is the daughter or son, little daughter or son, of a single parent, a family where the parents are not together, financially in places that are marginal. These are rather perverse priorities or incentives built into public policy.

When considering marriage as a solution for poverty, we need to face the reality that domestic against women is a significant cause of women's poverty. Domestic violence makes women poor, and it keeps them poor. The majority of battered women attempt to flee their abusers, but many of them end up on welfare or they end up homeless. Study after study demonstrates that a large proportion of the welfare caseload, consistently between 15 and 25 percent, consists of current victims of serious domestic violence. Between one-half and two-thirds of the women on welfare have suffered domestic violence or abuse at some time in their adult lives. Over 50 percent of homeless women and children cite domestic violence as the reason they are homeless.

Please indicate whether are there differential incentives that are going to make it harder for these women and these children to be able to leave these circumstances. That is what I am saying today. These are my concerns. That is why you have close to 90 organizations—by the way, hardly any of them would have any clout—that have real concerns about this. For these women and children, the cost of freedom and safety has been poverty. Marriage is not the solution to their economic insecurity. That is what I am saying today. These are my concerns.

By the way, do you know that one of the problems is, even if these women leave and they go to shelters—as my colleague from Nevada said earlier today, in many of our States we have more animal shelters than we have shelters for women and children who are battered or abused? Then, if they are in a shelter, there is no affordable housing to go to. As opposed to making proposals, which Dr. Horn has made, that talk about all these bonuses and ways of promoting marriage, why don't we, instead, put the emphasis on responsible fathers?

Don Frazier, who was mayor and a great representative of the House of Representatives, did a lot of that in Minnesota. We should do more. But if we have this kind of money, why don't we put it into affordable housing?

Marriage is not the solution to their economic insecurity. For some of these women—can I say this one time in this Chamber? For some of these women, marriage is not the answer to their economic insecurity, for some of them marriage could even mean death. It will undoubtedly mean economic dependence on the abuser. Many battered women are economically dependent on their abusers. Between one-third and almost 50 percent of abused women, surveyed in five studies, said their partner prevented them from working entirely. In fact, we introduced legislation today—Senator Murray, Senator Dodd, Senator Schumer were a part of this—in which we said—and we had people from the business community and the labor community testify—that part of the problem is a lot of women by leave work, the abuse, the stalker, the abuser, the stalk, comes to work, threatens her, comes into the office and makes a scene, and guess what happens. The employers let the women go. They say we can't take this any longer, and then she loses her job.

Of the 96 percent of women who report they experienced problems due to domestic violence, 70 percent have been harassed at work, 50 percent have lost a day of work a month as a result of abuse, and 25 percent have lost at least 1 job due to domestic violence.

Do you want to put these women in a situation where they have to stay in these marriages? Marriage is not always the answer, colleagues. I have been married 37 years—may be closer to 38 years. It has been the best thing that ever happened to me, God, I will sound corny. I am most religious in my thinking about having met Sheila, I am going to be in a key position. That is what I am worried about with Dr. Horn because he is going to be in a key position.

Here is the way one low-income mother put it to me, and thank God for her wisdom: They can marry off everybody in my neighborhood, but then all we'll have is two poor people married to each other. This is what is really at the heart of the matter. You don't end poverty by simply promoting marriage. In fact, you probably promote more successful
marriages if that is your goal. And do you know what, I think that is our goal. Let me quote as an example that every Senator, or almost every Senator, wants to promote more successful marriages. One of the ways is by ending poverty.

My colleague from Indiana will speak for Dr. Horn. I made it clear that I met him. He cares as much as I do. It is an honest disagreement. I made the argument, I say to Senator BAYH from Indiana—and we will voice vote this with overwhelming support. I needed to come to the floor because some of Dr. Horn’s advocacy of preferential treatment for Head Start and affordable housing for two-parent, married households, and arguments that you want to have bonuses for people to get married and stay married—I made the argument—and this hypocrisy of this, when it comes to violence in homes, is grim and harsh. You don’t want some of these women to be in a position of feeling as if they can’t leave a home where they are being battered and their children are being battered. That is what some of these proposals do.

As to some of his ideas, he said, “I no longer necessarily believe all of this.” But I have said some of these arguments about promoting marriage are fine; I am for it. But for some women this is not the answer.

You don’t want to have financial incentives, or disincentives, if you will, that put women in a position where the choice is, Do I stay in this home where I am being battered, my child can be battered, or my child witnesses this violence, or if I leave then no longer will I get a Head Start benefit, or I will lose my bonus I have received for being in this marriage or I will not be able to get affordable housing.

That is one of the things that concerns me the most. I say to two good colleagues. One of the reasons we have so many of these organizations in the trenches working in domestic violence expressing this concern is because of this hypocrisy of this. Someone needs to say it because Dr. Horn will be in this position, and then we will work with him.

I am all for promoting responsible fatherhood and marriage, but I do not want to do it in such a way that we end up—I met with one Senator, this came—for some of these women, marriage is death. That is right. For some of these women, staying in a marriage means they will lose their lives. I do not want public policy or social policy that makes it more difficult for them to leave these homes which are not safe homes, where they should leave these homes. That is part of what this debate is about.

In just the few minutes I have left, the other part of the argument I want to make is if, in fact, you want to promote successful marriages, especially if you are talking about the low- and moderate-income community, one of the ways to do it is to focus on some of these economic issues. There is a whole world of problems out there, such as unemployment, not having a living-wage job, drug and alcohol addiction, depression and mental illness, poor education, jail time, hunger and homelessness, and, in all due respect, quite often these are the reasons that marriages do break up.

Unless we talk about marriages and responsible fatherhood in the context of also dealing with these very tough problems that rip families apart, I do not think we go very far, and I will insist all of them be considered.

Frankly, it is not necessarily his fault, but I do not hear much from this administration in terms of being willing to invest some of the resources in any number of these different areas.

We had a proposal in Minnesota. I said “had.” It was the Minnesota Family Investment Program. It was a pilot program. Too bad, because from my point of view it clearly was a success. Two former Governors did a great job saying we are going to put a lot of money into childcare, into job training skills development, into making sure these families do not lose their medical care, and we are going to put a lot of money into significant income to disregard when they made more money, they then lost, dollar for dollar, what they were making.

Studies compared former AFDC recipients to those on MFIP and found MFIP individuals were 40 percent more likely to stay married and 50 percent less likely to be divorced after 5 years. There you have it. That is part of what we need to do.

Mr. President, do you know what. That is not what we are doing in a lot of this so-called welfare reform. As a matter of fact, finally I got the Food and Nutrition Service study the other day. I said to them: Tell me what is going on with food stamps. Why have we had a 30-percent-plus decline in food stamp participation post 1996? They said: In some cases, people are working and maker better income. In most cases, they are not, but they do not know they are eligible any longer.

There were cuts in food stamp benefits, massive cuts in benefits to legal immigrants. Frankly, Families USA points out there are some 660,000 people who no longer have medical assistance because of the welfare bill. In too many cases, people have dropped out.

Berkeley and Harvard did a study of the childcare situation and found that many of these kids were in dangerous situations or in front of a TV, and it would not surprise anyone if they came to kindergarten way behind.

I am for promoting families, responsible fatherhood, and I want these children to have as much a chance as other children. The solutions should be known from where the commitment comes.

Marriage is not, and in of itself, the way to address the root causes of poverty, and it is no reliable long-term solution to poverty, particularly poverty among women and children, and, in too many cases, incomes are better than one. It is far better to have two parents in the household, but that fact is not sufficient to support an argument that marriage will lead to an end of family poverty.

There are many reasons that women, more often than men, experience an economic downfall outside of marriage: Discrimination in the labor market; lack of quality, affordable accessible childcare; domestic violence; and I also say to my colleagues—Senator Reid said it earlier—in many States there are more animal shelters than shelters for women who come out of these very dangerous homes.

Moreover, the tragedy of it is, after they get out of these, there is no affordable housing. As a matter of fact, this is going to become a front-burner issue for us because we are not doing anything by way of getting resources back to State and local communities, and it is a huge concern. It is not surprising that the other day there was a report that came out in the Washington Post pointing out the issue really is not poverty, the issue is we have to double the official definition of poverty, which is around $17,000. If you want to be realistic of what it takes for a family to make it, there are many families with incomes under $40,000 who are having a heck of a time making it, and one of the reasons is the cost of housing.

If you do not address these factors that keep women from being economically self-sufficient, then your marriage and family formation advocates are merely proposing to shift the woman’s dependence from the welfare system to marriage. You see what I am saying? There is a missing piece here, I say to Dr. Horn and others.

Some women should not be dependent on their marriage. They should get out of their marriage. They should not be there. They should get out of these homes with their children because if they stay, they are going to be murdered and their children—talk about posttraumatic stress syndrome. What do my colleagues think it would be like to be a little child? I have been with them. I met with some of these families and have seen a mother who has been beaten up over and over, day after day. What do my colleagues think that does to children?

With domestic violence and divorce at the current rates, marriage will never be the sole answer. The solution is not, as Dr. Horn and others suggest, to interfere with the privacy rights of poor women but, rather, let’s focus on economic self-sufficiency. There are women’s economic vulnerability as an opportunity to control their decisions regarding their marriage or, for that matter,
childbearing. Fighting poverty and promoting family well-being will depend on positive Government support, for policies that ensure that low-income parents in their struggle to obtain good jobs so that they can have a decent standard of living, so they can give their children the care they know their children need and deserve. That is what it ought to be about.

I disagree with Dr. Horn on this policy, but colleagues and the public should be further aware that certain recent statements and writings by the nominee signal that basic views which underlie his policy positions I think are a little bit over the top.

I have already talked about how I like him. I say to both colleagues because I know they know him. I will give a couple examples.

Dr. Horn has written, for example, that females raised by single mothers "have a tendency toward early and promiscuous sexual activity." That material was given to me by advocates organizations. That is in direct quotes. From where in the world does that come? Where is the evidence for that?

He recently wrote that males raised by single mothers have "an obsessive need to prove their masculinity." He reported that single mothering or father absence to acts of violence carried out by males, such as the shootings at Columbine High, although, by the way, in that case, the families were intact. These were not single-parent families. This is not an attack on character.

I want Dr. Horn to know he is going to be nominated on a voice vote. He will be supported. That is fine. But I want to be on record saying I don't want him on the floor, I find myself in strong agreement with the Senator and thank him for expressing his concerns. I thank him, before he gets on with his busy schedule, for his championing of the cause of the less fortunate, to express strong support for his dedication, particularly ensuring that women are not placed in abusive situations but, in fact, are protected from abusive men who would do them or their children harm. I express those sentiments before the Senator has to leave.

Mr. WELSTON. I thank the Senator from Indiana for his graciousness. I think the statement he just made, especially dealing with violence in homes, is extremely important. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today simply to support the nomination of Wade Horn to be Assistant Secretary of HHS for Family Support. I am confident that he will do an outstanding job in discharging his duties for all Americans.

I have known Dr. Horn personally since 1996 when I had the privilege to be Governor of our State of holding one of the first conferences in the country on the importance of promoting more responsible fatherhood on the part of many men.

The vast majority of men in our society, when they bring children into the world, do the right thing by supporting children economically, emotionally and economically, and supporting the mother. Regrettably, in the last decade or so, we began the alarming trend of many men walking away from responsibilities, financial and otherwise, with great detriment to the children and the mothers of those children and, indeed, that the society and taxpayers, as well.

Wade Horn worked with us not only in that conference but in fashioning
legislation in the Halls of Congress to do something about this epidemic of fatherlessness that harms our society in so many important ways. He understands that a child growing up without the involvement of a father, emotionally or financially, is five times more likely to live in poverty, twice as likely to be involved with drug or sexual abuse, twice as likely to commit a crime of violence, twice as likely for a young girl to be involved with teen pregnancy, and much more likely to get involved in a variety of situations that will harm a youngster throughout the course of his or her lifetime.

Wade Horn is committed to doing something about this phenomenon, and thereby strengthening families and helping children. He understands this effort to not only good for American children; it is good for taxpayers, as well.

Many of the issues we debate in this Chamber, many of the initiatives we pursue, try to help America really deal with the implications of a culture that are actually deeper underlying problems. If we are going to get at the root causes of the problems that afflict too many of America’s children, we have to deal with them where they begin, the breakdown of the American family, and, in particular, too many men bringing children into the world and walking away, leaving women and taxpayers to try to pick up the pieces by themselves. That is not right. We spend hundreds of billions of dollars each and every year to try to overcome the consequences of irresponsible fathers not living up to their obligations.

Wade Horn understands that if we are going to do right by those kids and do right by our citizens who are picking up the tab, we need to do something about this problem. So he has committed much of his life to doing exactly that.

He also understands that this effort will be good for women. Women are doing heroic work, particularly single mothers, to try to pick up the pieces when men bring kids in the world and walk away.

It is not right that those women should labor without the emotional support and the financial support to which they are entitled. Our responsible fatherhood initiative is designed to help children, help taxpayers, and help women as well.

As I mentioned before our colleague, Senator WELLSTONE, had to leave the floor, we reached out to many women’s organizations to make sure this effort is done right. It is sensitive to the concerns of women who have experienced the horror of being battered or abused by a spouse or male companion. We want to make sure that is not the case; that, in fact, we protect women and children from the consequences of that type of behavior.

Wade Horn has been involved in that effort to make sure we pursue strengthening families to help women and children with legitimate and important concerns and take into account those that are unfortunately all too frequent in society today.

Mr. Horn, when he is confirmed, will be in a position to be intimately involved in the next generation of welfare reform that we will undertake this year and next. Because of his lengthy experience laboring in these vineyards, I think he is ideally suited to this task.

Let me offer a very brief recitation of some of Dr. Horn’s experience. From 1989 to 1993, Dr. Horn was Commissioner for Children, Youth and Families, and Chief of the Children’s Bureau within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Dr. Horn also served as a Presidential appointee to the National Commission on Children from 1990 to 1993, a member of the National Commission on Children’s Bureau. He served as a Presidential appointee to the National Commission on Children’s Bureau. He served as a Commissioner to the U.S. Advisory Board on Welfare Indicators from 1996 to 1997.

Prior to these appointments, Dr. Horn was the director of outpatient psychological services at the Children’s Hospital, National Medical Center here in Washington, DC, and an associate professor of psychiatry and behavioral sciences at George Washington University.

Currently, Dr. Horn is also an adjunct faculty at Georgetown University’s Public Policy Institute, and an affiliate scholar with the Hudson Institute.

Simply put, if I could just summarize, I have known Dr. Horn now for several years. I know of no more decent, more compassionate individual. I know of no one who cares about the cause of helping children more than Wade Horn. I think he is the cause of strengthening America’s families and that is what this really comes down to. Whether it is within the bonds of marriage or outside, this all comes down to the cause of helping children, and in so doing not only helping those little ones but helping society as a whole.

In conclusion, let me just say among his many other attributes, Wade Horn is an author. He authored a book after he was sick, fighting cancer, see his own little girls come to his bedside.

I know, based upon that personal experience and his many years of efforts in the vineyards of good public policy, there is no one who will bring a deeper, more heartfelt conviction to the cause of helping children, helping women, strengthening families, and strengthening America’s families any more than Dr. Horn. I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote in support of his confirmation.

Before, I yield the floor, I would also like to say how much I respect my colleague from Delaware. I thank Senator CARPER for his efforts on behalf of the Responsible Fatherhood Act. Perhaps it is not a coincidence that Senator CARPER and I are both former Governors and have personally been in a position of actually implementing welfare reform, not simply enacting it into law.

For that reason, I salute my dear friend and colleague, Senator CARPER, and thank him for his presence as well today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, let me say while Senator BAYH is still here, we have not only been Senators together, as he said, we have been Governors together. We were also fathers of young boys, his a few years younger than mine.

I believe, as I believe, and certainly as Wade Horn believes, while emphasizing the importance of fathers and fatherhood, we have no intention, no need, no interest in diminishing the importance of the role of mothers. Every child deserves not just one loving, nurturing, caring parent but two. To the extent that we as a society can encourage men to live up to the responsibilities of the children they father and bring into this world, those children will be better for it and so will our country.

I say a special thanks to Senator BAYH for his leadership on this issue. I am delighted to be able to support these efforts.

Senator BAYH has known Wade Horn for a half dozen or so years. So have I. I have known him through our work with the National Governors’ Association where he came from time to time, at our invitation, to speak on fatherhood. We have known him as his role in cohosting the National Summit on Fatherhood, where I have had the opportunity to participate. I have invited him to my home State of Delaware to speak at our Governor’s prayer breakfast, to focus on fatherhood and the importance of fathers in our lives. I also know him, having hosted him in our Governor’s house, having spent time with him and his wife there. I met his children, his daughters. I have some idea, not just what the author is like, not just what the speaker is like, not just what the policymaker is like, but I feel as if I know him a little bit as a human being. I have seen him in the role of devoted husband and loving father as well.

Senator WELLSTONE said, before he finished his remarks—and I appreciated the concerns he expressed—and I think this is a quote, “Dr. Horn will be in this position and we will have the opportunity to work with him.” I hope he is right. I believe Senator WELLSTONE is right in that.

Based on my experience from the last 6 years of knowing Wade Horn and his
family. I believe we will appreciate the opportunity to work with him. I feel confident that some question his nomination will come, in the end, to be glad that he was nominated and that we voted to confirm him.

I know others have gone back and looked at the words that have been attributed to Dr. Horn in the past. They could do that for me or the Presiding Officer or for any of us and have it appear we say things that, taken out of context, we may not have really said or intended to say. I have never heard Wade Horn say that men are not necessary, nor thatwomen remain in an abusive relationship or threatening relationships. I have heard him say that too many men fall short in meeting their obligations to the children they father and to the women who bear those children.

I have never heard Wade Horn disparage single moms for the work that they do in raising children. I have heard him speak of the need for young girls to see, in their own lives, a father who treats his family in a way that this young girl herself would want to be treated by her husband someday. I have heard him say there are young boys in this country who need to see how a man treats his wife so that a young boy will know how to treat his wife someday, when he has grown.

I have never heard Wade Horn say that children raised by single moms routinely turn out badly. I have heard him say that all children deserve to be raised by two loving, caring, nurturing parents, and that includes their fathers.

I have heard it said that as to 16-year-old girls who become pregnant, drop out of school, never marry the father of the children that they bear, 80 percent of them—80 percent of those women and their families will live in poverty in their lifetime. As to the 16-year-old girl who does not become pregnant, does not drop out of school, graduates from school, waits until the age of 20 to have a child and marries the father of that child, there is an 8-percent likelihood that family will live in poverty—80 percent on the one hand, 8 percent on the other hand.

I cannot stand here today and vouch for those numbers. But if they are even close, I think they serve to underscore for us the need for fathers, for men who father children, to take seriously their obligation to the children they father and to the women who bear them.

I believe Wade Horn will serve in this capacity doing a number of good things for the families of our country, men and women, boys and girls. But I think he is going to be a good voice, a recurring voice, one we need to hear, that says: Fathers are not dispensable. They are as important today as they were 100 years ago or 200 years ago. We need to remember that, those of us who are fathers and those of us who someday will be.

I am pleased to rise today in support of this nomination, and I hope it will receive ringing endorsement from this body.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KOHL. Madam President, I rise today to add my voice in support of the nomination of Wade Horn to serve as Assistant Secretary for Family Support at the Department of Health and Human Services.

I have had the pleasure of working with Wade Horn over the past few years on an issue that is vitally important to both of us—making sure that children receive the child support money they are owed. This has been a very positive and productive working experience. Dr. Horn and I share the goal of changing the current child support distribution system, which harms children and families, by compelling the Federal Government to keep their child support money instead of distributing it to the kids who need it. Through his experience, Wade Horn recognizes that fathers pay more child support when they have custody of the children. He will actually receive their money and benefit from it. He understands that the route to responsible fatherhood means we have to remove government-created barriers that actually discourage fathers from paying child support, and create more incentives for fathers to become actively involved in their children’s lives.

I have greatly appreciated Wade Horn’s commitment to changing the child support distribution system. His suggestions, input and advocacy have helped move this issue forward during the past several years, and I look forward to working with him to pass this vital legislation once he is confirmed. Together, I am hopeful that he and Secretary Thompson, who is also a tremendous advocate of child support distribution reform in his own right, will make this a top priority in the Bush Administration so that children get the support they are owed and need.

As President of the National Fatherhood Initiative, Dr. Horn understands that fathers, mothers and children often need support and help to maintain a strong and stable family life. His organization’s goal has been to encourage fathers to become positive role models for their children and become fully involved in their lives. He has worked to encourage greater support services and assistance for low-income fathers so they can actively and responsibly participate in their children’s upbringing. Not only do their children benefit from their support and involvement, but all of society reaps the benefits of having stronger families.

I realize that some have raised concerns about views Dr. Horn has expressed in the past regarding government support for single-parent families. It is my understanding that he has reconsidered many of those views and has committed to serving all families who need support and assistance. I believe it is critical that our nation must address a variety of issues to help working families of all shapes and sizes, and I look forward to working with him on a range of issues important to families—including increasing funding for Child Care, Head Start, and continuing to provide support for families making the transition from welfare to work. These will not be easy tasks, but I am hopeful that Wade Horn will take a thoughtful, balanced approach to addressing these matters. I urge my colleagues to support his nomination.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I am proud to support the nomination of Dr. Wade Horn to be the Assistant Secretary for Dependent Children. It stressed in the past several years, and I look forward to supporting this issue forward during the past several years, and I look forward to working with him to pass this vital legislation once he is confirmed. Together, I am hopeful that he and Secretary Thompson, who is also a tremendous advocate of child support distribution reform in his own right, will make this a top priority in the Bush Administration so that children get the support they are owed and need.

On the Children’s Commission, committed advocates representing both the liberal and conservative policy views came together to learn about child development and we struggled to find bipartisan policy initiatives to help children and their families. Our process was intense, but it led to a bold, bipartisan report full of recommendations to change policy to support children. Throughout that process, I witnessed how Wade Horn was willing to take risks for the right reasons.

It is my pleasure to say that the Children’s Commission report has been a guidebook for my legislative initiatives on children’s policy. While there is much more to do on children’s issues, we are making real progress. The Children’s Commission that Dr. Horn and I supported in 1991 called for a refundable child tax credit and an improved Earned Income Tax Credit. Our report recommended changing the welfare system, then known as Aid to Families with Dependent Children. It stressed the importance of child support enforcement. It called for education reform with a greater emphasis on local schools. And it even had a controversial chapter titled “Creating a Moral Climate for Children,” which challenged public officials, the media, the entertainment industry, and individuals to serve as role models for children.

Many of our recommendations from that time have become public policy, and I continue to build on this foundation.

While Dr. Horn and I do not agree on every issue, we do strongly agree about
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the importance of supporting children and families. We agree on the importance of bipartisanship on children’s issues, especially in the area of child welfare and adoption. We agree about the importance of direct and honest communication and cooperation between Congress and the Department of Health and Human Services.

Because I have worked with Dr. Wade Horn on the Children’s Commission and during his previous position in the first Bush administration, I am confident that he will be a committed leader on children’s issues in this administration. I look forward to working with him, including on the reauthorization of the Safe and Stable Families Program this year.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on the pending business for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I want to speak on behalf of the nominee to be Assistant Secretary for Children and Families at the Department of Health and Human Services, Dr. Wade Horn.

I got to know Dr. Horn while working with him on several fatherhood initiatives. He has been an outstanding leader in the fatherhood movement. And I am confident that he will serve with distinction in the position to which he has been nominated.

Dr. Horn is a dedicated public servant, a distinguished child psychologist, a skilled administrator, and an excellent choice to lead the Administration for Children and Families—a key and critical position for the administration.

Dr. Horn is a highly respected child psychiatrist, with a proven record of both competence and integrity. He has consistently demonstrated his deep commitment to increasing the well-being, strength, and stability of families and children in general, and at-risk children in particular.

It bears mention that Dr. Horn was previously confirmed by the Senate 11 years ago for the position of Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth and Families. As the Commissioner for the Children, Youth and Families Administration, Dr. Horn administered numerous programs serving children and families, including Head Start, foster care and adoption assistance, and Child Abuse and Neglect, runaway and homeless youth shelters, and various anti-drug programs.

Since leaving the Department of Health and Human Services, Dr. Horn has served as the President of the National Fatherhood Initiative—where I really got to know him—a nonpartisan initiative which has drawn the support and involvement of several Senators from both sides of the aisle, including myself, Senator Lieberman, Senator CARPER, and Senator BAYH. As the President of the Fatherhood Initiative, Dr. Horn has been at the forefront of the effort to encourage fathers to become more involved in the lives of their children and families. Their Fatherhood Initiative has conducted both national forums and targeted outreach programs to at-risk families to encourage increased responsibility, affection, support, and involvement of fathers something desperately need in our country. He has also authored regular columns dispensing advice to parents on how to raise healthier, happier, and more secure children, which have helped and encouraged literally thousands of families across the country.

One of the criticisms leveled against Dr. Horn is that he has sat on the board of Marriage Savers, and has been involved in marriage promotion programs. Why this is a criticism, I am not sure. Dr. Horn would never, has never advocated that anyone stay in an abusive marriage. No one believes this, despite inferences to the contrary on the floor of this Senate. What he has done is worked with groups that work with couples who want to strengthen their marriage and their family. And I would think that working towards strengthening marriage in our country—which has, let me note, a divorce rate near 50 percent—would be regarded as a positive qualification, not grounds for criticism.

We have Marriage Savers programs in Kansas. In two counties in the State of Kansas, Marriage Savers programs have helped to reduce divorce rates by over thirty percent in that area. This is a great achievement, not a questionable activity. That Dr. Horn’s involvement with Marriage Savers—a group dedicated to working with individuals who have requested assistance in strengthening their marriage—would somehow be cited as a red flag in Dr. Horn’s record is utterly baffling.

Dr. Horn has never advocated that women stay in abusive situations. He is saying that in marriages where children are involved, it is a good thing for a marriage to try to work through their problems.

With the background, temperament, and record that Dr. Horn has, it is difficult to understand why this nomination should have generated any debate at all. I don’t think that anyone can credibly raise a question about Dr. Horn’s qualifications for the job. I look forward to the confirmation of Dr. Horn to the position of Assistant Secretary for Children and Families at the Department of Health and Human Services, and I wish him the best in this capacity.

Finally, I note that this is an extraordinarily qualified nominee to this position. He is a person who has worked in this field virtually his entire life, who has worked successfully in this field and in an area of endeavor in which we need a lot of help. Our children and families are suffering in this country. Dr. Horn has worked himself, personally and directly, to put families back together. That is something we should be applauding, not questioning or condemning.

I strongly support the nomination of Dr. Wade Horn to this position within the Department of Health and Human Services.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator WELLSTONE, I yield back his time on the Horn nomination. Madam President, is there further time on the other side?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, under the direction and authority of the majority leader, that we move, pursuant to an order entered on July 21, to the Barreto nomination, for the Small Business Administration.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, under the direction and authority of the majority leader, that we move, pursuant to an order entered on July 21, to the Barreto nomination, for the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, under the direction and authority of the majority leader, that we move, pursuant to an order entered on July 21, to the Barreto nomination, for the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, under the direction and authority of the majority leader, that we move, pursuant to an order entered on July 21, to the Barreto nomination, for the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?
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The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector V. Barreto, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.