

WR - Talking Points

WR 2nd Anniversary 8.4.98

Today, the President will give a progress report on the welfare reform law, which was signed two years ago this month -- and take another historic step to end welfare as we knew it by eliminating the last vestige of the old welfare system, an anti-work, anti-family regulation called the 100-hour rule.

In the last two years, we have seen a genuine revolution in the welfare system, and an explosion of work and responsibility around the country. Today, HHS is releasing the Administration's first annual report to Congress on the progress of the welfare law. The report finds that:

* **Welfare caseloads** have dropped by 3 million, or 27%, since August 1996, to 8.9 million -- the lowest percentage of Americans on welfare since 1969.

* The report includes the best evidence yet that people are **leaving welfare for work**. The report cites new Census Bureau data showing that the rate of individuals on welfare who were working in the following year increased by nearly 30% between 1996 and 1997. The Census found that 1.7 million adults who were on welfare in 1996 were working in 1997.

* The report also shows that instead of the race to the bottom that some critics predicted in 1996, we have seen a race to independence. States are **spending more per person** on welfare to work than they were before the welfare law passed.

These findings are consistent with a recent **NGA report** that showed state spending on child care has increased by more than half, and spending on helping welfare recipients move to work has increased by one third.

But our work is not done. Today, we are announcing **DOL WTW grants** (Alexis).

* The **VP** has updated his report to the President to show that the federal govt has hired over 5700 workers off welfare -- more than halfway to our goal of 10,000 by 2000.

And today we are issuing a regulation that does away with the so-called 100-hour rule.

* For the last 30 years, the old welfare system has said that two-parent families on welfare would lose Medicaid coverage if they worked more than 100 hours in a given month. This only applied to 2-parent families.

* This rule was both anti-work and anti-family. It said if you want health care, you have two choices -- either don't go to work, or don't get married. It said to a father that his children would be better off if he stayed home or walked out than if we went to work.

* In recent years, a number of states got federal waivers to get out of this rule. But in order to protect the Medicaid guarantee for poor children, the welfare reform law locked in eligibility rules from before the law was passed. In other words, anyone on welfare today is eligible for Medicaid if they would have been eligible in July 1996. States could no longer waive the 100-hour rule.

* Today we are putting the 100-hour rule to rest, by enabling any state to set its own rules for Medicaid coverage of 2-parent welfare families. We expect that at least 130,000 people will get coverage as a result.

* It sends the important message that a welfare system that used to undermine work and family now supports marriage and is helping people go to work.

WR -
Talking
Pts

TY to Eli and businesses

- the **most successful start-up** in business history: **5 to 105 to 5000**. 135,000
- when POTUS signed, he challenged business to do its part
 - no longer any question: private sector has risen to the occasion
- NYT and WP stories: Higher retention rates for WR

Recipients and businesses have sparked a revolution

- Today, POTUS will announce: 5.2m (37%). 3.2m since 96 (27%)
 - Highest % ever in 93, now lowest since 1960s
 - Only two years before more than 250,000 -- now that's a typical month

Not just leaving welfare -- going to work

- WTW study on retention
- Census Bureau -- 20% increase in work rates
- State studies -- 50-60 +

Leanne A. Shimabukuro 02/25/99 04:49:37 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP

cc: Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP

Subject: Re: miami murder rate 

Between 1992 and 1997, overall crime in Miami dropped by 23%, with murders down by 20%. Robbery also declined by an impressive 36%. It's enough to put a smile on an AG's face.

POINTS FOR MIAMI WELFARE TO WORK EVENT
February 26, 1999

Tremendous success to date:

- Florida is a leader in moving people from welfare to work -- caseloads have gone down 65% since January 1993 and 54% since August 1996. This is the largest caseload decline among the 10 largest states. [FL leads for both time periods. For 1/93 - 9/98, TX and OH tie for 2nd place at 56% and for 8/96 - 9/98, TX is in 2nd at 47% and OH is in 3rd at 42%. *I'll fax caseload tables*]
- Florida has a strong and impressive commitment to helping families move from welfare to work. In the most recent available data (FY 97) Florida had 28% of its welfare families engaged in work. The FY 97 participant data recently released by HHS shows 75% of those participating in welfare reform were in unsubsidized employment. Others were in various forms of job search and training. *I'll fax the table* [Note: they were one of a few states who moved two-parent families to separate state program so you probably don't want to praise them for their participation rates]

Welfare to Work Grants:

- *I'll fax a sheet* showing all the WtW funds going to Florida. Note grants to Miami-Dade County and Latin Chamber of Commerce grants.

Business involvement:

- Partnership expects to have about 300 Miami businesses signed up by the end of this event
- Two of the founding members of the Welfare to Work Partnership are very active in Miami -- United Airlines [CEO Jerry Greenwald] and Burger King [CEO Dennis Malamatinas]
- In Florida, welfare reform is overseen by business led WAGES boards at the state and local level so businesses are integrally involved in the success of this effort in Florida.
- Miami has used an innovative industry-specific approach where business leaders from key sectors such as aviation and hotel/motel have formed alliances to bring companies from this sector together to get involved in the welfare to work effort. [Bruce, you may want to reference the following that will be mentioned by the speaker from United: United Airlines took the lead to form the Aviation Industry Coalition in South Florida in June 1998 to facilitate employment of welfare to work candidates at Miami International Airport. A group of over 40 airlines

and aviation/airport-related companies committed to creating 700 job openings for welfare hires over the next two years. To date, the Coalition has posted over 600 job openings through the Airport Resource Center - a collaborative effort between the local WAGES coalition, the Florida Dept of Labor and the Aviation Dept--and over 100 former welfare recipients have been placed in jobs.]

Jonathan Tisch from Loews Hotel has been instrumental in a similar hotel/motel alliance. And, the aviation and hotel/motel alliances have shared their approach with the Greater Miami Convention and Visitors Bureau to do something similar in the tourism industry.

- Small business is very active in Miami -- [Bruce, it would be good to say we recognize the key role small business plays in the welfare to work effort and our SBA is working closely with the Welfare to Work Partnership and with thousands of small businesses across the country to ensure they have the information and resources they need to hire and retain former welfare recipients. I believe the regional SBA administrator will be there and we continue to hear concerns from our friends at SBA that they don't get enough credit]
- You might want to highlight WtW and WOTC tax credits among the list of our initiatives - there's a session on how to access these earlier in the day.

Background on TANF spending:

- Not yet released FY 98 spending data shows FL has unobligated balance totaling 44% of TANF grant. The state legislature has required holding virtually all of this money in a rainy day fund (\$250 million of the \$253 million unobligated).

- **Tax Credits for Employers:** The Welfare to Work Tax Credit, enacted in the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, provides a credit equal to 35 percent of the first \$10,000 in wages in the first year of employment, and 50 percent of the first \$10,000 in wages in the second year, to encourage the hiring and retention of long term welfare recipients. This credit complements the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, which provides a credit of up to \$2,400 for the first year of wages for eight groups of job seekers. The President's FY 1999 budget extends these two important tax credits for an additional year.

TY to Eli and businesses

- the **most successful start-up** in business history: **5 to 105 to 5000**. 135,000
- when POTUS signed, he challenged business to do its part
 - no longer any question: private sector has risen to the occasion
- NYT and WP stories: Higher retention rates for WR

Recipients and businesses have sparked a revolution

- Today, POTUS will announce: 5.2m (37%), 3.2m since 96 (27%)
 - Highest % ever in 93, now lowest since 1960s
 - Only two years before more than 250,000 -- now that's a typical month

Not just leaving welfare -- going to work

- WTW study on retention
- Census Bureau -- 20% increase in work rates
- State studies -- 50-60 +

CLINTON-GORE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

REFORMING WELFARE

On August 22, 1996, President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, fulfilling his longtime commitment to 'end welfare as we know it.' As the President said upon signing, "... this legislation provides an historic opportunity to end welfare as we know it and transform our broken welfare system by promoting the fundamental values of work, responsibility, and family."

TRANSFORMING THE BROKEN WELFARE SYSTEM

- **Overhauling the Welfare System with the Personal Responsibility Act:** In 1996, the President signed a bipartisan welfare plan that is dramatically changing the nation's welfare system into one that requires work in exchange for time-limited assistance. The law contains strong work requirements, performance bonuses to reward states for moving welfare recipients into jobs and reducing illegitimacy, state maintenance of effort requirements, comprehensive child support enforcement, and supports for families moving from welfare to work -- including increased funding for child care. State strategies are making a real difference in the success of welfare reform, specifically in job placement, child care and transportation.
- **Law Builds on the Administration's Welfare Reform Strategy:** Even before the Personal Responsibility Act became law, many states were well on their way to changing their welfare programs to jobs programs. By granting Federal waivers, the Clinton Administration allowed 43 states -- more than all previous Administrations combined -- to require work, time-limit assistance, make work pay, improve child support enforcement, and encourage parental responsibility. The vast majority of states have chosen to continue or build on their welfare demonstration projects approved by the Clinton Administration.
- **Welfare Rolls Decline as More Recipients go to Work:** In January 1999, the President released state-by-state data (from September 1998) showing that welfare caseloads are at their lowest level in 30 years and that the welfare rolls have fallen by nearly half since he took office. Since January 1993, 36 states have had caseload declines of more than 40 percent and nationwide the rolls have fallen by 44 percent, from 14.1 million to just below 8 million. This historic decline occurred in response to the Administration's grants of Federal waivers to 43 states, the provisions of the new welfare reform law, and the strong economy. Recent information released by the Department of Health and Human Services also shows that the percentage of welfare recipients working has tripled since 1992, that an estimated 1.5 million people who were on welfare in 1997 were working in 1998, and that all states met the first overall work participation rates required under the welfare reform law.

MOVING PEOPLE FROM WELFARE TO WORK

- **Mobilizing the Business Community:** At the President's urging, the Welfare to Work Partnership was launched in May 1997 to lead the national business effort to hire people from the welfare rolls. Founded with 105 participating businesses, the Partnership grew to 5,000 within one year, and in his 1999 State of the Union address, the President announced that the Partnership now includes over 10,000 businesses who have hired hundreds of thousands of people. In 1997, just 3,200 of these businesses hired 135,000 welfare recipients and the President has challenged them to double their efforts to 270,000 in the next year. The Partnership provides technical assistance and support to businesses around the country, including: a toll-free number, a web site, a quarterly newsletter, and a "Blueprint for Business" hiring manual. The Partnership also published *The Road to Retention*, a report of companies that have found higher retention rates for former welfare recipients for other new hires, and strategies they used to achieve this success.
- **Connecting Small Businesses with New Workers:** The Small Business Administration is addressing the unique and vital role of small businesses who employ over one-half of the private workforce, by helping small businesses throughout the country connect with job training organizations and job-ready welfare recipients. In addition, SBA provides training and assistance to welfare recipients who wish to start their own businesses. SBA provides assistance to businesses through its 1-800-U-ASK-SBA number, as well through its network of small business and women's business centers, one-stop capital shops, district offices, and its home page.
- **Mobilizing Civic, Religious and Non-profit Groups:** The Vice President created the Welfare to Work Coalition to Sustain Success, a coalition of national civic, service, and faith-based groups committed to helping former welfare recipients succeed in the workforce. Working in partnership with public agencies and employers, Coalition members provide mentoring, job training, child care, transportation, and other support to help these new workers with the transition to self sufficiency. Charter members of the Coalition include: Alpha Kappa Alpha, the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, the Baptist Joint Committee, Goodwill, Salvation Army, the United Way, Women's Missionary Union, the YMCA, the YWCA, and other civic and faith-based groups.
- **Doing Our Fair Share with the Federal Government's Hiring Initiative:** Under the Clinton Administration, the Federal workforce is the smallest it has been in thirty years. Yet, this Administration also believes that the Federal government, as the nation's largest employer, must lead by example. The President asked the Vice President to oversee the Federal government's hiring initiative in which Federal agencies have committed to directly hire at least 10,000 welfare recipients in the next four years. Already, the federal government has hired over 9,700 welfare recipients, over 90 percent of its planned hires. As a part of this effort, the White House pledged to hire six welfare recipients and has already exceeded this goal.
- **Funds to Help Move More People from Welfare to Work, with a Focus on Fathers:** Because of the President's leadership, the 1997 Balanced Budget Act included the total

funding requested by the President for the creation of his \$3 billion welfare to work fund. This program helps states and local communities move long-term welfare recipients, and certain non-custodial parents, into lasting, unsubsidized jobs. These funds can be used for job creation, job placement and job retention efforts, including wage subsidies to private employers and other critical post-employment support services. The Department of Labor provides oversight but most of the dollars are placed, through the Private Industry Councils, in the hands of the localities who are on the front lines of the welfare reform effort. In addition, 25 percent of the funds are awarded by the Department of Labor on a competitive basis to support innovative welfare to work projects. The President announced the first round of 49 competitive grants in May, and the Vice President announced the second round of 75 competitive grants in November 1998. In January 1999, the Department of Labor announced the availability of \$240 million in competitive grants for FY 1999. These funds will support innovative local welfare-to-work strategies for noncustodial parents, individuals with limited English proficiency, disabilities, substance abuse problems, or a history of domestic violence.

The President's FY 2000 budget includes \$1 billion for the Welfare-to-Work program to help 200,000 long-term welfare recipients in high-poverty areas move into lasting unsubsidized employment. This is an extension of the two-year \$3 billion Welfare-to-Work program the President secured in the Balanced Budget Act. The initiative, as reauthorized, will provide at least \$150 million to ensure that every state helps fathers fulfill their responsibilities by working, paying child support, and playing a responsible part in their children's lives. Under this proposal, states and communities will use a minimum of 20 percent of their formula funds to provide job placement and job retention assistance to low-income fathers who sign personal responsibility contracts committing them to work and pay child support. This effort will further increase child support collections, which have risen 80 percent since the President took office, from \$8 billion in 1992 to \$14.4 billion in 1998. Remaining funds will go toward assisting long-term welfare recipients with the greatest barriers to employment to move into lasting jobs. The reauthorized program also will double the welfare-to-work funding available for tribes.

- **Tax Credits for Employers:** The Welfare to Work Tax Credit, enacted in the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, provides a credit equal to 35 percent of the first \$10,000 in wages in the first year of employment, and 50 percent of the first \$10,000 in wages in the second year, to encourage the hiring and retention of long term welfare recipients. This credit complements the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, which provides a credit of up to \$2,400 for the first year of wages for eight groups of job seekers. The Omnibus Budget Act includes an extension through June 30, 1999 and the President's FY 2000 budget proposes to extend both credits for an additional year.
- **Welfare-to-Work Housing Vouchers:** In his FY 1999 budget, the President proposed \$283 million for 50,000 new housing vouchers for welfare recipients who need housing assistance to get or keep a job, and Congress approved full funding for this new initiative. Families will use these housing vouchers to move closer to a new job, to reduce a long commute, or to secure more stable housing to eliminate emergencies that keep them from getting to work every day on time. Nearly all of these vouchers will be awarded to communities on a competitive basis, to communities who create cooperative efforts among their housing, welfare and employment agencies to assure the most effective use

of this flexible new tool to help people make the transition from welfare to work. The President's FY 2000 budget provides \$430 million for 75,000 welfare-to-work vouchers, including \$144 million in new funds for 25,000 additional vouchers.

- **Welfare-to-Work Transportation:** One of the biggest barriers facing people who move from welfare to work -- in cities and in rural areas -- is finding transportation to get to jobs, training programs and child care centers. Few welfare recipients own cars. Existing mass transit does not provide adequate links to many suburban jobs at all, or within a reasonable commute time. In addition, many entry level jobs require evening or weekend hours that are poorly served by existing transit routes. To help those on welfare get to work, President Clinton proposed a \$100 million a year welfare to work transportation plan as part of his ISTEA reauthorization bill. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) authorizes \$750 million over five years for the President's initiative and reverse commute grants. Of this amount, \$50 million is guaranteed funding in FY 1999, rising to \$150 million in 2003. The Omnibus Budget Act includes \$75 million for this program in FY 1999 and the Department of Transportation is currently reviewing applications for this first year funding. The President's budget proposes to double funding for FY 2000, bringing it to the full authorized level of \$150 million. The Job Access competitive grants will assist states and localities in developing flexible transportation alternatives, such as van services, for welfare recipients and other low income workers.
- **Eliminating Anti-Work and Anti-Family Rules that Denied Families Health Coverage:** In August 1998, the President eliminated a vestige of the old welfare system by announcing that the Department of Health and Human Services will revise its regulations to allow all states to provide Medicaid coverage to working, two-parent families who meet State income eligibility. Under the old welfare regulations, adults in two-parent families who worked more than 100 hours per month could not receive Medicaid regardless of income level, while there were no such restrictions on single-parent families. Because these regulations provided disincentives to marriage and full-time work, the Administration allowed a number of states to waive this rule. The new regulation eliminates this rule for all States, providing health coverage for more than 130,000 working families to help them stay employed and off welfare.

PROMOTING PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

- **Enforcing Child Support -- 80% Increase in Collections:** The Clinton Administration collected a record \$14.4 billion in child support in 1998 through tougher enforcement, an increase of \$6.4 billion, or 80% since 1992. Not only are collections up, but the number of families that are actually receiving child support has also increased. In 1997, the number of child support cases with collections rose to 4.2 million, an increase of 48% from 2.8 million in 1992. In addition, a new collection system proposed by the President in 1994 and enacted as part of the 1996 welfare reform law located one million delinquent parents in its first nine months of operation. This National Directory of New Hires helps track parents across state lines by enabling child support officials to match records of delinquent parents with wage records from throughout the nation. Approximately one-third of all child support cases involve parents living in different

states. In June 1998, the President signed the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act, a law based on his 1996 proposal for tougher penalties for parents who repeatedly fail to support children living in another state or who flee across state lines to avoid supporting them. This new law creates two new felonies, with penalties of up to two years in prison, for egregious child support evaders who travel across state or country lines to evade child support obligations, or who have an unpaid obligation to a child living in another state that is more than \$10,000 or has remained unpaid for more than two years.

Increasing Parental Responsibility: The President's unprecedented and sustained campaign to ensure parents financially support their children is working. Paternity establishment, often the crucial first step in child support cases, has dramatically increased, due in large part to the in-hospital voluntary paternity establishment program begun in 1994 by the Clinton Administration. In 1997, the number of paternities established or acknowledged rose to a record 1.3 million, two and a half times the 1992 figure of 512,000. In addition to tougher enforcement including a strong partnership with states, President Clinton has taken executive action including: directing the Treasury Department to collect past-due child support from Federal payments including Federal income tax refunds and employee salaries, and taking steps to deny Federal loans to any delinquent parents. The Federal government collected over \$1.1 billion in delinquent child support from federal income tax refunds for tax year 1997, a 70 percent increase since 1992. The welfare reform law contains tough child support measures that President Clinton has long supported including: the national new hire reporting system; streamlined paternity establishment; uniform interstate child support laws; computerized state-wide collections; and tough new penalties. These five measures are projected to increase child support collections by an additional \$24 billion over the next ten years.

- **Breaking the Cycle of Dependency -- Preventing Teen Pregnancy:** Significant components of the President's comprehensive effort to reduce teen pregnancy became law when the President signed the 1996 Personal Responsibility Act. The law requires unmarried minor parents to stay in school and live at home or in a supervised setting; encourages "second chance homes" to provide teen parents with the skills and support they need; and provides \$50 million a year in new funding for state abstinence education activities. Since 1993, the Clinton Administration has supported innovative and promising teen pregnancy prevention strategies, including working with boys and young men on pregnancy prevention strategies. The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, a private nonprofit organization, was formed in response to the President's 1995 State of the Union. In 1997, the President announced the National Strategy to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, mandated in the welfare reform law. The first annual report on this Strategy reported that HHS-supported programs already reach at least 31 percent or 1,470 communities in the United States. Notably, data shows we are making progress in reducing teen pregnancy -- teen births have fallen six years in a row, by 15 percent from 1991 to 1997. And, teen pregnancy rates are at their lowest level in 20 years.

RESTORING FAIRNESS AND PROTECTING THE MOST VULNERABLE

The President made a commitment to fix several provisions in the welfare reform law that had nothing to do with moving people from welfare to work. In 1997, the President fought for and ultimately was successful in ensuring that the Balanced Budget Act protects the most vulnerable. In 1998, the President continued to reverse unfair cuts in benefits to legal immigrants. The Administration's FY 2000 budget would build on this progress by restoring important disability, health, and nutrition benefits to additional categories of legal immigrants, at a cost of \$1.3 billion over five years.

- **Disability and Health:** The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 restored disability and health benefits to 420,000 legal immigrants who were in this country before welfare reform became law (August 22, 1996), at an estimated cost of \$1.5 billion. The Administration's new budget would restore eligibility for SSI and Medicaid to legal immigrants who enter the country after that date if they have been in the U.S. for five years and become disabled after entering the United States. This proposal would cost approximately \$930 million and assist an estimated 54,000 legal immigrants by 2004, about half of whom would be elderly.
- **Nutritional Assistance:** The Agricultural Research Act of 1998 provided Food Stamps for 225,000 legal immigrant children, senior citizens, and people with disabilities who came to the United States by August 22, 1996. The Administration's budget would extend this provision by allowing legal immigrants in the United States on August 22, 1996 who subsequently reach age 65 to be eligible for Food Stamps at cost of \$60 million.
- **Childrens' Health Care and Maternal Care for Pregnant Women:** States currently can provide health coverage to immigrant children who entered the country before August 22, 1996. The President's FY 2000 budget would give states the option to provide health coverage to legal immigrant children who entered the country after August 22, 1996. Under this proposal, states could provide health coverage to those children through Medicaid or their CHIP allotment. The proposal would cost \$220 million and serve approximately 55,000 children by FY 2004. Furthermore, the budget proposes to give states the option to provide Medicaid coverage to legal immigrant women who entered the country after August 22, 1996 and subsequently became pregnant. Such coverage would help reduce the number of high-risk pregnancies, ensure healthier children, and lower the cost of emergency Medicaid deliveries. This proposal would cost \$105 million and serve approximately 23,000 women by FY 2004.
- **Helping People Who Want to Work but Can't Find a Job:** The Balanced Budget Act (BBA), as amended by the Agricultural Research Act, also restored \$1.3 billion in food stamp cuts. The welfare reform law restricted food stamps for able-bodied childless adults to only 3 out of every 36 months, unless they were working. This move ignored the fact that finding a job often takes time. The BBA provided funds for work slots and food stamp benefits to help those who are willing to work but, through no fault of their own, have not yet found employment. In addition, the BBA allows states to exempt up to 15 percent of the food stamp recipients (70,000 individuals monthly) who

would otherwise be denied benefits as a result of the "3 in 36" limit.

CLINTON-GORE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

REFORMING WELFARE

On August 22, 1996, President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, fulfilling his longtime commitment to 'end welfare as we know it.' As the President said upon signing, "... this legislation provides an historic opportunity to end welfare as we know it and transform our broken welfare system by promoting the fundamental values of work, responsibility, and family."

TRANSFORMING THE BROKEN WELFARE SYSTEM

- **Overhauling the Welfare System with the Personal Responsibility Act:** In 1996, the President signed a bipartisan welfare plan that is dramatically changing the nation's welfare system into one that requires work in exchange for time-limited assistance. The law contains strong work requirements, performance bonuses to reward states for moving welfare recipients into jobs and reducing illegitimacy, state maintenance of effort requirements, comprehensive child support enforcement, and supports for families moving from welfare to work -- including increased funding for child care. State strategies are making a real difference in the success of welfare reform, specifically in job placement, child care and transportation.
- **Law Builds on the Administration's Welfare Reform Strategy:** Even before the Personal Responsibility Act became law, many states were well on their way to changing their welfare programs to jobs programs. By granting Federal waivers, the Clinton Administration allowed 43 states -- more than all previous Administrations combined -- to require work, time-limit assistance, make work pay, improve child support enforcement, and encourage parental responsibility. The vast majority of states have chosen to continue or build on their welfare demonstration projects approved by the Clinton Administration.
- **Welfare Rolls Decline as More Recipients go to Work:** In January 1999, the President released state-by-state data (from September 1998) showing that welfare caseloads are at their lowest level in 30 years and that the welfare rolls have fallen by nearly half since he took office. Since January 1993, 36 states have had caseload declines of more than 40 percent and nationwide the rolls have fallen by 44 percent, from 14.1 million to just below 8 million. This historic decline occurred in response to the Administration's grants of Federal waivers to 43 states, the provisions of the new welfare reform law, and the strong economy. Recent information released by the Department of Health and Human Services also shows that the percentage of welfare recipients working has tripled since 1992, that an estimated 1.5 million people who were on welfare in 1997 were working in 1998, and that all states met the first overall work participation rates required under the welfare reform law.

MOVING PEOPLE FROM WELFARE TO WORK

- **Mobilizing the Business Community:** At the President's urging, the Welfare to Work Partnership was launched in May 1997 to lead the national business effort to hire people from the welfare rolls. Founded with 105 participating businesses, the Partnership grew to 5,000 within one year, and in his 1999 State of the Union address, the President announced that the Partnership now includes over 10,000 businesses who have hired hundreds of thousands of people. In 1997, just 3,200 of these businesses hired 135,000 welfare recipients and the President has challenged them to double their efforts to 270,000 in the next year. The Partnership provides technical assistance and support to businesses around the country, including: a toll-free number, a web site, a quarterly newsletter, and a "Blueprint for Business" hiring manual. The Partnership also published *The Road to Retention*, a report of companies that have found higher retention rates for former welfare recipients for other new hires, and strategies they used to achieve this success.
- **Connecting Small Businesses with New Workers:** The Small Business Administration is addressing the unique and vital role of small businesses who employ over one-half of the private workforce, by helping small businesses throughout the country connect with job training organizations and job-ready welfare recipients. In addition, SBA provides training and assistance to welfare recipients who wish to start their own businesses. SBA provides assistance to businesses through its 1-800-U-ASK-SBA number, as well through its network of small business and women's business centers, one-stop capital shops, district offices, and its home page.
- **Mobilizing Civic, Religious and Non-profit Groups:** The Vice President created the Welfare to Work Coalition to Sustain Success, a coalition of national civic, service, and faith-based groups committed to helping former welfare recipients succeed in the workforce. Working in partnership with public agencies and employers, Coalition members provide mentoring, job training, child care, transportation, and other support to help these new workers with the transition to self sufficiency. Charter members of the Coalition include: Alpha Kappa Alpha, the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, the Baptist Joint Committee, Goodwill, Salvation Army, the United Way, Women's Missionary Union, the YMCA, the YWCA, and other civic and faith-based groups.
- **Doing Our Fair Share with the Federal Government's Hiring Initiative:** Under the Clinton Administration, the Federal workforce is the smallest it has been in thirty years. Yet, this Administration also believes that the Federal government, as the nation's largest employer, must lead by example. The President asked the Vice President to oversee the Federal government's hiring initiative in which Federal agencies have committed to directly hire at least 10,000 welfare recipients in the next four years. Already, the federal government has hired over 9,700 welfare recipients, over 90 percent of its planned hires. As a part of this effort, the White House pledged to hire six welfare recipients and has already exceeded this goal.
- **Funds to Help Move More People from Welfare to Work, with a Focus on Fathers:** Because of the President's leadership, the 1997 Balanced Budget Act included the total

funding requested by the President for the creation of his \$3 billion welfare to work fund. This program helps states and local communities move long-term welfare recipients, and certain non-custodial parents, into lasting, unsubsidized jobs. These funds can be used for job creation, job placement and job retention efforts, including wage subsidies to private employers and other critical post-employment support services. The Department of Labor provides oversight but most of the dollars are placed, through the Private Industry Councils, in the hands of the localities who are on the front lines of the welfare reform effort. In addition, 25 percent of the funds are awarded by the Department of Labor on a competitive basis to support innovative welfare to work projects. The President announced the first round of 49 competitive grants in May, and the Vice President announced the second round of 75 competitive grants in November 1998. In January 1999, the Department of Labor announced the availability of \$240 million in competitive grants for FY 1999. These funds will support innovative local welfare-to-work strategies for noncustodial parents, individuals with limited English proficiency, disabilities, substance abuse problems, or a history of domestic violence.

The President's FY 2000 budget includes \$1 billion for the Welfare-to-Work program to help 200,000 long-term welfare recipients in high-poverty areas move into lasting unsubsidized employment. This is an extension of the two-year \$3 billion Welfare-to-Work program the President secured in the Balanced Budget Act. The initiative, as reauthorized, will provide at least \$150 million to ensure that every state helps fathers fulfill their responsibilities by working, paying child support, and playing a responsible part in their children's lives. Under this proposal, states and communities will use a minimum of 20 percent of their formula funds to provide job placement and job retention assistance to low-income fathers who sign personal responsibility contracts committing them to work and pay child support. This effort will further increase child support collections, which have risen 80 percent since the President took office, from \$8 billion in 1992 to \$14.4 billion in 1998. Remaining funds will go toward assisting long-term welfare recipients with the greatest barriers to employment to move into lasting jobs. The reauthorized program also will double the welfare-to-work funding available for tribes.

- **Tax Credits for Employers:** The Welfare to Work Tax Credit, enacted in the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, provides a credit equal to 35 percent of the first \$10,000 in wages in the first year of employment, and 50 percent of the first \$10,000 in wages in the second year, to encourage the hiring and retention of long term welfare recipients. This credit complements the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, which provides a credit of up to \$2,400 for the first year of wages for eight groups of job seekers. The Omnibus Budget Act includes an extension through June 30, 1999 and the President's FY 2000 budget proposes to extend both credits for an additional year.
- **Welfare-to-Work Housing Vouchers:** In his FY 1999 budget, the President proposed \$283 million for 50,000 new housing vouchers for welfare recipients who need housing assistance to get or keep a job, and Congress approved full funding for this new initiative. Families will use these housing vouchers to move closer to a new job, to reduce a long commute, or to secure more stable housing to eliminate emergencies that keep them from getting to work every day on time. Nearly all of these vouchers will be awarded to communities on a competitive basis, to communities who create cooperative efforts among their housing, welfare and employment agencies to assure the most effective use

of this flexible new tool to help people make the transition from welfare to work. The President's FY 2000 budget provides \$430 million for 75,000 welfare-to-work vouchers, including \$144 million in new funds for 25,000 additional vouchers.

- **Welfare-to-Work Transportation:** One of the biggest barriers facing people who move from welfare to work -- in cities and in rural areas -- is finding transportation to get to jobs, training programs and child care centers. Few welfare recipients own cars. Existing mass transit does not provide adequate links to many suburban jobs at all, or within a reasonable commute time. In addition, many entry level jobs require evening or weekend hours that are poorly served by existing transit routes. To help those on welfare get to work, President Clinton proposed a \$100 million a year welfare to work transportation plan as part of his ISTEA reauthorization bill. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) authorizes \$750 million over five years for the President's initiative and reverse commute grants. Of this amount, \$50 million is guaranteed funding in FY 1999, rising to \$150 million in 2003. The Omnibus Budget Act includes \$75 million for this program in FY 1999 and the Department of Transportation is currently reviewing applications for this first year funding. The President's budget proposes to double funding for FY 2000, bringing it to the full authorized level of \$150 million. The Job Access competitive grants will assist states and localities in developing flexible transportation alternatives, such as van services, for welfare recipients and other low income workers.
- **Eliminating Anti-Work and Anti-Family Rules that Denied Families Health Coverage:** In August 1998, the President eliminated a vestige of the old welfare system by announcing that the Department of Health and Human Services will revise its regulations to allow all states to provide Medicaid coverage to working, two-parent families who meet State income eligibility. Under the old welfare regulations, adults in two-parent families who worked more than 100 hours per month could not receive Medicaid regardless of income level, while there were no such restrictions on single-parent families. Because these regulations provided disincentives to marriage and full-time work, the Administration allowed a number of states to waive this rule. The new regulation eliminates this rule for all States, providing health coverage for more than 130,000 working families to help them stay employed and off welfare.

PROMOTING PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

- **Enforcing Child Support -- 80% Increase in Collections:** The Clinton Administration collected a record \$14.4 billion in child support in 1998 through tougher enforcement, an increase of \$6.4 billion, or 80% since 1992. Not only are collections up, but the number of families that are actually receiving child support has also increased. In 1997, the number of child support cases with collections rose to 4.2 million, an increase of 48% from 2.8 million in 1992. In addition, a new collection system proposed by the President in 1994 and enacted as part of the 1996 welfare reform law located one million delinquent parents in its first nine months of operation. This National Directory of New Hires helps track parents across state lines by enabling child support officials to match records of delinquent parents with wage records from throughout the nation. Approximately one-third of all child support cases involve parents living in different

states. In June 1998, the President signed the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act, a law based on his 1996 proposal for tougher penalties for parents who repeatedly fail to support children living in another state or who flee across state lines to avoid supporting them. This new law creates two new felonies, with penalties of up to two years in prison, for egregious child support evaders who travel across state or country lines to evade child support obligations, or who have an unpaid obligation to a child living in another state that is more than \$10,000 or has remained unpaid for more than two years.

Increasing Parental Responsibility: The President's unprecedented and sustained campaign to ensure parents financially support their children is working. Paternity establishment, often the crucial first step in child support cases, has dramatically increased, due in large part to the in-hospital voluntary paternity establishment program begun in 1994 by the Clinton Administration. In 1997, the number of paternities established or acknowledged rose to a record 1.3 million, two and a half times the 1992 figure of 512,000. In addition to tougher enforcement including a strong partnership with states, President Clinton has taken executive action including: directing the Treasury Department to collect past-due child support from Federal payments including Federal income tax refunds and employee salaries, and taking steps to deny Federal loans to any delinquent parents. The Federal government collected over \$1.1 billion in delinquent child support from federal income tax refunds for tax year 1997, a 70 percent increase since 1992. The welfare reform law contains tough child support measures that President Clinton has long supported including: the national new hire reporting system; streamlined paternity establishment; uniform interstate child support laws; computerized state-wide collections; and tough new penalties. These five measures are projected to increase child support collections by an additional \$24 billion over the next ten years.

- **Breaking the Cycle of Dependency -- Preventing Teen Pregnancy:** Significant components of the President's comprehensive effort to reduce teen pregnancy became law when the President signed the 1996 Personal Responsibility Act. The law requires unmarried minor parents to stay in school and live at home or in a supervised setting; encourages "second chance homes" to provide teen parents with the skills and support they need; and provides \$50 million a year in new funding for state abstinence education activities. Since 1993, the Clinton Administration has supported innovative and promising teen pregnancy prevention strategies, including working with boys and young men on pregnancy prevention strategies. The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, a private nonprofit organization, was formed in response to the President's 1995 State of the Union. In 1997, the President announced the National Strategy to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, mandated in the welfare reform law. The first annual report on this Strategy reported that HHS-supported programs already reach at least 31 percent or 1,470 communities in the United States. Notably, data shows we are making progress in reducing teen pregnancy -- teen births have fallen six years in a row, by 15 percent from 1991 to 1997. And, teen pregnancy rates are at their lowest level in 20 years.

RESTORING FAIRNESS AND PROTECTING THE MOST VULNERABLE

The President made a commitment to fix several provisions in the welfare reform law that had nothing to do with moving people from welfare to work. In 1997, the President fought for and ultimately was successful in ensuring that the Balanced Budget Act protects the most vulnerable. In 1998, the President continued to reverse unfair cuts in benefits to legal immigrants. The Administration's FY 2000 budget would build on this progress by restoring important disability, health, and nutrition benefits to additional categories of legal immigrants, at a cost of \$1.3 billion over five years.

- **Disability and Health:** The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 restored disability and health benefits to 420,000 legal immigrants who were in this country before welfare reform became law (August 22, 1996), at an estimated cost of \$11.5 billion. The Administration's new budget would restore eligibility for SSI and Medicaid to legal immigrants who enter the country after that date if they have been in the U.S. for five years and become disabled after entering the United States. This proposal would cost approximately \$930 million and assist an estimated 54,000 legal immigrants by 2004, about half of whom would be elderly.
- **Nutritional Assistance:** The Agricultural Research Act of 1998 provided Food Stamps for 225,000 legal immigrant children, senior citizens, and people with disabilities who came to the United States by August 22, 1996. The Administration's budget would extend this provision by allowing legal immigrants in the United States on August 22, 1996 who subsequently reach age 65 to be eligible for Food Stamps at cost of \$60 million.
- **Childrens' Health Care and Maternal Care for Pregnant Women:** States currently can provide health coverage to immigrant children who entered the country before August 22, 1996. The President's FY 2000 budget would give states the option to provide health coverage to legal immigrant children who entered the country after August 22, 1996. Under this proposal, states could provide health coverage to those children through Medicaid or their CHIP allotment. The proposal would cost \$220 million and serve approximately 55,000 children by FY 2004. Furthermore, the budget proposes to give states the option to provide Medicaid coverage to legal immigrant women who entered the country after August 22, 1996 and subsequently became pregnant. Such coverage would help reduce the number of high-risk pregnancies, ensure healthier children, and lower the cost of emergency Medicaid deliveries. This proposal would cost \$105 million and serve approximately 23,000 women by FY 2004.
- **Helping People Who Want to Work but Can't Find a Job:** The Balanced Budget Act (BBA), as amended by the Agricultural Research Act, also restored \$1.3 billion in food stamp cuts. The welfare reform law restricted food stamps for able-bodied childless adults to only 3 out of every 36 months, unless they were working. This move ignored the fact that finding a job often takes time. The BBA provided funds for work slots and food stamp benefits to help those who are willing to work but, through no fault of their own, have not yet found employment. In addition, the BBA allows states to exempt up to 15 percent of the food stamp recipients (70,000 individuals monthly) who

would otherwise be denied benefits as a result of the "3 in 36" limit.

President Clinton's FY 2000 Budget:
Supporting Working Families and Helping People Move from Welfare to Work

Welfare-to-Work Reauthorization: In 1997, the President insisted that the Balanced Budget Act provide \$1.5 billion a year in FY 1998 and FY 1999 for states and local communities to help move long-term welfare recipients in high poverty areas into jobs and help them succeed in the work force. In order to ensure the success of welfare reform for individuals who face the greatest challenges, the President proposes to reauthorize the Welfare-to-Work program in FY 2000, with several program modifications including a stronger focus on increasing the employment fathers so they can better meet their responsibilities to their children. The President's budget will include \$1 billion for the Welfare-to-Work initiative in FY 2000, of which at least \$150 million will be dedicated to fathers who agree to work, pay child support, and become part of their children's lives again. Remaining funds will go toward assisting long-term welfare recipients with the greatest challenges to employment move into lasting jobs, including doubling the funds available for Native American tribes.

Welfare-to-Work Transportation: A significant barrier facing people who move from welfare to work, in both cities and rural areas, is finding transportation to get to jobs and employment-related services. The President's leadership on this issue helped secure funding through FY 2003 for Job Access grants to assist states and localities in developing flexible transportation alternatives, such as van services, for welfare recipients and other low income workers. The President's budget doubles funding for this initiative, providing \$150 million in FY 2000.

Welfare-to-Work Housing Vouchers: Last year's budget contained \$283 million for 50,000 new housing vouchers for welfare recipients who need housing assistance to get or keep a job. Families will use these housing vouchers to move closer to a new job, to reduce a long commute, or to secure more stable housing to eliminate emergencies that keep them from getting to work every day on time. The FY 2000 budget proposes \$144 million for an additional 25,000 vouchers, increasing the total number of welfare-to-work vouchers by 50 percent to 75,000 and bringing total funding to \$430 million.

Employer Tax Credits: The President's FY 2000 budget extends for one year the Welfare-to-Work and Work Opportunity Tax Credits to encourage more employers to hire welfare recipients and other disadvantaged individuals, at a cost of \$528 million. Both credits are currently set to expire on June 30, 1999. The Welfare-to-Work Tax Credit provides a credit equal to 35 percent of the first \$10,000 in wages for the first year of employment and 50 percent of the first \$10,000 in wages in the second year to encourage the hiring and retention of long-term welfare recipients. The Work Opportunity Tax Credit provides a credit of up to \$2,400 for the first year of wages for eight groups of job seekers.

Child Support Enforcement: Since the President entered office, child support payments have increased 80 percent to a record \$14.4 billion in 1998. Not only are collections up, but the number of families that are receiving child support has also increased. Last June, the President signed legislation making certain egregious child support violations federal felonies. To ensure that federal authorities have the resources available to prosecute under these statutes, the Department of Health and Human Services will establish investigative teams in five regions of the country to identify and investigate cases for prosecution. These sites will serve 17 states plus D.C., which together have 63 percent of the nation's child support cases. Moreover, to ensure U.S. Attorneys have the legal staff necessary to prosecute deadbeat parents, the budget includes

\$34 million over five years, to fund an eightfold increase in the legal support staff dedicated to child support.

Child Care: The President's budget proposes to expand the Child Care and Development Block Grant to help working families struggling to meet the costs of child care. The President's proposal: (1) increases funding for child care subsidies by \$7.5 billion over five years, and these new funds, combined with funds provided in welfare reform, will enable the program to serve an additional 1.15 million children by FY 2004; (2) provides \$3 billion over five years to promote early learning; and (3) provides \$173 million to improve child care quality. Additional funds for subsidies are necessary because millions of families who are eligible for assistance with their child care costs currently do not receive any help: in FY 1997, states provided child care assistance to only 1.25 million of the 10 million low-income children eligible.

The President's budget also proposes to increase the Child Care and Dependent Care Tax Credit which provides tax relief to taxpayers who pay for the care of a child under 13 or a disabled dependent or spouse in order to work. The President's proposal increases the credit for families earning under \$60,000, providing an additional average tax cut of \$354 for these families and eliminating income tax liability for almost all families with incomes below 200% of poverty (\$35,000 for a family of four) that claim the maximum allowable child care expenses. The budget includes \$5 billion over five years to expand the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit for nearly three million working families paying for child care. The President's budget also proposes to enable parents who stay at home with children under one year old to take advantage of the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit by claiming assumed child care expenses of \$500. The President's budget proposal will provide an average tax credit of \$178, at a cost of \$1.3 billion over five years, which will benefit 1.7 million families. The President's plan also includes a new tax credit to businesses that offer child care services to their employees.

Social Services Block Grant: The Budget proposes to fund the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) at its fully authorized level of \$2.38 billion. SSBG provides funding to States to support a wide range of programs including child protection and child welfare, child care, as well as services focused on the needs of the elderly and disabled. The flexibility of this grant permits States to target funds to meet the specific needs in their communities.

Individual Development Accounts: Since 1992, the President has supported the creation of Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) to empower individuals to save for a first home, post-secondary education, or to start a new business. Last year, the President signed into law legislation creating a five-year \$125 million demonstration program and the FY 1999 budget included \$10 million to launch this initiative. The President's budget provides \$20 million for IDAs in FY 2000.

Substance Abuse Treatment: SAMSHA's Targeted Capacity Expansion Grant program provides funds to help communities address emerging substance abuse problems and unmet treatment needs. National estimates show that approximately 20 percent of welfare recipients have a substance abuse problem, and some states who have recently reviewed their welfare caseloads have even higher estimates. Last year, one-third of these competitive grants focused on substance abuse treatment for women with children, including those moving from welfare to work. The President's FY 2000 budget proposes \$110 million for Targeted Capacity Expansion grants, which is double the FY 1999 level of \$55 million and will provide treatment for another 21,000 individuals. The President's budget also funds the SAMSHA Block Grant at \$1.615 billion, \$30 million or 2 percent above the FY 1999 level.

Transitional Medical Assistance: Transitional Medical Assistance (TMA) provides time-limited Medicaid coverage to low-income households whose earnings or child support would otherwise make them ineligible for Medicaid under state Medicaid income eligibility standards. The budget would eliminate some reporting requirements that are burdensome to states and to families, allowing States to check on TMA eligibility through regularly scheduled recertification procedures in the same manner that they otherwise assure ongoing eligibility in the Medicaid program. The budget would also encourage states to use existing options to expand Medicaid coverage to all low-income working families by relieving states of TMA rules if they are otherwise providing coverage to low-income working families.

TANF Contingency Fund: The 1996 welfare reform legislation established a Contingency Fund to assist States in meeting the need for welfare assistance during periods of economic downturn. The President's budget proposes replacing the current capped Contingency Fund with a new uncapped fund that could more effectively respond to state needs in the event of an unforeseen economic downturn.

Restoring Benefits for Legal Immigrants: The Administration's budget continues to build on the progress of the last few years to restore important disability, health and nutrition benefits to legal immigrants, at a cost of \$1.3 billion over five years.

- The budget restores eligibility for SSI and Medicaid to legal immigrants who enter the country after August 22, 1996 if they have been in the U.S. for five years and become disabled after entering the United States. This proposal costs approximately \$930 million and assists an estimated 54,000 by 2004, about half of whom would be elderly.
- The budget also allows elderly legal immigrants who were in the United States by August 22, 1996 to be eligible for Food Stamps at a cost of \$60 million. This provision makes an additional 15,000 legal immigrants eligible in 2004.
- Finally, the President's budget allows states to provide health care benefits to legal immigrant children and pregnant women, who entered the United States after August 22, 1996. Under this provision approximately 55,000 children could be served by FY 2004 at a cost of approximately \$220 million and 23,000 pregnant women could be served at a cost of \$105 million by FY 2004.

English Literacy / Civics Initiative: The President's Budget contains an adult literacy initiative to help states and communities provide expanded access to high quality English language proficiency instruction, linked to practical instruction in civics and life skills including how to navigate the workplace, public education system, and other key institutions in American life. This initiative is designed both to help meet the extraordinary demand for English and civics instruction in immigrant communities and to demonstrate our shared commitment to fully integrate new Americans into our social and civic life. States, community-based organizations, local education agencies, and other non-profits will compete for grants to support English proficiency and civics instruction. With \$70 million, the initiative will be able to provide English language and civics instruction to approximately 150,000 people in FY 2000. Overall, the President's FY 2000 budget contains a \$190 million increase for adult education and family literacy.

Queen Esther Brown is currently a Bus Shelter Enforcement Officer for the Miami Dade Transit Agency and has been employed by the agency for over 11 years. As a former welfare recipient, Ms. Brown found herself the mother of four children and entirely dependent on the welfare system at the age of 22. One day while volunteering at her children's school, Ms. Brown was offered temporary employment. Heartened by the school's confidence in her, Ms. Brown took the position and began the transition from welfare to self-sufficiency. Ms. Brown began her career with the Miami Dade Transit Agency as a Parking Lot Attendant in December 1987 and has since been promoted a number of times. Of her four children, two are in high school while the other two are enrolled in college.

Mary Hooks has been appointed by Governor Jeb Bush to be Secretary of the Florida Department of Labor and Employment Security. As a business owner, past elected official, and now Secretary of the Department of Labor and Employment Security, she is fast earning a national reputation as a role model for women and minorities.

Secretary Hooks brings to the agency a strong background in leadership, commitment, and community involvement. She is continuing the department's goal of "Working to Keep Florida Working", and is dedicated to providing job opportunities for all of Florida's citizens.

Mary Hooks is the owner of M.B. Hooks & Associates, a West Palm Beach insurance agency, specializing in life, group health, disability, and annuities. She is past president of the Palm Beach Association of Life Underwriters. In 1992, she was presented with their Public Service Award for outstanding community service.

Repeatedly honored for her civic commitment, Mary Hooks received the Public Sector Leadership Award from the Executive Women of the Palm Beaches in 1996. As a city commissioner, she helped establish the Minority Business Enterprise and Preference Goals Program. This program helps minorities and women-owned businesses apply and qualify for government contracts.

Secretary Hooks has been married for 30 years to Lee A. Hooks, an educator and chairperson of the Fine Arts Department of the John F. Kennedy Middle Magnet School in Riviera Beach, Florida. They have a son, Brandon, 21, who attends Florida A & M University in Tallahassee.

Whether professional or personal, Secretary Hooks strives to achieve excellence in every aspect of her life. She now leads an agency of 7,000 associates.

George F. Knox is a Shareholder of the law firm of Adorno & Zeder, P.A. Mr. Knox specializes in Public Finance, Land Use and Local Government Law. He served as City Attorney and Director of the Law Department for the City of Miami, Florida from 1976 to 1982.

Mr. Knox has lectured at the Nova University Center for the Study of Law and at the University of Miami School of Law and its School of Business Administration, and served as Assistant Professor of law at the University of Arkansas. He has served as Adjunct Professor at the Florida International University College of Urban and Public Affairs.

Professionally, Mr. Knox is a member of several organizations. He has been a board member of United Way of Dade County since 1990 and a member of the Executive Committee since 1992. Mr. Knox served as 1997 Campaign Co-Chair after ten years in various United Way volunteer fundraising roles. He believes there is no other community wide organization providing more direction and leadership in making Miami a better place for all our citizens to live.

George Knox received a Bachelor of Science degree from Michigan State University in 1966, majoring in Zoology, and his Juris Doctorate from the University of Miami School of Law in 1973.

A Good Start for Welfare Reform

by Bruce Reed

8/18/97

900 words

tel. 202-456-6515

Perhaps nothing in the Clinton Presidency has prompted more division and debate than the new welfare law the President signed a year ago this week. Three Administration staffers resigned in protest; one sold the Atlantic Monthly a cover story on "The Worst Thing Bill Clinton Has Done." One national columnist wrote that giving the President a second term to restore the bill's cuts in immigrant benefits was like giving Jack the Ripper a scholarship to medical school.

A year later, welfare recipients are faring a lot better under the new law than welfare reform critics. A strong economy and aggressive state efforts to move people from welfare to work have helped produce a record drop in welfare caseloads. The percentage of Americans on welfare is the smallest since 1970. This month, the President signed a balanced budget law that restores \$11.5 billion in immigrant benefits, as promised.

The conventional wisdom in elite circles has long been that signing the welfare bill was a cynical, heartless, poll-driven decision. The new law's early success suggests another possibility: that the President did the right thing, for the right reason.

When he signed the welfare law, President Clinton made two predictions that almost no one believed at the time. First, he said the immigrant benefits could be paid for with smaller tax cuts. Asked how he could get that through a Republican Congress, the President said, "It all depends on your priorities." A year later, that's exactly what happened: the President threatened to veto the entire budget agreement if it didn't do right by immigrants, and the same Republicans who had imposed the cuts found the money to fix them -- helping 350,000 elderly and disabled immigrants to be treated fairly.

Before the budget agreement, it was a close call whether the good in the welfare bill outweighed the harm from the immigrant cuts. Now, the budget has not only restored immigrant benefits, it provides work slots so hundreds of thousands of childless adults can now keep their food stamps, tax credits for businesses that hire people off welfare, and \$3 billion to make sure long-term welfare recipients in depressed areas have jobs to go to.

The President's other prediction last August, also widely dismissed at the time, was that states and recipients alike might actually be up to the responsibilities the new law demands.

Critics said that breaking the 61-year-old federal entitlement and turning welfare over to the states would produce a "race to the bottom," with every state rushing to throw poor people into the streets.

It turns out that not every state wants to be Mississippi. No longer able to blame Washington for failure, states are competing to show who can do the best job. Even conservatives seem willing to spend money now that the welfare system is about work. Child care spending is up everywhere, in many states by even more than the new law requires. Illinois increased its child care budget by 96%. Last week, California adopted a bipartisan welfare plan that increases overall welfare spending by \$223 million in the first year, and budgets \$1.8 billion a year for child care and work programs.

In fact, the new law is actually helping states be more generous. Critics had warned that states would have to cut back because they now get a fixed block grant instead of uncapped federal spending that goes up or down with caseload size. Instead, the block grant has proved to be a boon for states and recipients alike. Because the block grant was based on higher caseload levels, states are receiving about 25% more from the federal government than they would under the old law. That's at least \$3 billion a year more that states can spend on moving people from welfare to work -- more than we proposed in the President's original 1994 bill, which Republicans attacked as a budget buster.

But the most impressive rebuttal to last year's dire predictions has come from recipients themselves, who are taking responsibility at a remarkable pace. Prior to the Clinton Administration, the welfare caseload had dropped by more than a quarter million only twice in six decades. Today welfare caseloads, which fell by a record 1.9 million in the President's first three-and-a-half years in office, are on course to have dropped by 2 million more in the year since he signed the law. These people aren't leaving because of time limits, which haven't gone into effect yet. Most of them are leaving on their own to build more self-sufficient lives.

The challenge of welfare reform is far from over. Making the leap from welfare to work is still an enormous personal struggle for everyone who goes through it. We need to do everything we can -- from providing hiring subsidies to making child care and transportation more affordable -- to help more businesses give people that chance and more recipients to take it. We also need to keep an eye on states to make sure they plow any savings from their success right back into putting even more people to work.

But on two points, the first year of this bold experiment leaves little room for debate: The old welfare system based on income maintenance was a dismal failure -- and the new system based on work and responsibility is off to a very good start.

Welfare Reform Talking Points

"I say to those who are on welfare -- and especially to those who have been trapped on welfare for a long time -- for too long our welfare system has undermined the values of family and work instead of supporting them. The Congress and I are near agreement on sweeping welfare reform. We agree on time limits, tough work requirements, and the toughest possible child support enforcement. But I believe we must also provide child care so that mothers who are required to go to work can do so without worrying about what is happening to their children."

State of the Union Address, 1/23/96

We want real reform. President Clinton has repeatedly called for a bipartisan welfare reform bill that's tough on work and responsibility, not tough on children. In his balanced budget plan, the President has proposed a sweeping welfare reform proposal that includes tough work requirements, time-limited assistance, more funding for child care, incentives to reward states for placing people in jobs, tough child support enforcement, and protections for children -- while saving \$40 billion over seven years. The President is determined to enact real, bipartisan welfare reform that is motivated by the urgency of reform rather than an extremist agenda that could hurt children.

A bipartisan step forward. President Clinton vetoed the legislation drafted by the Congressional majority because it lacked adequate child care to enable single parents to work, a performance bonus to reward success, and an adequate contingency fund to protect states -- and because it made deep cuts in help for abused, disabled, and hungry children. By making specific recommendations to improve the bill, the nation's 50 governors have stated, in effect, that the President was right to veto this flawed legislation. The NGA's actions have increased the possibility that Republican and Democrats in Congress will produce a bipartisan bill that gets the job done. However, while we applaud the NGA's contributions, we do have concerns about achieving our common national objectives and maintaining the federal-state partnership necessary to reach them.

The fundamental elements of reform. The President has consistently said that welfare reform is first and foremost about work. That means providing adequate child care to enable recipients to leave welfare for work; rewarding states for placing people in jobs; guaranteeing health care coverage for poor families; requiring states to continue to invest funds in a work-oriented welfare system; and protecting states' and families in the event of economic downturn or population growth. It does not mean using welfare reform as a cover for budget cutting at the expense of our poorest children.

Continuing to work with Congress. The President remains committed to working with Congress and the NGA leadership to enact real welfare reform. There is bipartisan consensus around the country on the fundamental elements of real welfare reform, and it would be a tragedy if this Congress missed the opportunity to achieve it. The Senate's original legislation had strong bipartisan support, and the NGA welfare proposal was another important bipartisan step forward, especially in the areas of child care, the performance bonus, and the contingency fund for states. Congress should build on this bipartisan progress and pass a bill that gets the job done.

We'll still get the job done. Since taking office, the Clinton Administration has given a record 37 states freedom from red tape to reform their own welfare systems -- granting more waivers than the two previous administrations combined. These welfare-to-work programs are making work and responsibility a way of life for more than 10 million people. The President has repeatedly called for bipartisan welfare reform legislation this year. But if Congress fails to send him a bill that gets the priorities right, President Clinton will continue his commitment to ending welfare as we know it -- in each and every state.

Welfare Reform Talking Points March 1996

"I say to those who are on welfare -- and especially to those who have been trapped on welfare for a long time -- for too long our welfare system has undermined the values of family and work instead of supporting them. The Congress and I are near agreement on sweeping welfare reform. We agree on time limits, tough work requirements, and the toughest possible child support enforcement. But I believe we must also provide child care so that mothers who are required to go to work can do so without worrying about what is happening to their children."
State of the Union Address, 1/23/96

We want real reform. President Clinton has repeatedly called for a bipartisan welfare reform bill that's tough on work and responsibility, not tough on children. In his budget, the President has proposed a sweeping welfare reform proposal that would provide time-limited, conditional assistance in return for work; give states new flexibility to design their own approaches to reform; preserve the national commitment to nutrition assistance, foster care, and adoption assistance; strengthen child support enforcement; and protect states' ability to respond to growing caseloads - while saving \$40 billion. The President is determined to enact real, bipartisan welfare reform that is motivated by the urgency of reform rather than a budget plan contrary to America's values.

A bipartisan step forward. The NGA's action was a bipartisan statement that the President was right to veto the flawed legislation passed by Congress -- legislation that did very little to encourage work, and too much that could harm children. The NGA's actions have increased the possibility that Republican and Democrats in Congress will produce a bipartisan bill that gets the job done. However, while we applaud the NGA's contributions, we do have concerns about achieving our common national objectives and maintaining the federal-state partnership necessary to reach them.

The fundamental elements of reform. The President has consistently said that welfare reform is first and foremost about work. That means providing adequate child care to enable recipients to leave welfare for work; rewarding states for placing people in jobs; guaranteeing health care coverage for poor families; requiring states to continue to invest funds in a work-oriented welfare system; and protecting states and families in the event of economic downturn or population growth. It does not mean using welfare reform as a cover for budget cutting at the expense of our poorest children.

Continuing to work with Congress. The President will continue to work with Congress and the NGA leadership, through the overall budget negotiations, to craft a bill that gets the job done. Welfare reform needs to be considered in the context of critical and related issues such as Medicaid and the EITC. There is bipartisan consensus around the country on the fundamental elements of real welfare reform, and it would be a tragedy if this Congress missed the opportunity to achieve it. The NGA welfare proposal represents an important bipartisan step forward, especially in the areas of child care, the performance bonus, and the contingency fund for states.

We'll still get the job done. Since taking office, the Clinton Administration has granted welfare reform waivers to a record 37 states -- more than the two previous Administrations combined. These waivers are making work and responsibility a way of life for more than 10 million people. In addition, we're giving all 50 states the chance to take the fast-track to ending welfare as we know it, by cutting red tape for state reforms that require work, promote parental responsibility, and protect children. The President has repeatedly called for bipartisan welfare reform legislation this year. But if Congress fails to send him a bill that gets the priorities straight, President Clinton will continue his commitment to ending welfare as we know it -- one state at a time.

-3-

WELFARE

- Caseloads fall and state experiments reward work and responsibility.

Under the Clinton Administration, America's welfare system has changed profoundly. The evidence of President Clinton's leadership can be seen in both the evolving debate about national reform and in the positive changes that are now occurring under federally-approved state demonstrations. Welfare caseloads are down while work and training activities among recipients are up. And child support collections have reached a record high.

Waivers: The Clinton Administration has approved 50 state demonstration projects in 35 states, more than all previous administrations combined. In 1995 alone, 28 waivers were granted in 23 states. Currently, some 9 million people, about 70 percent of all AFDC recipients, are in families subject to welfare reform provisions, including strengthened work requirements, tougher child support enforcement and time limits.

Self-Sufficiency: Due in part to both the Administration's emphasis on welfare reform and its policies to strengthen the economy, welfare caseloads are down by 5 percent since President Clinton took office in January 1993. This represents 700,000 fewer recipients who receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) each month. The number of adult recipients participating in work and training activities is up dramatically since the President took office. In the fiscal year before the President took office (FY 1992), a monthly average of 510,000 welfare recipients participated in the Jobs Opportunities and Basic Skills Training program (JOBS). In the latest year for which data are available (FY 1994), a monthly average of 600,000 recipients participated in JOBS, an increase of nearly 18 percent.

Child Support Enforcement: Since the Administration took office, our partnership with states has yielded unprecedented financial support for children. From 1992 to 1995, collections have grown by nearly 40 percent and paternity establishments have risen by more than 40 percent. Preliminary data for FY 1995 show \$11 billion in child support was collected, up from \$8 billion in FY 1992. Preliminary data for paternity establishments show an estimated 735,000 in FY 1995, up from 554,205 in FY 1992. Collections would be further increased under proposals made by President Clinton.

Until Congress can agree on a bipartisan bill that is tough on work and fair to children, the Administration will continue to work with the nation's governors in reforming welfare one state at a time.

-more-

Talking Points

Overall themes

"Work First" bill

Gramm/Faircloth bill

Senate Finance Committee bill

House bill

Block grants

Public opinion

Work

Child care

Child support enforcement

Teen pregnancy

CBO analysis of Senate Finance bill

GOP divisions

Welfare Reform Talking Points: **OVERALL PLAN**

August 1995

"I want to endorse today the bill authored by Senators Daschle, Breaux and Mikulski ... It supports work. It supports doing the things that are necessary to get people into the work force and protecting children, especially dealing with the child care issues and requiring states to continue to support the children of the country who, through no fault of their own, are born into poor families. So I believe this is the right kind of welfare reform. It also saves money. It will help us balance the budget, but it does it in the right way."

President Clinton, 6/14/95

The President's commitment to welfare reform is part of his longstanding commitment to the middle class values of work, responsibility and family. While governor of Arkansas, President Clinton worked closely with elected officials from both parties to pass the Family Support Act. As President, he has given more than half the states the flexibility to reform welfare at the local level and introduced the most comprehensive welfare reform legislation ever proposed. And he's endorsed the "Work First" plan in the Senate, which combines real work responsibilities with protections for children.

Welfare reform means real work requirements. Real welfare reform is first and foremost about work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. States must have the necessary resources for child care, training, and work in order to get the job done. State bureaucracies should be rewarded for getting people to work or prepare for work -- not for cutting people from the rolls. Recipients must sign personal responsibility agreements, and move toward work and self-sufficiency from the very first day. Time limits must make clear to welfare recipients and caseworkers that welfare is a transitional system.

Welfare reform means requiring parental responsibility. Child support enforcement is a crucial part of welfare reform, because it sends a strong signal to young people about the responsibility of both parents to the children they bring into the world. If we're going to demand responsibility of mothers, we should demand responsibility of fathers too. That means welfare reform should include measures designed to identify the father in every case; find delinquent parents who move from job to job or state to state to avoid paying child support; speed up payments; and invoke tough penalties, like drivers license revocation, for nonpayment.

Children should not be punished for their parents' mistakes. True reform should make it easier for poor children to grow into productive adults -- not harder. Teenage parents should not be denied cash assistance -- instead, help should be conditioned on their staying at school, living at home, and identifying their child's father. Needy children should be assured basic protections wherever they live. School lunches, Food Stamps, and assistance to abused, disabled and neglected children should not be slashed under the guise of "welfare reform."

States must have flexibility -- and resources -- to get the job done. The federal-state partnership should be retained, because we won't have welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives states more burdens and fewer resources. Any legislation must enable states to succeed in moving people from welfare to work and supporting working families and children who need temporary help. States should be rewarded for moving people from welfare to work, and protected in the event of population growth, an economic downturn, a natural disaster, or another unpredictable emergency.

Welfare Reform Talking Points: "WORK FIRST"

August 1995

"I want to endorse today the bill authored by Senators Daschle, Breaux and Mikulski ... It supports work. It supports doing the things that are necessary to get people into the work force and protecting children, especially dealing with the child care issues and requiring states to continue to support the children of the country who, through no fault of their own, are born into poor families. So I believe this is the right kind of welfare reform. It also saves money. It will help us balance the budget, but it does it in the right way."

President Clinton, 6/14/95

"Ending welfare as we know it." "Work First" replaces AFDC with time-limited conditional assistance for poor families with children. In order to receive assistance, all recipients must sign a contract spelling out an individualized plan to move from welfare to work as quickly as possible. From day one, all recipients would be required to look for work and accept a job that's offered. Recipients who fail to live up to their contract would see their benefits reduced or eliminated. In addition, the Democratic alternative would change the culture of welfare offices, by turning them into employment offices and retraining caseworkers to focus on employment.

Real work requirements. In order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real work requirements backed up with the resources states need to get the job done. "Work First" would cut welfare spending in some areas in order to increase funding to move welfare recipients into the workforce. In contrast, the current Republican approach combines unrealistic work requirements with reduced funding for states -- making it harder, not easier, to move people from welfare to work. Even the Congressional Budget Office concluded that 44 states would not have enough funding to meet the work requirements in the Senate Finance Committee's bill.

Real incentives. President Clinton and the Democratic leadership agree that states should be rewarded for moving people onto private payrolls -- not for simply cutting them from the welfare rolls. That's why this bill includes a performance bonus for states that exceed job-placement targets -- and penalties for those who do not. Welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom, it should be a race to independence.

Parental responsibility. "Work First" recognizes that child support enforcement is critical to welfare reform. If we're going to demand responsibility of mothers, we should demand responsibility of fathers too. That's why the leadership bill contains tough child support enforcement measures to encourage both parents to meet their responsibilities. In addition, under this bill, teen parents would be required to stay in school, live at home, and prepare for work in order to receive assistance. We must send a strong message to the next generation that having children is an immense responsibility, rather than an easy route to independence.

Hope for bipartisanship. Senators Daschle, Breaux, Mikulski and others have presented a bold plan to end welfare as we know it, and we hope it will lead to a bipartisan agreement on welfare reform legislation. As President Clinton has said, he would "cut welfare, but save enough to protect children and move able-bodied people from welfare to work ... this debate must go beyond partisanship; it must be about what's good for America, and which approach is more likely to bring prosperity and security to our people over the long run." The Democratic alternative bill takes a step forward in this process -- towards the President's goal of having real, bipartisan welfare reform legislation that gets the job done.

Welfare Reform Talking Points: GRAMM/FAIRCLOTH BILL
August 1995

"We are now at an historic moment. The failure to pass welfare reform this year would be a disservice to the American people. It shouldn't become another victim to the politics of gridlock. Republicans and Democrats alike have a real responsibility to bring real change to Washington. And a bipartisan majority in the Senate is prepared to vote for a welfare reform bill with time limits and real work requirements and without moralistic dictates that will do more harm than good ... Let's not let politics stand in the way of making work and responsibility a way of life for the next generation."

President Clinton, Radio Address, 7/8/95

The wrong approach. Denying aid to teen mothers and their children, as the Gramm bill proposes, would do more harm than good. As President Clinton has said, "this approach also would punish the innocent children of unmarried teenagers for the mistakes of their parents. This might cut spending on welfare, but it wouldn't reform welfare to promote work and responsible parenting. That's why so many Republicans and Democrats oppose it."

The right approach. We must take strong action to address the problem of teen pregnancy, but we should not give up on teenage parents and their children. As President Clinton has said, "I want to discourage teen pregnancy. We have to do that -- but not by hurting innocent babies. We should require teen mothers to live at home, stay in school, and turn their lives around -- so they and their children stay off welfare for good."

Investing in the future. Real welfare reform means moving people into jobs -- not cutting them from the rolls. As President Clinton has said, "we ought to look at our problems with a view toward the long-term. Moving people from welfare to work will save a lot more money in the long run than throwing children off the rolls. They will be in trouble, and they will cost us a lot of money in the long run, and a lot of our national life as well. We are never going to end welfare unless people have the training and child care to be good workers and good parents."

Protections for children. Neither food stamps nor the school lunch program should be block-granted, as the Gramm bill proposes. Only a national system of nutrition programs can establish and meet nutrition standards that respond to economic changes and ensure that children's health will be protected. Children must be helped -- not hurt -- as we move ahead to create real, lasting welfare reform.

Real welfare reform. As President Clinton said recently, "I'm going to do my best to get you a welfare reform proposal which gives more flexibility to the states and doesn't have a lot of ideological prescriptions one way or the other ... I think that is the right way to do it." President Clinton has called for a bipartisan bill that moves people into jobs, encourages parental responsibility, and gives states the tools they need to get the job done -- without punishing children for their parents' past mistakes.

Welfare Reform Talking Points: **SENATE FINANCE BILL**
August 1995

"Last night I laid before the nation my plan to balance the budget in 10 years in a way that is consistent with the long-term prosperity of the American people and our fundamental interests. And one of the priorities I stated was pursuing the right kind of welfare reform. I still believe that the Republican bill is too tough on children and too weak on work, and runs the risk of undermining our fundamental commitment to the welfare of children without moving people from welfare to work."

President Clinton, 6/13/95

We're for change. Government programs should reflect the values of work, responsibility, and opportunity. But in order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real, fundamental change that helps move people from welfare to work, encourages responsible behavior, and sends a strong message to the next generation that people should not have children until they are ready to care for them.

The Senate Finance Committee's bill is not welfare reform. The focus of real welfare reform is a paycheck, not a welfare check. Although the Finance Committee's bill moves in the right direction, it still falls short of the kind of real welfare reform that Americans in both parties expect. It confuses welfare reform with budget cuts -- including roughly the same \$30 billion in reductions in the House bill. In many respects it is still tough on children. It does not provide states the resources or incentives necessary to move recipients from welfare to work. It shifts costs to the states and undermines our obligation to hold state welfare bureaucracies accountable for results.

Phony about work. Real welfare reform is first and foremost about work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. States must have the necessary resources for child care, training, and work in order to move people into jobs. But the Finance Committee bill undercuts the ability of the states to move recipients from welfare to work by reducing the funding available for work programs and for child care. It provides nothing to reward states for success in movement to work. Real welfare reform means giving states the incentives and resources to get the job done.

Unrealistic about child care. Despite the critical link between child care and work, the Committee bill would repeal three federal programs that provide direct child care assistance for poor and low-income working families. The bill would dramatically cut the child care that people on welfare need to go to work, and that working people need to stay off welfare in the first place. It defies common sense to take away child care and keep people from going to work.

Tough on kids. True reform should make it easier for poor children to grow into productive adults - not harder. Teenage parents should be required to stay in school and live at home. But the Finance Committee bill puts many children at risk through its funding cuts for programs assisting low-income families, including a combination of an arbitrary benefit cutoff after five years of welfare receipt, incentives for states to cut benefits, deny eligibility and curtail services, and cuts in SSI benefits for children.

Short on state flexibility. We won't have welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives states more burdens and fewer resources. Any legislation must enable states to succeed in moving people from welfare to work and supporting working families and children who need temporary help. States should be rewarded for moving people from welfare to work, and protected in the event of population growth, an economic downturn, a natural disaster, or another unpredictable emergency.

Welfare Reform Talking Points: HOUSE WELFARE BILL

August 1995

"At a time when so many Americans without regard to party agrees on the need for welfare reform, it's a shame the House of Representatives could not produce a real welfare reform plan that would promote work and responsibility and attract broad bipartisan support. I am disappointed that instead of joining in a real, bipartisan effort to move people from welfare to work, a narrow partisan Republican majority passed a bill that is weak on work and tough on children."

President Clinton, 3/24/95

We're for change. Government programs should reflect the values of work, responsibility, and opportunity. But in order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real, fundamental change that helps move people from welfare to work, encourages responsible behavior, and sends a strong message to the next generation that people should not have children until they are ready to care for them.

The House bill is not welfare reform. The focus of real welfare reform is a paycheck, not a welfare check. In contrast to our proposals, the House bill is weak on work and responsibility, and tough on kids. It confuses welfare reform with more than \$66 billion in budget cuts -- at the expense of the nutrition, health, and safety of America's children. As President Clinton has said, "We will not achieve real reform or state flexibility, if Congress just gives the states more burdens and less flexibility, and fails to make work and responsibility the law of the land."

Phony about work. The original work requirements in the House bill were so weak that even fewer people would be working than under current law. Then, after Democrats protested, the requirements were strengthened -- but in such a slipshod manner than even the Congressional Budget office criticized them as unworkable -- and thus unreal. In addition, the bill allows caseload reductions to count as "participation in work," giving states a perverse incentive to just cut people off welfare -- whether or not they've moved into jobs. And it actually reduces funds for the supports -- like education, job training, and child care -- that single moms need to enter the work force.

Tough on kids. The House bill would cut assistance to 5.6 million children, through provisions that would deny aid to the children of minor mothers, to children born to mothers already on welfare, and to mothers who have received benefits for five years. Cuts in child care would leave more than 320,000 children home alone. According to a recent study by the Children's Defense Fund, over 2 million children would lose school lunches because of cuts in child nutrition programs. And, upon enactment, the bill would deny cash benefits and Medicaid to more than 157,000 disabled children.

Hope for bipartisanship. Welfare reform should build on the consensus for change that has brought Democrats and Republicans, rich and poor, and religious leaders of all faiths to the conclusion that the status quo must go. While the House debate was often divisive, the "silver lining" was the bipartisan agreement on tougher child support enforcement. Such teamwork and consensus is possible on the Senate's broader welfare reform legislation, but only if work is the cornerstone of a real effort that puts long-term gains ahead of short-term politics.

Welfare Reform Talking Points: **BLOCK GRANTS**
August 1995

"There have to be some protections for the times when the economy goes down in the country as a whole and the times when the economy goes down in some parts of the country but not in others. I have tried to say all along one of the big risks of these block grants is that some states are going to come up short in the next recession, and all states could."

President Clinton, remarks to the National Conference of State Legislatures, 7/20/95

State flexibility. The Clinton Administration has a proven commitment to state flexibility. We've already given 32 states freedom from federal rules to implement their own welfare reform plans -- that's more than the previous two administrations combined. President Clinton has also announced a plan to put more states across the country on a fast track to implementing reforms that promote work. But we also want to ensure that states get both the flexibility and the tools they need to succeed under national welfare reform.

Real resources. In order to end welfare as we know it, we need real work requirements backed up with real resources for job training, job placement, and child care to help people get jobs and keep them. Yet the current Republican approach combines unrealistic work requirements with reduced funding for states -- making it harder, not easier, to move people from welfare to work. Even the Congressional Budget Office concluded that only six out of the 50 states would be able to meet the work requirements under the Senate Finance Committee bill. We will not achieve real welfare reform or true state flexibility if Congress simply gives the states more burdens and less money, and fails to make work and responsibility the law of the land.

Protections for states. States should be rewarded for moving people from welfare to work, and protected in the event of population growth, an economic downturn, a natural disaster, or another unpredictable emergency. By failing to provide for the changing needs of states, block grants would not allow growing or economically distressed states to meet the needs of their people, or to provide assistance to families who hit a "bump in the road" and need temporary help.

Protections for children. As the President has said, neither food stamps nor the school lunch program should be block-granted. "For a lot of kids in this country -- a lot of kids -- the only decent meal they get every day is the meal they get at school. This program works. If it's not broken, we shouldn't fix it," he said. Only a national system of nutrition programs can establish and meet nutrition standards that respond to economic changes and ensure that children's health will be protected. Children must be helped -- not hurt -- as we move ahead to create real, lasting welfare reform.

A continuing partnership. As President Clinton said to the nation's governors, "I believe we ought to have a continuing partnership -- not for the federal government to tell you how to do welfare reform, but because any money we wind up saving through today's neglect will cost us a ton more in tomorrow's consequences. And this partnership permits you to say at least as a first line of defense, we must do this for the poor children of our state." The "Work First" bill has the right incentives for states -- including a performance bonus for states that exceed job-placement targets -- and penalties for those who do not. As the President has said, welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom -- it should be a race to independence.

Welfare Reform Talking Points: **PUBLIC OPINION**
August 1995

"We've come a long way in the welfare reform debate in the last few years. Not so very long ago, many liberals opposed requiring all welfare recipients who can work to do so. And not so long ago, most conservatives thought the government shouldn't spend money on child care to give welfare mothers a chance to go to work and still be good parents. Now we have a broad consensus for both. We should do both. And we shouldn't allow welfare reform to be held prisoner to ideological political debates."

President Clinton, Radio Address, 7/8/95

The system must be fixed. The American people believe the welfare system is broken and must be fixed. According to an April 1995 *New York Times* survey, "a remarkable 96 percent believe the welfare system needs fundamental changes." In an April 1995 *Wall Street Journal* poll, 46 percent of Americans said it would concern them "a great deal" if Congress doesn't complete welfare reform.

Work must be the centerpiece of real reform. A May 1995 *Wall Street Journal*/NBC News poll asked respondents to identify measures that would be effective in improving the welfare system. Eighty-four percent said that requiring recipients to work for benefits would be effective. In addition, an April 1994 *Los Angeles Times* survey found nearly three-in-four people agreeing that the main goal of any welfare reform plan should be "to get people in the work force."

Welfare reform should help people move to work. An April 1995 *Washington Post* poll shows that an overwhelming 94 percent of Americans support requiring job training for welfare recipients. A recently released Covenant House/Yankelovich Partners Inc. survey also found that, instead of reducing the services necessary to move people into jobs, Americans believe that "there ought to be more, especially in the areas of job training, job placement, and family counseling." According to the survey, "67 percent of Americans say what we need most is more job training, and 62 percent say there should be more job placement services provided."

People support child care for working parents. A May 1995 *Wall Street Journal*/NBC News poll found that 77 percent of Americans believe that providing subsidized child care for poor mothers who leave welfare for work would help improve the welfare system. A March 1995 survey by a Republican pollster had similar findings. According to the study, 67 percent of Americans believe the government should help pay for child care for mothers on welfare who are required to work.

Americans are against arbitrarily denying assistance. Cutting off benefits to teen mothers would only punish poor children -- and make a broken system even worse. An April 1995 *Washington Post* poll found that 57 percent of Americans oppose denying benefits to unmarried teen mothers. A recent Covenant House survey also showed that "congressional proposals to reduce government programs for those young people -- specifically ending welfare payments to teenage mothers -- are sharply at odds with national sentiments."

Welfare Reform Talking Points: **WORK**
August 1995

"My top priority is to get people off welfare and into jobs...To do that, we have to take some of the money we save and plow it into job training, education and child care ... If we're going to make people on welfare work, then we've got to make it possible for them to work. If we're going to make people self-reliant, we have to make it possible for them to support themselves. We can be tough, but we've got to be practical."
President Clinton, radio address, 4/8/95

Real welfare reform is first and foremost about work. Welfare reform must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. The American people agree: an April *Washington Post* poll showed that 94 percent of Americans believe that welfare recipients should be required to work or train for work.

To be credible, welfare reform legislation must have real work requirements. President Clinton's approach, like the Democratic leadership's plan, combines real work requirements with real supports to move people from welfare to work. We would require recipients to develop personal responsibility agreements, ensuring that from the very first day, recipients will identify the education, training, job placement and child care services they'll need to move into work. Time limits would make clear to welfare recipients and caseworkers that welfare is a transitional system leading to self-sufficiency.

Welfare reform must also have the incentives and resources for states to get the job done. Real work requirements must be backed up with real resources for education, training, and job placement to help people get jobs and keep them -- and the NGA, the American Public Welfare Association, and the National Conference of State Legislatures agree. The Democratic leadership's "Work First" plan would cut welfare spending in some areas in order to increase funding to move welfare recipients into the workforce. In contrast, the Senate Finance Committee bill combines unrealistic work requirements with reduced funding for states -- making it harder, not easier, to move people from welfare to work. Even the Congressional Budget Office concluded that only six out of the 50 states would be able to meet the bill's work requirements.

States should be rewarded for getting people to work or prepare for work -- not for cutting people from the rolls. While we must give states more flexibility in welfare reform, we must also make sure that they continue to fulfill their responsibilities. The Senate bill gives states an incentive to save money by throwing people off the rolls. Welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom -- it should be a race to independence. As President Clinton said, "I want a performance bonus, but one that will force the welfare bureaucracy and the welfare recipients to focus on work."

The Democratic leadership's "Work First" plan is the right kind of reform. President Clinton has endorsed the Democratic leadership's welfare reform bill because it includes all of the elements that are necessary to help recipients move into the workforce -- and stay there. It also has the right incentives for states -- including a performance bonus for states that exceed job-placement targets -- and penalties for those who do not.

Welfare Reform Talking Points: **CHILD CARE**
August 1995

"But if we're going to end welfare, we must do more about a crucial element that is missing from the current approach of many in Congress. Instead of providing the child care people need to get off welfare, some in Congress actually are trying to cut child care. So, today I say to Congress, child care must be the central element of our effort to put welfare mothers to work."
President Clinton, radio address, 7/1/95

President Clinton recognizes that child care is necessary to help move people from welfare to work and to prevent welfare dependency in the first place. Single mothers cannot participate in work and training activities unless their children are cared for. And working families struggling to stay off welfare often need child care assistance in order to make ends meet. If welfare reform is to succeed in moving people into the workforce and keeping them there, adequate child care is essential.

The link between work and child care is widely recognized. "Our experience suggests that a renewed commitment to work by welfare recipients will require additional child care funds above current levels," the National Conference of State Legislatures emphasized in a recent letter to Senator Packwood. Senator Packwood himself has acknowledged that "single parents must have day care in order to work. Day care costs money. A family is on welfare because it doesn't have money. It can be a vicious downward spiral."

Recent studies agree that adequate child care is essential to helping people move into the workforce -- and stay there. A report last week from the National Research Council presents evidence that "the successful completion of job training is contingent on child care that is reliable and of acceptable quality and that matches parents' scheduling needs, [and] highlights the pivotal role that child care plays in facilitating work effort among families in poverty." This research supports other recent findings, including a December 1994 GAO study estimating that child care subsidies would increase work among poor women by 52 percent.

The Senate Finance Committee bill is unrealistic about work and child care. The Senate bill undercuts the ability of states to move recipients from welfare to work by reducing the funding available for work programs and child care. Despite the link between child care and work, the Senate bill would repeal three federal programs that provide direct child care assistance for more than 640,000 children. By combining resources for cash benefits, child care, and employment assistance into one block grant, the Finance committee bill provides no guarantee that states will invest any money into work programs and child care that move people off welfare.

The Clinton Administration has already made adequate funding for child care programs a consistent priority in its efforts to support working families. Poor single parents cannot be required to participate in education or training activities unless child care is available and their children are safe. States need resources and incentives aimed at moving welfare recipients into the workforce -- not at simply cutting them off.

"Work First," the Democratic leadership plan endorsed by President Clinton, emphasizes work by providing states with the resources they need to help recipients find jobs -- and keep them. To provide incentives for people to move from welfare to work, the "Work First" plan increases child care assistance for welfare recipients moving to self-sufficiency and working families struggling to stay off the welfare rolls.

Welfare Reform Talking Points: **CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT**

August 1995

"If everybody who could pay their child support and who's under an order to do it did it, we could lift 800,000 people off the welfare rolls tomorrow. That is still our greatest short-term opportunity, and we all need to do what we can to seize it."

President Clinton, remarks to the NGA, 7/31/95

The Administration recognizes that both parents must support their children, and is working to enact the toughest child support enforcement program ever proposed. Child support enforcement is a crucial part of welfare reform, because it sends a strong signal to young people about the responsibility of both parents to the children they bring into the world. Parenthood brings clear obligations and those obligations must be enforced.

Since taking office, President Clinton has taken strong steps to improve our nation's child support enforcement system. In 1994, we collected a record \$10 billion in child support payments from non-custodial parents, due to the increased resources we've devoted to child support enforcement and the IRS' withholding of income tax refunds from parents. In addition, our new in-hospital paternity establishment provisions, the President's executive order to improve child support enforcement among federal employees, and the Justice Department's aggressive pursuit of parents who cross state lines without paying will work together to further improve the system.

Child support can help end the poverty and insecurity that victimize single-parent families. The failure to collect child support has several explanations. Paternity is not established for most children born out of wedlock; child support awards are usually low and rarely modified; and ineffective collection allows many absent parents -- especially in interstate cases -- to avoid payment without penalty. If child support orders reflecting current ability to pay were established and enforced, single mothers would have received \$34 billion more than they now receive. Closing that gap is a top priority for this Administration.¹

The Clinton Administration has a comprehensive plan to improve child support collection. As the President has said, governments don't raise children -- parents do. To send that message loud and clear to men and women -- those who already have children and those who don't -- welfare reform must include tough child support enforcement measures like streamlined paternity establishment, new hire reporting, uniform interstate child support laws, computerized statewide collections, and license revocation. These five Administration-backed improvements would increase child support collections by \$24 billion in the next 10 years alone -- helping millions of children who deserve the support of both parents. And they'd reduce federal welfare costs by \$4 billion over the same period.

The Clinton Administration is pleased that the Finance Committee proposal includes the effective measures we demanded from the start. Both the House and the Senate Finance Committee have taken the Administration's child support measures and put them into their bills -- including our plan to ask states to deny drivers' licenses and professional licenses to deadbeat parents.

The Democratic leadership plan, endorsed by President Clinton, also contains tough child support enforcement measures to encourage both parents to meet their responsibilities. Absent parents who owe child support may choose to enter into a repayment plan with the state or, choose between a community service job or jail. In addition, states would have the option to provide job placement services to absent parents who agree to meet their child support obligations once they are employed.

¹Elaine Sorensen, "Noncustodial Fathers: Can They Afford to Pay More Child Support?" The Urban Institute (1994).

Welfare Reform Talking Points: **TEEN PREGNANCY**

August 1995

"I think most Americans believe that while we should promote work and we should fight premature -- and certainly fight out-of-wedlock -- pregnancy, it is a mistake to deny people benefits, children benefits, because their parents are underage and unmarried ... I believe it's better to require young people to stay at home, stay in school, and turn their lives around, because the objective is to make good workers, good parents, good citizens, and successful children. That's what we're all trying to do."

President Clinton, remarks to the NGA, 7/31/95

Teen pregnancy creates enormous costs to society because of its link to poverty, welfare dependency, child health, and other domestic concerns. Each year, 200,000 teenagers aged 17 and younger have children. Their babies are often low-birth weight and have disproportionately high infant mortality rates. And the link between teen births and poverty is clear. Approximately 80 percent of the children born to teenage parents who dropped out of high school and did not marry are poor. In contrast, just 8 percent of children born to married high school graduates aged 20 or older are poor.

Preventing teen pregnancy and out-of-wedlock births is a critical part of welfare reform. Cases headed by unwed mothers accounted for most of the growth in the welfare rolls over the last decade. We need to send the strongest possible signal to teens that pregnancy and childbirth should be delayed. And we also need to focus on teens who are already mothers -- with mentoring, child care, time-limited AFDC benefits, requirements to live with a caring adult and identify their child's father, incentives to stay in school, and other services necessary to put them on the path to work and self-sufficiency.

Welfare reform must be smart, not shortsighted. Simply denying assistance to a teenage mother, as the House bill proposes, won't do anything to move her toward self-sufficiency. The bill's approach is also mean-spirited: it cuts people off because they are poor, young and unmarried -- and small children pay the price for their parents' mistakes. And, as President Clinton has said, "It's bound to lead to more dependency, not less; to more broken families, not fewer; to more burdens on the taxpayers over the long run, not less."

The President has also proposed a national campaign against teen pregnancy to ensure that children are brought into the world by families who have the ability to care for them. To prevent welfare dependency in the first place, teenagers must get the message that staying in school, postponing pregnancy, and preparing to work are the right things to do. We must show teenagers that having children is an immense responsibility rather than an easy route to independence.

Welfare reform must strengthen families and protect children. Our approach would take strong action to address the problem of teen pregnancy, but would not give up on teenage parents and their children. Teenagers who do have a child must be required to take responsibility for that child, but they must also get the help they need to become good role models and providers. Arbitrarily denying aid to young mothers and their children will only weaken families, not strengthen them.

Welfare Reform Talking Points: **CBO REPORT ON H.R. 4**
August 1995

"According to the Congressional Budget Office, the current Senate Finance Committee bill will not succeed in moving people from welfare to work. The Congressional Budget Office -- and the person who wrote the report was generally acknowledged to be one of the preeminent Republican experts on welfare reform -- concluded that only six of our states would be able to fulfill the bill's work requirements in the year 2000 with the bill's funding provisions. Forty-four states will fail. Six out of 50 in baseball is a .120 batting average. You can't play for the Orioles with that batting average. You can't stay in the minor leagues, and you sure won't elevate children or end welfare as we know it."

President Clinton, Speech to the National Governors' Association, 6/6/95

Phony about work. The Congressional Budget Office Reports that "by 2000 most states would have difficulty satisfying the requirements" in the Senate Finance Committee's bill. "The cost of administering such a large scale work and training program would be high and federal funding is frozen at 1994 levels ... Given the costs and administrative complexities involved, CBO assumes that most states would simply accept penalties of up to 5 percent of their block grant amounts rather than implement the requirements."

Setting states up for failure. Rather than reward states for success, the Senate Finance bill sets them up for failure. According to the CBO, it would cost states \$10 billion a year by the year 2000 to meet the requirements in the Senate bill -- and yet the bill expects them to do this with less money than they have now. As a result, 44 states will fail to move people from welfare to work, and instead will simply accept a modest penalty that's cheaper than providing the necessary child care and work opportunities.

Real resources. CBO's report says what we already know: in order to end welfare as we know it, we have to give states the resources they need to get the job done. As President Clinton has said, "the reason the Senate bill fails on the standard of work, is clear. It takes away the tools that states now use to move people from welfare to work: child care, job training, greater incentives for job placement." We won't have welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives states more burdens and fewer resources, and fails to make work and responsibility the law of the land.

Real incentives. For reform to work, states must be rewarded for putting people on private payrolls -- not for simply cutting them from the welfare rolls. That's why the Democratic leadership bill includes a performance bonus for states that exceed job-placement targets -- and penalties for those who do not. As the President said in a recent speech to the NGA, "I want a performance bonus, but one that will force the welfare bureaucracy and the welfare recipients to focus on work."

Welfare Reform Talking Points: **GOP DIVISIONS**
August 1995

As the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and other papers have recently reported, sharp divisions among Senate Republicans have forced them to delay floor debate on a welfare reform bill. The *Washington Post* notes that "the collapse of the party's consensus this week points to a prior problem involving an incoherence of design and a contrived attempt to bale together contradictory concepts. Having put off a vote, the Senate needs to reconsider its whole package." These are the issues that are being debated:

No conservative mandates. The *Washington Post* reported that a group of Senate conservatives, "wants to change the Senate bill to make it more like the House-passed welfare measure." Among other things, they would bar cash assistance to unmarried mothers under the age of 21, and reinstate an "illegitimacy bonus" that entangles welfare reform in abortion politics. Senator Lauch Faircloth has even threatened to filibuster any bill that lacks these punitive provisions. We do not support these extremist policies and are disappointed that real welfare reform is being held up by a small group of ultra-conservatives.

Real work. In order to end welfare as we know it, states must be rewarded for moving people onto private payrolls -- not simply cutting them from the welfare rolls. The *New York Times* recently reported that some Republican senators are joining Democrats in lining up behind a bipartisan amendment that would require states to maintain funding for child care, job training, and work. The proposal, the *Times* noted, "would give states a financial stake in welfare reform, making them more accountable to both state and Federal taxpayers."

Fair funding for states. The *Washington Post* reported that some Republican senators are finally realizing that any proposal to block grant and freeze federal funding to the states "would create large practical problems." And the *New York Times* reported that even "Senator Alfonse D'Amato, Republican of New York, denounced the proposal." As the Senator stated, "This is not welfare reform. It's a redistribution of dollars. It shifts money to Texas and Florida. It penalizes states like New York that have met their moral obligation to take care of impoverished children." As we've repeatedly said, in order to end welfare as we know it, all states must have the resources necessary to get the job done.

We know what works. While Republicans are moving apart, Democrats are coming together. As the *Associated Press* recently reported, mayors "are lining up behind a Democratic plan to redesign the nation's welfare system as Senate Republicans continue to feud over their welfare overhaul legislation." The bipartisan U.S. Conference of Mayors has endorsed the "Work First" plan, noting that it provides the resources local governments need to help move people from welfare to work.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Thursday, October 26, 1995

"SHOWING SIGNS OF COMPROMISE"

As the *New York Times* noted yesterday, House and Senate negotiators met for the first time Tuesday to begin to draft a compromise welfare bill, with Republicans "showing signs of compromise." Democrats and moderate Republicans have emphasized that an acceptable bill must allow state flexibility, move people into jobs, and protect children. And the Clinton Administration has made our priorities clear: real welfare reform must emphasize work, family, and responsibility. "Congress has an historic chance to reach a bipartisan agreement to end the current welfare system and replace it with one that is tough on work, tough on responsibility, and fair to children," OMB Director Alice Rivlin wrote to congressional leaders last week. "A bill that honors those values will be acceptable; a bill that is weak on work and tough on children will not be."

- o **Only bipartisan reform can pass.** President Clinton has emphasized he will only sign welfare reform legislation into law if Congress can agree on a bipartisan bill that is tough on work and fair to children, and members of both parties agree. "If we stray too far from the Senate bill, support for welfare reform in the Senate could well erode," Senator John Chafee told the *New York Times* yesterday. "We may also be faced with a Presidential veto. I don't think any of us want to see that happen." Several Democrats have also "urged colleagues to heed the bipartisan endorsement of the Senate bill and adopt its provisions over the House bill's," the *Washington Times* wrote yesterday. Without Democratic support, Senator John Breaux noted yesterday, "you do not have enough votes to pass a bill...that can become the law of the land."
- o **Protections for children.** Democrats and Republicans across the country agree that implementing punitive House provisions, such as a mandatory family cap or teen cut-off, would punish children, reduce state flexibility -- and do nothing to promote work. As the *New York Times* wrote yesterday, "Mr. Clinton, like the National Governors' Association, supports the Senate position that these questions should be left for the states to decide." The Administration also opposes House provisions which would end the Federal commitment to abused and neglected children and those at risk. Those programs "protect many deserving abused and neglected children," the Director of Boys Town wrote conferees this week. "As you know there are proposals to eliminate...and replace them with Block Grants to the states. Please don't let this happen."
- o **Moving people from welfare to work.** "We will only complete this historic mission of ending welfare as we know it if we succeed in moving people from welfare to work," Alice Rivlin wrote last week. "That means imposing time limits and tough work requirements, making sure people get the child care they need to go to work, and rewarding states and holding them accountable for their efforts to put people to work, not for cutting them off." The Administration considers the following provisions of the Senate bill essential to real reform: requiring states to maintain their stake in moving people from welfare to work; providing adequate child care; protecting states and families in the event of economic downturn; and providing incentives that reward states for putting people to work, not for cutting them off.
- o **Progress, not gridlock.** As the President has repeatedly said, we are committed to bipartisan progress on welfare reform. Representative Clay Shaw seems to agree, telling the *New York Times* that "I am not drawing any lines in the sand." The final outcome may depend on the willingness of other conferees to listen to moderate Republicans like Senator Chafee, who warned that it would be wrong to insist on a "purist ideological test."

ENTERING THE FINAL STRETCH

As the *Washington Post* writes today, "Ten months after Congress began drafting welfare reform, the master carpentry begins this afternoon when House and Senate conferees meet in the Rayburn House Office Building to combine hundreds of details passed by the House and Senate into a single coherent bill that can win the support of both houses and be signed by the president." While awaiting national legislation, the Clinton Administration has made our priorities clear: real welfare reform must emphasize work, family, and responsibility. "Congress has an historic chance to reach a bipartisan agreement to end the current welfare system and replace it with one that is tough on work, tough on responsibility, and fair to children," OMB Director Alice Rivlin wrote in an Administration letter to Congress last week. "A bill that honors those values will be acceptable; a bill that is weak on work and tough on children will not be."

- o **Moving people from welfare to work.** "We will only complete this historic mission of ending welfare as we know it if we succeed in moving people from welfare to work," Alice Rivlin wrote to congressional leaders last week. "That means imposing time limits and tough work requirements, making sure people get the child care they need to go to work, and rewarding states and holding them accountable for their efforts to put people to work, not for cutting them off." The Administration considers the following provisions of the Senate bill essential to real welfare reform: requiring states to maintain their stake in moving people from welfare to work; providing adequate child care; protecting states and families in the event of economic downturn; and providing incentives that reward states for putting people to work, not for cutting them off.
- o **Demanding responsibility.** "The Administration believes that welfare reform must promote responsibility and responsible parenting. We must demand responsibility from parents who bring children into the world, not let them off the hook and expect taxpayers to pick up the tab for their neglect," the Administration wrote to Congress last week. That's why the Administration supports the following elements of welfare reform to help make responsibility the law of the land: the toughest possible child support enforcement, requiring minor mothers to live at home and stay at school as a condition of assistance, and a national campaign against teen pregnancy.
- o **Protecting children.** Democrats and Republicans across the country agree that implementing punitive House provisions, such as a mandatory family cap or teen cut-off, would punish children -- and do nothing to promote work. "The House ordered states to attempt to change the behavior of welfare recipients by cutting off aid to teenagers who have children out of wedlock, and to women who have additional children while on welfare," the *Washington Post* notes today. "The governors oppose this and the Senate rejected both provisions." The Administration also opposes House provisions which would destroy vital child nutrition programs, such as school lunch and WIC, and end the Federal commitment to abused and neglected children and those at risk.
- o **Only bipartisan reform can pass.** "If Congress can agree on a bipartisan bill that is tough on work and fair to children, the President will sign real welfare reform into law, and the nation will be better for it," the Administration wrote last week. "But, if Congress tries to walk away from our common values with a bill that is weak on work and tough on children, it will kill welfare reform, and the Administration will continue to pursue welfare reform through waivers, one state at a time, until Congress gets it right."

OUR GOALS FOR REAL WELFARE REFORM

On Tuesday, the Senate named conferees who will join with House members to reconcile their welfare reform bills. Yesterday, the Clinton Administration sent a letter to congressional leaders outlining our priorities for national welfare reform legislation. "We have made great strides together in this welfare reform debate," OMB Director Alice Rivlin wrote. "Now Congress has an historic chance to reach a bipartisan agreement to end the current welfare system and replace it with one that is tough on work, tough on responsibility, and fair to children. A bill that honors those values will be acceptable; a bill that is weak on work and tough on children will not be. The Administration calls on conferees to put politics aside and help give the American people a government that honors their values by making welfare a second chance and responsibility a way of life." The Administration has made clear that real welfare reform must accomplish the following goals:

- o **Moving people from welfare to work.** "We will only complete this historic mission of ending welfare as we know it if we succeed in moving people from welfare to work," Alice Rivlin wrote to congressional leaders yesterday. "That means imposing time limits and tough work requirements, making sure people get the child care they need to go to work, and rewarding states and holding them accountable for their efforts to put people to work, not for cutting them off." The Administration considers the following provisions of the Senate bill essential to real welfare reform: requiring states to maintain their stake in moving people from welfare to work; providing adequate child care; protecting states and families in the event of economic downturn; and providing incentives that reward states for putting people to work, not for cutting them off.
- o **Demanding responsibility.** "The Administration believes that welfare reform must promote responsibility and responsible parenting. We must demand responsibility from parents who bring children into the world, not let them off the hook and expect taxpayers to pick up the tab for their neglect," the Administration wrote yesterday. That's why the Administration supports the following elements of welfare reform to help make responsibility the law of the land: the toughest possible child support enforcement, requiring minor mothers to live at home and stay at school as a condition of assistance, and a national campaign against teen pregnancy.
- o **Protecting children.** "There is an overwhelming bipartisan consensus in this country that welfare reform should not punish children," the Administration noted in its letter. "Across the country, Republicans and Democrats at the state and local level agree that we must demand responsibility from young mothers and young fathers, not penalize children for their parents' mistakes." Destroying vital child nutrition programs, such as school lunch and WIC, ending the Federal commitment to abused and neglected children and those at risk, requiring states to deny assistance to unwed minor mothers and their children, and mandating a nationwide family cap would punish children and do nothing to promote work, family, and responsibility. As President Clinton has emphasized from the beginning, real welfare reform must be tough on work -- not tough on children.
- o **Only bipartisan reform can pass.** "If Congress can agree on a bipartisan bill that is tough on work and fair to children, the President will sign real welfare reform into law, and the nation will be better for it," the Administration emphasized yesterday. "But, if Congress tries to walk away from our common values with a bill that is weak on work and tough on children, it will kill welfare reform, and the Administration will continue to pursue welfare reform through waivers, one state at a time, until Congress gets it right."

CONSENSUS ON REAL WELFARE REFORM

This month, House and Senate conferees will meet to reconcile their welfare reform bills, with bipartisan agreement still a real possibility. As today's *Washington Post* reports, a bipartisan coalition of 26 female senators and representatives have now written to conferees, urging them to include adequate child care funding and state maintenance of effort provisions in the final welfare bill. A group of 18 moderate Republicans also wrote to conferees, calling for a bipartisan bill that includes the Senate bill's child care, state maintenance of effort, and child welfare provisions. These groups join the chorus of voices calling for reform like President Clinton has championed from the beginning.

- o **The tools for work.** "We will only complete this historic mission to end welfare as we know it if we succeed in moving people from welfare to work," President Clinton said in a recent letter to participants in January's welfare summit at Blair House. "That means imposing time limits and tough work requirements, making sure people get the child care they need to go to work, and rewarding states and holding them accountable for their efforts to put people to work, not for cutting them off." Twenty-six female members of Congress echoed President Clinton in a letter to conferees last week. "We urge the conference to adopt the Senate's level of -- and capped entitlement approach to -- child care funding, as well as the Senate provision which prohibits states from financially penalizing women with young children who are unable to participate in work programs due to a lack of child care."
- o **Don't punish children.** The *Washington Times* reports today that a mandatory family cap or teen cut-off would fail to curb illegitimacy. But, as President Clinton and people across the country have emphasized, such provisions would also punish children for their parents' mistakes. As the *Washington Post* reports, the U.S. Catholic Conference released a letter to Congress yesterday, asking lawmakers to "retreat from plans to cut off welfare benefits to many immigrants who have not become citizens and to unmarried teenage mothers." A bipartisan group of 26 female senators and representatives also urged conferees to reject House provisions that hurt kids. "We oppose the House bill's provisions requiring states to deny cash assistance to unwed teenage mothers and to children born to mothers on welfare," they wrote to conferees last week.
- o **Bipartisan support.** "We are united in our belief that comprehensive welfare reform will best be achieved through a conference report that attracts substantial bipartisan support in the House of Representatives," eighteen Republican representatives wrote to Republican conferees last week. "In this regard, we believe that the vast majority of our House colleagues -- Republicans and Democrats -- can support a conference agreement that requires work, embraces responsibility, and includes" the Senate bill's child care funding levels and child welfare services provisions, and state maintenance of effort requirements.
- o **Only bipartisan reform can pass.** When both Houses of Congress meet to resolve their differences, they should build on the bipartisan progress the Senate made last month. "If Congress can agree on a bipartisan bill that is tough on work and fair to children, we'll have real welfare reform, and the nation will be better for it," President Clinton wrote to lawmakers last week. "But let me be clear: if Congress walks away from this bipartisan common ground and sends me a bill that is weak on work and tough on children, it will kill welfare reform, and I will be forced to continue to end welfare through the waiver process, one state at a time, until Congress gets it right."

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR REAL WELFARE REFORM

This month, House and Senate conferees will meet to reconcile their welfare reform bills. While we await national reform, the President -- and state and local officials -- continue to emphasize that real welfare reform must be tough on work, not tough on kids. As yesterday's *Washington Post* reports, the nation's governors sent a bipartisan letter to Congress this week, denouncing the conservative mandates in the House bill and supporting key Administration-backed provisions in the Senate bill: like increased child care funding and a contingency fund.

The governors' letter echoed President Clinton, who wrote Congress last Friday urging bipartisan welfare legislation that will "demand responsibility from young mothers and young fathers and not punish children for their parents' mistakes," the *Washington Post* noted. Here's what we need:

- o **The tools for work.** "We will only complete this historic mission to end welfare as we know it if we succeed in moving people from welfare to work," President Clinton wrote last week to participants in January's welfare summit at Blair House. "That means imposing time limits and tough work requirements, making sure people get the child care they need to go to work, and rewarding states and holding them accountable for their efforts to put people to work, not for cutting them off."
- o **Don't punish children.** "Across the country, Republican and Democratic governors agree that we must demand responsibility from young mothers and young fathers, not punish children for their parents' mistakes," the President wrote to lawmakers last week. "Likewise, the American people know that ending welfare is not about walking away from abused children or taking away poor children's school lunch." State and local officials agree. "Welfare reform legislation must not be about one-size-fits-all mandates on state and local governments," local government groups wrote to Senator Dole last week. "We therefore urge you to oppose the House provisions which would penalize children and shift costs to local governments by requiring states to deny or reduce benefits to these populations." On Tuesday, the National Governors' Association also wrote Congress, urging it to oppose the House bill's mandatory teen cut-off and family cap provisions.
- o **Bipartisan support.** Yesterday, Republican Representative Connie Morella issued a press release urging House conferees to support key provisions in the Senate bill, including additional child care funding, maintenance of effort by states, and preservation of child welfare services. As Rep. Morella wrote, moderate Republicans are "united in our belief that comprehensive reform will best be achieved through a conference report that attracts substantial bipartisan support in the House of Representatives...Americans want welfare reform that is effective and compassionate. They do not want Congress to embrace the extreme in this debate."
- o **Only bipartisan reform can pass.** When both Houses of Congress meet to resolve their differences, they should build on the bipartisan progress the Senate made last month. "If Congress can agree on a bipartisan bill that is tough on work and fair to children, we'll have real welfare reform, and the nation will be better for it," President Clinton wrote to lawmakers last week. "But let me be clear: if Congress walks away from this bipartisan common ground and sends me a bill that is weak on work and tough on children, it will kill welfare reform, and I will be forced to continue to end welfare through the waiver process, one state at a time, until Congress gets it right."

CHALLENGING CONGRESS ON WELFARE REFORM

This month, House and Senate conferees will meet to reconcile their welfare reform bills. While we await national reform, the President continues to emphasize that real welfare reform must be tough on work, not tough on kids. As today's *New York Times* reports, President Clinton challenged Congress today to send him a bill that commands bipartisan support. "If Congress can agree on a bipartisan bill that is tough on work and fair to children, we'll have real welfare reform, and the nation will be better for it," President Clinton wrote to participants in January's welfare summit at Blair House. "But let me be clear: if Congress walks away from this bipartisan common ground and sends me a bill that is weak on work and tough on children, it will kill welfare reform, and I will be forced to continue to end welfare through the waiver process, one state at a time, until Congress gets it right."

- o **We know what we need.** "More than eight months ago, we came together at Blair House in an honest effort to find common ground on an issue upon which most Americans have long agreed: the need to reform our broken welfare system," the President's letter says. "Leaders from both parties and all levels of government put a host of innovative solutions on the table and agreed that, whatever else we do, we must first restore the values of work, responsibility and family."
- o **The tools for work.** "We will only complete this historic mission to end welfare as we know it if we succeed in moving people from welfare to work. That means imposing time limits and tough work requirements, making sure people get the child care they need to go to work, and rewarding states and holding them accountable for their efforts to put people to work, not for cutting them off," President Clinton emphasized in his letter to lawmakers. Last week, representatives of the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties and the United States Conference of Mayors also wrote to Senator Dole supporting key Administration-backed provisions in the Senate bill, including adequate child care funding; requirements that states continue to invest their own funds in a work-oriented welfare system; and a contingency fund to protect states against an economic downturn.
- o **Don't punish children.** "Across the country, Republican and Democratic governors agree that we must demand responsibility from young mothers and young fathers, not punish children for their parents' mistakes. Likewise, the American people know that ending welfare is not about walking away from abused children or taking away poor children's school lunch," the President wrote to lawmakers. State and local officials agree. "Welfare reform legislation must not be about one-size-fits-all mandates on state and local governments..." local government groups wrote to Senator Dole last week. "We therefore urge you to oppose the House provisions which would penalize children and shift costs to local governments by requiring states to deny or reduce benefits to these populations."
- o **Only bipartisan reform can pass.** When both Houses of Congress meet to resolve their differences, they should build on the bipartisan progress the Senate made last month. "We have made great strides together in this welfare reform debate, and I am confident that we can put politics aside and achieve an historic bipartisan agreement. We have come too far to let the American people down," President Clinton wrote to lawmakers. "Together, we can give them a government that honors their values, by making welfare a second chance and responsibility a way of life."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Thursday, October 5, 1995

CRITICAL ELEMENTS OF REAL WELFARE REFORM

This month, House and Senate conferees will meet to reconcile their welfare reform bills. While we await national reform, the Clinton Administration -- and editorialists across the country -- are outlining the critical elements for real reform: the incentives and the resources to move parents of young children into the workforce.

- o **The tools for work.** "Senate moderates...beefed up the best available inducement to lure welfare parents into the work force: a promise of child care for their children," the *Minneapolis Star Tribune* wrote recently. "That promise and enough money to make it real need vigilant safeguarding in conference committee." Adequate resources for child care and other key Administration-backed provisions in the Senate bill will ensure that work is the centerpiece of real reform. As the President has emphasized, in addition to adequate child care funding, real welfare reform must include incentives for states to move people from welfare to work, not simply cut them off; personal responsibility contracts for recipients; requirements that states continue to invest their own funds in a work-oriented welfare system; and a contingency fund to help protect states against an economic downturn.
- o **Don't punish children.** "The Senate...correctly decided against saddling states with mandates like not funding families that have additional children while on welfare. States should have that discretion, not Washington," the *Dallas Morning News* said recently. "Unfortunately, the House bill demands the cut-off. It also requires states to deny cash payments to teen mothers. These federal mandates should be struck down when the two chambers resolve their differences." As the Clinton Administration has said from the beginning, states need more flexibility, not less, under welfare reform. And they certainly don't need the conservative mandates the House bill would impose. "Conservative micromanagement is just as bad as liberal micromanagement," Michigan Governor John Engler has emphasized.
- o **Only bipartisan reform can pass.** When both Houses of Congress meet to resolve their differences, they should build on the bipartisan progress the Senate made last month. Insistence on some House provisions could doom reform, because moderate senators from both parties won't support a bill that punishes children and undercuts work. As President Clinton has said, "we've worked too hard, too long, to let partisan extremism kill this effort. Welfare reform will not work and cannot pass unless it's a truly bipartisan effort."
- o **A commitment to real reform.** The Clinton Administration has proven its commitment to giving states the flexibility they need to get the job done. So far, we have granted welfare reform waivers to 35 states -- more than the previous two administrations combined. In addition, we're giving all 50 states the chance to take the fast-track to ending welfare as we know it, by cutting red tape for state reforms that require work, promote parental responsibility, and protect children. As the President has said, we should have bipartisan national welfare reform this year. But if Congress does the wrong thing or fails to act, the Clinton Administration will continue its commitment to ending welfare as we know it -- one state at a time.

MOVING FORWARD WITH REAL WELFARE REFORM

Last week, the House named its welfare reform conferees, who will join with senators to reconcile the House and Senate bills. Meanwhile, the Clinton Administration is continuing to move forward with real welfare reform, even as we wait for congressional action. Yesterday, the Administration approved a welfare reform waiver for Illinois, and last week, we approved waivers for North Dakota and Washington state -- bringing the total to 35 states that have been given the green light to implement their own innovative reforms. "While the country awaits Congress to enact national welfare reform, the Clinton Administration is giving states the authority to reform welfare now," Secretary Shalala said.

- o **We're getting the job done.** The Clinton Administration has proven its commitment to giving states the flexibility they need to get the job done. Illinois is the most recent example of a state that's using work requirements, time-limited assistance, and personal responsibility contracts to move people into jobs. In addition, we're giving all 50 states the chance to take the fast-track to ending welfare as we know it, by cutting red tape for state reforms that require work, promote parental responsibility, and protect children. As the President has said, we should have bipartisan national welfare reform this year. But if Congress does the wrong thing or fails to act, the Clinton Administration will continue its commitment to ending welfare as we know it -- one state at a time.
- o **Tough on work.** "Truly tying welfare to work, as the [Senate] reform bill tries to do, has two great virtues: It deters people from doing things that cause them to go on AFDC in the first place, and it helps those who land there anyway to move into productive employment," Stephen Chapman noted last week in the *Kansas City Star*. Key Administration-backed provisions in the Senate bill, if accepted by the House, will ensure that work is the centerpiece of real reform: real resources to help provide child care; a revolutionary performance bonus to reward states for moving people from welfare to work, not simply cutting them off; personal responsibility contracts for recipients; requirements that states continue to invest their own funds in a work-oriented welfare system; and a contingency fund to help protect states against an economic downturn.
- o **Not tough on kids.** Welfare reform should be tough on work -- not tough on kids. But some conservatives are still pushing for punitive provisions such as a mandatory family cap and a ban on aid to teen moms and their children. Real welfare reform means requiring teen parents to stay in school, live at home, and turn their lives around -- not punishing children for their parents' mistakes. It's not about walking away from abused children or slashing school lunches. That's why the Administration opposes provisions that would block-grant and cut funding for child nutrition and child welfare programs. As Republican Representative Peter Torkildsen said yesterday, "It makes no sense to tamper with programs like WIC and the school lunch program. These programs work well and have very low administrative costs...In our attempt to fix what's broken, we should not reinvent what works."
- o **Only bipartisan reform can pass.** When both Houses of Congress meet to resolve their differences, they should build on the bipartisan progress the Senate made last month. Insistence on some House provisions could doom reform, because moderate senators from both parties won't support a bill that punishes children and undercuts work. As President Clinton has said, "we've worked too hard, too long, to let partisan extremism kill this effort. Welfare reform will not work and cannot pass unless it's a truly bipartisan effort. And it will only become law if it truly reflects the spirit of our great nation and the values of all Americans."

REFORMING WELFARE ONE STATE AT A TIME

As we look ahead to a House-Senate conference committee on welfare reform, the Clinton Administration is making our priorities clear: welfare reform must be a bipartisan effort to require work, promote parental responsibility, and protect children. Today, we're approving a welfare reform waiver for North Dakota, a state that's using personal responsibility contracts and time-limited assistance to move people from welfare to work. "North Dakota is one of 34 states that have now been given the freedom to pursue welfare reform plans that promote work and responsibility," Secretary Shalela said today. "Congress should continue the bipartisan progress the Senate made this month towards national welfare reform that's pro-work, pro-responsibility, and pro-child. However, even if Congress fails to act, the Clinton Administration will continue its commitment to ending welfare as we know it -- one state at a time."

- o **Tough on work.** The Senate has made substantial progress towards real welfare reform that's tough on work. Key Administration-backed provisions in that bill, if accepted by the House, will ensure that work is the centerpiece of real reform: a revolutionary performance bonus to reward states for moving people from welfare to work, not simply cutting them off; personal responsibility contracts for recipients; resources for child care; conditional assistance for teenagers; and a contingency fund to help protect states against an economic downturn. As President Clinton has said, "For 15 years I have worked on this problem. I know these things will make a real difference in moving people from welfare to work."
- o **Not tough on kids.** Welfare reform should be tough on work -- not tough on kids. But some conservatives are still pushing for punitive provisions such as a mandatory family cap and a ban on aid to teen moms and their children. Real welfare reform means requiring teen parents to stay in school, live at home, and turn their lives around -- not punishing children for their parents' mistakes. It's not about walking away from abused children or slashing school lunches. That's why the Administration opposes provisions in the House bill that would block-grant and cut funding for child nutrition and child welfare programs. And that's why we're insisting that the bill contain all of the tough child support enforcement provisions proposed by the Administration last year.
- o **Only bipartisan reform can pass.** When both houses of Congress meet to resolve their differences, they should build on the bipartisan progress the Senate made this month. Including House provisions that are weak on work and tough on children could doom reform, because we've already seen that senators from both parties won't support a bill that punishes children and undercuts work. As President Clinton has said, "we've worked too hard, too long, to let partisan extremism kill this effort. Welfare reform will not work and cannot pass unless it's a truly bipartisan effort. And it will only become law if it truly reflects the spirit of our great nation and the values of all Americans."
- o **We'll still get the job done.** Since taking office, the Clinton Administration has granted welfare reform waivers to a record 34 states -- more than the two previous Administrations combined. In addition, we're giving all 50 states the chance to take the fast-track to ending welfare as we know it, by cutting red tape for state reforms that require work, promote parental responsibility, and protect children. As the President has said, we should have bipartisan national welfare reform this year. But if Congress does the wrong thing or fails to act, the Clinton Administration will continue its commitment to ending welfare as we know it -- one state at

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Tuesday, September 26, 1995

MAKING PROGRESS TOWARD REAL CHANGE

Although a date has yet to be set for a House-Senate conference committee on welfare reform, the President and Democrats have made their position clear: real welfare reform must emphasize work, responsibility, and family. As the President has said, "We'll be working hard on this bill over the next few weeks to make sure the right incentives are there to move people from welfare to work, to make sure children are protected, and that states not only share the problem, but have the resources they need to get the job done. And we'll be working hard to build on the bipartisan progress we've made this week. We must not let it fall apart when the House and Senate meet to resolve their differences."

- o **Progress on national reform.** With a bipartisan welfare reform bill passed in the Senate, Congress is within striking distance of passing comprehensive national legislation. As the *LA Times* noted last week, "The unusual Senate bipartisanship beefed up funds for child care. That's appropriate. No preschooler should be forced to stay home alone because a parent traded a welfare check for a paycheck. The coalition also squelched a freeze on benefits for welfare mothers who would give birth to additional children...Moderate Republicans and Democrats also teamed up to reject the House's prohibition of cash welfare benefits for teenage mothers...The Senate's requirement that states spend 80% of what they spent in 1994 on welfare would fairly share responsibility between Congress and the statehouses."
- o **Resources for work.** If welfare reform is to succeed in moving people into the workforce and keep them there, states must have adequate resources. As the *Chicago Tribune* noted last week, "A bipartisan consensus of governors, including such avid welfare reformers as Wisconsin governor Tommy Thompson, has told Congress quite correctly that welfare cannot be reformed humanely and on the cheap. More money will be needed, at least at the start, to help welfare-dependent families make the transition to work and financial independence."
- o **No conservative mandates.** Some conservative Republicans have said that they will oppose a bill that lacks punitive provisions such as a mandatory family cap and a ban on aid to teen moms and their children. But including those extremist mandates could doom reform, because senators have shown that they won't support a bill that's tough on kids. "Some of the people on the extreme right wing of the Republican majority have held this issue hostage, because they want to force the states to implement requirements that would deny benefits to young unmarried mothers and their children," the President said. "But I believe it's better to require young people to stay at home, stay in school, and turn their lives around, because the objective is to make good workers, good parents, good citizens, and successful children. That's what we're all trying to do...I'm against giving the states more mandates and less money, whether the mandates come from the right or the left."
- o **Let's get the job done.** "The President and Democrats have put some very strong principles out that we believe in," House Minority Leader Dick Gephardt said on CBS's *Face the Nation* Sunday. "One is that we ought to get people off of welfare and into work, and we ought to put real work requirements on states to get people to work. That's what we're all trying to do. Secondly, we shouldn't be penalizing children. We should be helping children have an opportunity to have a sound and productive life...if you can accept those principles, we can work our way to a bill that accepts those principles -- I think those are commonly believed

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
September 25, 1995

MAKING PROGRESS TOWARD REAL CHANGE

Although a date has yet to be set for a House-Senate conference committee on welfare reform, the President and Democrats have made their position clear: real welfare reform must emphasize work, responsibility, and family. As the President has said, "We'll be working hard on this bill over the next few weeks to make sure the right incentives are there to move people from welfare to work, to make sure children are protected, and that states not only share the problem, but have the resources they need to get the job done. And we'll be working hard to build on the bipartisan progress we've made this week. We must not let it fall apart when the House and Senate meet to resolve their differences."

- o **Progress on national reform.** With a bipartisan welfare reform bill passed in the Senate, Congress is within striking distance of passing comprehensive national legislation. As the *LA Times* noted last week, "The unusual Senate bipartisanship beefed up funds for child care. That's appropriate. No preschooler should be forced to stay home alone because a parent traded a welfare check for a paycheck. The coalition also squelched a freeze on benefits for welfare mothers who would give birth to additional children...Moderate Republicans and Democrats also teamed up to reject the House's prohibition of cash welfare benefits for teen-age mothers...The Senate's requirement that states spend 80% of what they spent in 1994 on welfare would fairly share responsibility between Congress and the statehouses."
- o **Resources for work.** If welfare reform is to succeed in moving people into the workforce and keep them there, states must have adequate resources. As the *Chicago Tribune* noted last week, "A bipartisan consensus of governors, including such avid welfare reformers as Wisconsin governor Tommy Thompson, has told Congress quite correctly that welfare cannot be reformed humanely and on the cheap. More money will be needed, at least at the start, to help welfare-dependent families make the transition to work and financial independence."
- o **No conservative mandates.** Some conservative Republicans have said that they will oppose a bill that lacks punitive provisions such as a mandatory family cap and a ban on aid to teen moms and their children. But including those extremist mandates would doom reform, because senators have shown that they won't support a bill that's tough on kids. This weekend, conservative Republicans showed signs of compromise on a key sticking point: whether or not states should be required to deny benefits to mothers under 18 who have additional children while on welfare. "...I think we could probably see some latitude," House Majority Leader Dick Armey said on CBS's *Face the Nation* Sunday. "That may be a ground where we can sit down and work out the differences between us."
- o **Let's get the job done.** "The President and Democrats have put some very strong principles out that we believe in," House Minority Leader Dick Gephardt said on CBS's *Face the Nation* Sunday. "One is that we ought to get people off of welfare and into work, and we ought to put real work requirements on states to get people to work. That's what we're all trying to do. Secondly, we shouldn't be penalizing children. We should be helping children have an opportunity to have a sound and productive life...if you can accept those principles, we can work our way to a bill that accepts those principles -- I think those are commonly believed principles -- let's get it done."

For Bruce
TPS
result

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Thursday, September 21, 1995

MAINTAINING BIPARTISAN PROGRESS ON REAL REFORM

This week, the Senate passed a welfare reform bill that moves towards the President's goal of rewarding work, promoting parental responsibility, and protecting children. The House and the Senate still must reconcile the differences in their bills, but President Clinton has made his position clear: "Finally we're on the verge of coming to grips with one of the most fundamental social problems of our time -- moving people from welfare to work. Now we must finish the job, and we can't let ideological extremism get in the way."

- o **A commitment to real welfare reform.** President Clinton has a longstanding commitment to real welfare reform that gets the job done. As he said earlier this month, "For more than 15 years, first as governor of Arkansas, and later when I became president, I have always felt it was critically important to fix our broken welfare system...Over the last two and a half years, while I have been urging Congress to act, my administration has worked as hard as we can to change the welfare system by executive action in a way that honors the values most Americans hold dear -- work, responsibility, and family."
- o **Movement towards real reform.** Last week's series of bipartisan votes moved the Senate bill closer to real reform. "Unlike the house bill, the Senate measure would require the states, each year for the next five years...to spend on welfare at least 80 percent of what they spent this year. The senators also voted to spend an additional \$3 billion on child care, and they rejected House provisions that would deny welfare assistance to children born to unmarried women younger than 18 or to mothers already on welfare. Mr. Clinton supports the Senate on those matters," the *New York Times* wrote today.
- o **No conservative mandates.** As the *Washington Post* and others report today, conservatives have said that they will oppose a bill that lacks punitive mandates such as a mandatory family cap and a ban on aid to teen moms and their children. But, as the *Washington Post* notes, "the inclusion of that language would doom a conference bill on the Senate floor." Senators have shown that they won't pass a bill that is tough on kids. As President Clinton has said, "if welfare reform remains a bipartisan effort to promote work, protect children, and collect child support from people who ought to pay it, we will have welfare reform this year, and it will be a very great thing. But if the Congress gives in to extremist pressure and walks away from the bipartisan American common ground, they will kill welfare reform."
- o **It's time to get the job done.** "Despite the progress we've made, our work isn't done yet," the President said. "We'll be working hard on this bill over the next few weeks to make sure the right incentives are there to move people from welfare to work, to make sure children are protected, and that states not only share the problem, but have the resources they need to get the job done. And we'll be working hard to build on the bipartisan progress we've made this week. We must not let it fall apart when the House and Senate meet to resolve their differences."

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR REAL WELFARE REFORM

Yesterday, the Senate passed a welfare reform bill with wide bipartisan support. President Clinton voiced his support for the spirit of compromise that led to the passage of the Senate bill, but said that the final product should not include the punitive conservative provisions of the House bill. "If welfare reform remains a bipartisan effort to promote work, protect children, and collect child support from people who ought to pay it, we will have welfare reform this year, and it will be a very great thing," the President said yesterday in Florida. "But if the Congress gives in to extremist pressure and walks away from the bipartisan American common ground, they will kill welfare reform."

- o **Consensus on welfare reform.** "What we all want," President Clinton said yesterday in Florida, "is for people on welfare to be able to live the way the rest of America lives. We want people to be able to succeed as workers and as parents. We want the values of family and work and responsibility to triumph. We don't want anybody to be trapped, generation after generation, on welfare. And we know it would be good for the rest of us as well if they were liberated and became taxpayers instead of tax-drawers."
- o **Maintaining a bipartisan coalition.** "Democrats forced a series of compromises, such as squeezing Republicans to agree to spend \$11 billion over five years on child care for working mothers and creation of a \$1 billion fund over five years to help states pay benefits during economic downturns," the *Wall Street Journal* reports today. Democrats and moderate Republicans joined together to move welfare reform towards the president goal of a bipartisan bill that puts work, responsibility, and family first. "We'll be working hard to build on the bipartisan progress we've made this week," the President said Saturday. "We must not let it fall apart when the House and Senate meet to resolve their differences...We've worked too hard, too long, to let partisan extremism kill this effort."
- o **No conservative mandates.** As the *Wall Street Journal* notes today, "if the final version adopts the House's more restrictive measures -- particularly provisions that would deny additional benefits to women who have more children while on welfare and refuse cash benefits to unmarried teenagers who have children -- it would likely lose the support of the coalition of Senate GOP moderates and Democrats cobbled together in recent weeks by Senator Dole." President Clinton said Saturday that "there are some on the far right who say they don't want welfare reform at all unless it meets all their ideological litmus tests. By an overwhelming bipartisan majority, the Senate showed wisdom and courage in rejecting those litmus tests this week."
- o **Let's deliver on real welfare reform.** "I ask you to do what you can, without regard to party, to encourage your senators and your members of Congress to give this country a welfare reform bill that is pro-family, pro-work, pro-responsibility, and pro-child," President Clinton said yesterday. "We'll be working hard on this bill over the next few weeks to make sure the right incentives are there to move people from welfare to work, to make sure children are protected, and that states not only share the problem, but have the resources they need to get the job done," the President emphasized in his radio address Saturday.

LET'S FINISH THE JOB RIGHT

Today, the Senate will vote on its welfare reform bill -- which, as the President said in his Saturday radio address, has made substantial progress towards real reform. However, "our work isn't done yet," the President emphasized Saturday. "We'll be working hard on this bill over the next few weeks to make sure the right incentives are there to move people from welfare to work, to make sure children are protected, and that states not only share the problem, but have the resources they need to get the job done. And we'll be working hard to build on the bipartisan progress we've made this week. We must not let it fall apart when the House and Senate meet to resolve their differences...We've worked too hard, too long, to let partisan extremism kill this effort."

- o **We've taken action.** The Clinton Administration has granted welfare reform waivers to a record 34 states -- more than the two previous Administrations combined. In addition, we've given all 50 states the chance to take the fast-track to ending welfare as we know it by cutting red tape for state reforms that require work, promote parental responsibility, and protect children. Today, for example, the President travels to Florida, a state that has combined time limited assistance with transitional employment to move people from welfare to work. "Ever since the 1992 campaign," President Clinton said in his radio address, "I've been appealing to Americans to join me in an effort to end welfare as we know it. Since I became President, I've been working to reform welfare state by state while pushing for national action in Congress."
- o **Bipartisan movement towards real reform.** Last week's series of bipartisan votes moved the Senate bill closer to real reform. "Senators in both parties agreed," the President said Saturday, "that states have a responsibility to maintain their own efforts to move people from welfare to work, and to care for poor children, and that states should have access to a contingency fund to protect against an economic downturn that would put people out of work and on welfare through no fault of their own. They also agreed on a revolutionary work performance bonus that I have urged that, for the first time ever will reward states for placing welfare recipients into private sector jobs. They agreed that, instead of just cutting off young, unwed mothers, we should require them to live at home, stay in school and turn their lives around...All these things have long been critical elements of my approach to welfare reform, from my service as governor to my work as President."
- o **No conservative mandates.** As the President said Saturday, "still, there are some on the far right who say they don't want welfare reform at all unless it meets all their ideological litmus tests. These extremists want to cut off all help to children whose mothers are poor, young and unmarried...These same people want Washington to impose mandates like a family cap, even though Republican and Democratic governors alike agree that these decisions should be left to the states. By an overwhelming bipartisan majority, the Senate showed wisdom and courage in rejecting those litmus tests this week," the President emphasized. "Now we must finish the job, and we can't let ideological extremism and politics as usual get in the way."
- o **Moving towards real reform.** "After months of sometimes bitter debate," President Clinton said Saturday, "we are now within striking distance of transforming the welfare system in four fundamental ways. First, people on welfare will have to work in return for the help they receive. Second, no one who can work will be able to stay on welfare forever. Third, we will begin to make work possible by providing child care for mothers of young children. And, fourth, we will put in place the toughest child support enforcement measures ever." These are all critical elements of welfare reform -- measures the President has been calling for from the start.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, September 18, 1995

WE MUST FINISH THE JOB

Last week, after a series of bipartisan votes that moved welfare reform toward the President's goal of encouraging and requiring work, the Senate is within striking distance of passing comprehensive national legislation. As the President said in his Saturday radio address, the Senate has made substantial progress, although the work isn't done yet.

Key areas of agreement now include a revolutionary performance bonus to reward states for moving people from welfare to work, not simply cutting them off; resources for child care; a contingency fund to help protect against an economic downturn; conditional assistance for teenagers; and all of the tough child support enforcement provisions proposed by the Administration last year. As the President said on Saturday, "Finally, we're on the verge of coming to grips with one of the most fundamental social problems of our time."

- o **Reform is underway.** "Our Administration has freed 34 states from federal rules to enable them to move people from welfare to work," the President emphasized in his radio address. "We've offered all 50 states the opportunity to set time limits on welfare, require people to work or stay in school, give private employers incentives to work. And it's working. The welfare rolls are down, the food stamp rolls are down across America. But we still need national action in Congress."
- o **Progress on national reform.** Senate Democrats and moderate Republicans joined forces last week to remove punitive mandates from the Dole bill, add resources for child care, reward states for moving people from welfare to work, and provide an economic contingency fund to protect states in times of economic downturn. The Senate also agreed to require teen mothers to live at home, stay in school, and turn their lives around. The Senate bill also includes the President's plan for child support enforcement -- the toughest ever. "All these things have long been critical elements of my approach to welfare reform, from my service as governor to my work as President," President Clinton said. "For 15 years I have worked on this problem. I know these things will make a real difference in moving people from welfare to work."
- o **Rejecting extremism.** As the President said Saturday, "still, there are some on the far right who say they don't want welfare reform at all unless it meets all their ideological litmus tests. These extremists want to cut off all help to children whose mothers are poor, young and unmarried...These same people want Washington to impose mandates like a family cap, even though Republican and Democratic governors alike agree that these decisions should be left to the states. By an overwhelming bipartisan majority, the Senate showed wisdom and courage in rejecting those litmus tests this week," the President emphasized Saturday. "Now we must finish the job, and we can't let ideological extremism and politics as usual get in the way."
- o **It's time to get the job done.** "Despite the progress we've made, our work isn't done yet," the President said Saturday. "We'll be working hard on this bill over the next few weeks to make sure the right incentives are there to move people from welfare to work, to make sure children are protected, and that states not only share the problem, but have the resources they need to get the job done. And we'll be working hard to build on the bipartisan progress we've made this week. We must not let it fall apart when the House and Senate meet to resolve their differences."

THE WORK CONTINUES

Yesterday, the Senate made some progress towards improving the Dole bill: at the insistence of Democrats, senators tentatively agreed to provide additional funding for child care and create a contingency fund to protect states in times of recession. As White House spokesman Mike McCurry said yesterday, the Clinton administration has made no final conclusions about the bill, although "we've had some luck and some success in making the case in favor of some of those amendments, and the work will continue." We're hoping for more progress today, as we look toward a final Senate vote on Tuesday.

- o **Child care is crucial.** As the *New York Times* and other papers report today, at the urging of Democrats, senators have agreed to add \$3 billion in child care funding to the Dole bill, for a total of \$8 billion over five years. The administration has said from the start that adequate child care funding is essential to ending welfare as we know it. As President Clinton has said, "child care must be the central element of our effort to put welfare mothers to work.... if we want parents on welfare to go to work, we have to make sure they have good, clean, safe places for their children to go during the day."
- o **Protections for states.** The Senate has also tentatively agreed to add a contingency grant fund for states. This protection, absent from the original Dole bill and the House bill, is a provision that the administration and governors of both parties have said is necessary for states to succeed under welfare reform. As the President has said, "there have to be some protections for the times when the economy goes down in the country as a whole and the times when the economy goes down in some parts of the country but not in others." A contingency fund would protect states in the event of an economic downturn, a natural disaster, or another unpredictable emergency -- and ensure that they have the resources they need to promote work and protect children.
- o **The elements for work.** This week, at the insistence of Democrats, the Senate agreed to include a performance bonus to give states an incentive to move people into jobs -- rather than simply cutting them from the rolls. As President Clinton has said, "I want a performance bonus, but one that will focus the welfare bureaucracy and the welfare recipients to focus on work." The Senate has also agreed to include personal responsibility contracts in the bill -- a key component of the administration's plan to ensure that welfare reform is about work, first and foremost.
- o **Hope for a bipartisan bill.** This week, the Senate made progress in improving the Dole bill -- and moving it farther away from the fatally flawed bill passed by the House. Senators voted with a wide bipartisan margin to remove conservative mandates such as a ban on aid to teen mothers and to children born to mothers on welfare. In addition, they agreed to include resources for child care and the incentives for states to move people from welfare to work. While there's still work to do before Tuesday's vote, there is hope for a strong bipartisan bill that gets the job done. As the President has said, "there is common ground on welfare. We want something that's good for children, that's good for the welfare recipients, that's good for the taxpayers, and that's good for America."

THERE'S A LOT OF WORK LEFT TO DO

Yesterday, as the *Baltimore Sun* reports, "in a double-barreled defeat for conservative Republicans," Democrats and moderate Republicans joined to remove the mandatory family cap provision from the Dole bill. In addition, on a 76 to 24 vote, members rejected a ban on cash benefits to unwed teenage mothers. Both votes were a strong victory for Democrats, who support state flexibility under welfare reform. However, while the bill is getting better, there's still a way to go. As the *Wall Street Journal* and other papers report today, Democrats continue to work to ensure that welfare reform includes adequate child care funding, rewards work, and protects states in times of recession. As President Clinton has said, it's time to deliver what the American people want.

- o **Moving in the right direction.** As today's *Los Angeles Times* reports, under pressure from Democrats, the Senate has agreed to require that states maintain at least 80 percent of their current welfare spending indefinitely. Yesterday, the Senate also defeated efforts by conservative Republicans to ban aid to teen mothers and to families who have additional children on welfare. Governors support this move: "we oppose any provisions that prohibit states from aiding such groups as legal aliens, teen parents, or additional children born to welfare recipients," they wrote yesterday to Senator Dole. As President Clinton has said, states must have more flexibility -- not less -- under real welfare reform.
- o **Child care is key.** As President Clinton has said, "it is pure fantasy to believe we can put a welfare mother to work unless we provide child care for her children." Yesterday, in a bipartisan letter to Senator Dole, the National Governors' Association urged him to provide the child care resources states need to successfully move people from welfare to work. "We are concerned that unless adequate child care funding continues to be approved at the Federal level, the work requirements in the bill could represent a significant unfunded mandate on the states," the governors wrote. "We all agree that states will need substantially more funding than is currently in your bill." As the *New York Times* and others papers report today, the Dole bill still falls short:-- but Democrats are working to ensure that child care is there for real welfare reform.
- o **Rewarding work.** From the start, Democrats have called for a performance bonus to give states an incentive to move people into the workforce. Last night, the Senate passed the Lieberman/Roth amendment, which provides a \$2 billion fund to reward states that succeed in moving people from welfare to work. As President Clinton has said, "We should reward states for putting people to work, not for cutting people off. We will only succeed if we move people from welfare to work." The Senate has also agreed to include the Harkin amendment, which requires personal responsibility contracts -- a central part of the administration's welfare reform proposal.
- o **Don't put states at risk.** In addition to being rewarded for moving people into the workforce, states must be protected in the event of population growth, an economic downturn, a natural disaster, or another unpredictable emergency. As governors wrote to Senator Dole yesterday, "We urge you to include a contingency grant fund that gives states that experience sharp increases in unemployment access to federal matching funds." Democrats support such a contingency fund to ensure that states have the resources they need to get the job done.

IT'S TIME TO DELIVER ON REAL WELFARE REFORM

Yesterday, the Senate narrowly defeated the Breaux "maintenance of effort" amendment, which would have required states to maintain 90 percent of their current level of welfare spending for the next five years. But, as today's *New York Times* reports, moderate Republicans have extracted an agreement requiring states to maintain 80 percent of their current spending over five years -- a "victory for Democrats," as *USA Today* reports. The Senate also defeated a Republican amendment to block grant the Food Stamp program with a wide, bipartisan margin. Today, the Senate will consider amendments to remove the family cap and illegitimacy bonus, and to add adequate resources for child care. The administration supports these crucial measures to ensure that welfare reform promotes work and protects children.

- o **No conservative mandates on states.** Today, Senator Domenici will move to strike the mandatory family cap provision from the Dole bill -- to give states the flexibility they need to succeed under real welfare reform. Even some Republican senators have told Senator Dole that they oppose placing conservative restrictions on states: "These restrictions are inconsistent with the stated goal of providing maximum flexibility to the states," they wrote in June. "Moreover, there is no evidence that such provisions have any impact on the rate of out-of-wedlock pregnancies." And Governor Engler has said that "conservative micromanagement is just as bad as liberal micromanagement," under welfare reform. Senator Jeffords will also offer an amendment today to remove the illegitimacy bonus from the Dole bill -- ensuring that work remains the focus of real welfare reform.
- o **We still need child care.** Democrats -- and many Republicans -- agree that child care is essential to real welfare reform. But the Dole bill fails to provide the child care people will need in order to move from welfare to work. Today, after a narrow defeat on Monday, Democrats will try again to ensure that welfare reform provides the child care assistance that people need find jobs -- and keep them. As the president has said, "child care must be the central element of our effort to put welfare mothers to work."
- o **Rewarding success -- not the status quo.** Real reform means encouraging states to help people find jobs and keep them. States should be rewarded for success in moving people into the workforce -- rather than given an incentive to save money by cutting people off the rolls. That's why Democrats support a performance bonus for states to focus the welfare bureaucracy and recipients on the central goal of moving people from welfare to work.
- o **It's time to deliver on real reform.** As President Clinton has said, "this is a time to deliver for the American people -- not to pander to extremists who've held us back for too long. We can't let welfare reform die at the hands of ideological extremism or presidential politics or budget politics. If welfare reform gets caught up in the whirlpool of the budget debate, we run the risk that it might drown... The American people have waited long enough."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Tuesday, September 12, 1995

WE'RE WORKING FOR REAL WELFARE REFORM

Yesterday, the Senate narrowly defeated the Kennedy/Dodd child care amendment, despite united Democratic support and two Republican votes. As President Clinton has repeatedly said, adequate child care funding is essential to welfare reform that is truly about work, and we'll try again to remedy this shortcoming in the Dole bill. Today, Democrats will also focus on the need for states to maintain their own effort in moving people from welfare to work and on the need for a national nutritional safety net. As President Clinton said in his Saturday radio address, "let's end the old system that fosters dependence, and let's give the American people a new one based on independence, work, responsibility, and family."

- o **Maintaining a partnership with states.** Today, Senator Breaux will offer an amendment to ensure that states remain partners in welfare reform and continue to have incentives to help people move into jobs -- not just cut them off. "The states and the federal government must remain partners if we're going to have real welfare reform that helps people get and keep jobs," Senator Breaux said yesterday. "Our maintenance of effort amendment would ensure that federal dollars don't replace state funds -- funds states could use for other programs." As Senator Breaux noted, the Republicans' alternative maintenance of effort provision is "purely cosmetic."
- o **Preserving the nutrition safety net.** Today, the Senate will also vote on an amendment by Senator Ashcroft to mandate a Food Stamp block grant, an amendment we oppose because it would cut a hole in the nutrition safety net. A Food Stamp block grant would sever the link between Food Stamps and nutrition; eliminate the program's economic responsiveness; end national eligibility and benefit standards; and ultimately divert support away from food. This provision was already rejected by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees on bipartisan votes. In fact, even Senator Dole has said that "the nutrition area is one that does not easily lend itself to state responsibility This Senator believes that child nutrition should remain a national priority."
- o **Providing real resources for work.** States must have the necessary resources for child care, training, and work in order to move people into jobs. But the Dole bill undercuts the ability of states to move recipients from welfare to work by reducing the funding they need to get the job done. As today's *Washington Post* notes, the CBO released an analysis yesterday finding that only 10 to 15 states would meet their work requirements by the year 2000 under the Dole bill. We won't have welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives states more mandates and fewer resources. As Republican Governor Voinovich of Ohio has said, "if we're supposed to get serious about getting people to work, which is what everyone says, then we've got to spend what it takes." Democrats will continue to work to ensure that states get the funding they need to get the job done.
- o **Real reform, not presidential politics.** Late today, Republican Senator Domenici may offer an amendment to strike the mandatory family cap provision from the Dole bill -- a smart move away from placing conservative restrictions on states. As President Clinton said in his Saturday radio address, "We can't let welfare reform die at the hands of ideological extremism or presidential politics or budget politics... Now we've got a real chance to reach common ground and higher ground. The senators owe it to the people who sent them to Washington not to let this opportunity slip away, by doing the wrong thing, or by failing to

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, September 11, 1995

LET'S GET THE JOB DONE

Today, the Senate continues deliberation on welfare reform, voting on amendments to the Dole bill. As the *Washington Times* noted yesterday, "Senate Republicans are deeply divided over terms of the final legislation." On Saturday, in his weekly radio address to the nation, the president renewed his pledge to end welfare as we know it. "For 30 years, under both Democratic and Republican leadership, we've been saddled with a broken welfare system. Now we've got a real chance to reach common ground and higher ground. The senators owe it to the people who sent them to Washington not to let this opportunity slip away, by doing the wrong thing, or by failing to act at all. The American people have waited long enough...Let's end the old system that fosters dependence, and let's give the American people a new one based on independence, work, responsibility, and family."

- o **Child care is key.** Democrats -- and many Republicans -- agree that child care is essential to real welfare reform. "We should impose time limits and tough work requirements, while making sure that parents get the child care they need to go to work," the president noted in his radio address. But the Dole bill fails to provide the child care people will need in order to move from welfare to work. Today, the Senate will vote on an amendment offered by Senators Kennedy and Dodd, which would provide the child care assistance that people need find jobs -- and keep them.
- o **A partnership with the states.** "States have a responsibility to maintain their own efforts to move people from welfare to work," the president emphasized in his Saturday radio address. "That way we can have a race to independence, not a race to the bottom." But the Dole bill still fails to give states a real stake in moving people from welfare to work. This week the Senate will vote on the Breaux amendment -- a provision that will make states real partners in welfare reform.
- o **No political extremism.** As the President emphasized in his radio address Saturday, "We can't let welfare reform die at the hands of ideological extremism or presidential politics ... This is a time to deliver for the American people -- not to pander to extremists who've held us back for too long." As the president has stated from the beginning, punitive provisions such as cutting off aid to teen moms and their children, mandating a nationwide family cap, or implementing an illegitimacy bonus would only punish children for their parents' mistakes -- and do nothing to move people towards self-sufficiency. Moderate Republicans have also noted, "these restrictions are inconsistent with the stated goal of providing maximum flexibility to the states."
- o **Real resources for work.** "Real reform, first and foremost, must be about work," the president reaffirmed in his radio address. States must have the resources they need in order to back up tough work requirements. They should also be rewarded for getting the job done. That's why Democrats support a performance bonus to give states an incentive to move people into work. As President Clinton said Saturday, "We should reward states for putting people to work, not for cutting people off. We will only succeed if we move people from welfare to work."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Friday, September 8, 1995

CRITICAL ELEMENTS OF REAL WELFARE REFORM

Yesterday, despite united Democratic support, the Senate defeated the "Work First" plan offered by Senators Daschle, Breaux, and Mikulski. Today, Democrats will offer parts of that proposal separately, in an effort to make the flawed Dole bill what it should be: a plan to move people from welfare to work. As the president has said, at least two critical elements are essential for real welfare reform: real maintenance of effort requirements that make states partners in moving people from welfare to work and child care provisions that make it possible for single parents to move into jobs -- and stay there.

- o **Child care is key.** Democrats -- and many Republicans -- agree that child care is essential to real welfare reform. To enable people to move from welfare to work, we must provide child care assistance for welfare recipients moving to self-sufficiency. But the Dole bill would eliminate the guarantee for child care assistance that people need in order to move from welfare to work. The Republican bill "is so deficient in child care that it makes the bill totally unworkable," Senator Dodd emphasized at a news conference yesterday with Senator Kennedy and other Democrats. "We can't go cheap on this issue."
- o **The right incentives for states.** States should be rewarded for moving people onto private payrolls -- not for simply cutting them off the welfare rolls. But the Dole bill, even as amended, fails to give states a real stake in moving people from welfare to work. As the *New York Times* notes today, "the [Dole maintenance of effort] amendment is a sham. It purports to require states to maintain current spending on programs for low income families. But the amendment is riddled with loopholes and will not, in fact, force any state to give up a dime." Under the Dole bill, the *New York Times* warns, "states will be tempted to drop benefits and raise eligibility, in part to avoid attracting an influx of the poor from neighboring states."
- o **No conservative mandates.** As the press reports today, an issue that continues to divide Republicans is the denial of aid to teen mothers and their children. Our position is clear: cutting off aid to teen moms would do nothing to move them towards self-sufficiency, and it would only punish children for their parents' mistakes. As President Clinton has said, "I want to discourage teen pregnancy. We have to do that -- but not by hurting innocent babies. We should require teen mothers to live at home, stay in school, and turn their lives around -- so they and their children stay off welfare for good."
- o **A basis for bipartisan reform.** The Administration believes that real welfare reform must require work, promote parental responsibility, and protect children. As the president wrote to Senate leaders this week, "I support the 'Work First' plan because welfare reform is first and foremost about work. We should impose time limits and tough work requirements, and make sure that people get the child care they need to go to work. We should reward states for putting people to work, not for cutting people off. We will only end welfare as we know it if we succeed in moving people from welfare to work."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Thursday, September 7, 1995

WORK FIRST IS REAL REFORM

Today, the Senate continues debate on welfare reform, voting on the Democrats' "Work First" plan -- endorsed by President Clinton as real reform. Yesterday, President Clinton sent a letter to Senate leaders expressing strong support for "Work First," which has all the necessary elements to get the job done: "Now we need to pass a welfare reform bill that ends the current welfare system altogether and replaces it with one that puts work, responsibility, and family first," the president emphasized.

o **"Work First" is real reform.** As President Clinton stated in his letter to Senator Dole, "I strongly support and urge you to pass the welfare reform bill sponsored by Senators Daschle, Breaux, and Mikulski that is before the Senate today. Instead of maintaining the current broken system that undermines our basic values, the Daschle-Breaux-Mikulski plan demands responsibility and requires people to work. The 'Work First' bill will cut the budget by moving people to work, not by asking states to handle more problems with less money, and shipping state and local taxpayers the bill."

o **Real work requirements.** "I support the 'Work First' plan because welfare reform is first and foremost about work," the president wrote yesterday. "We should impose time limits and tough work requirements, and make sure that people get the child care they need to go to work. We should reward states for putting people to work, not for cutting people off. We will only end welfare as we know it if we succeed in moving people from welfare to work." Adequate child care funding is especially critical to helping single parents find jobs -- and keep them.

o **A true partnership with the states.** The "Work First" plan makes states partners in welfare reform -- instead of giving them more problems and less resources. In contrast, as the *Washington Post* notes today, "it's easy to include a provision in a bill labeled 'maintenance of effort' as Mr. Dole clearly has, by allowing states to count all sorts of extraneous expenditures as meeting this 'maintenance of effort' requirement and having this requirement expire in a couple of years." States should be rewarded for putting people to work -- not for cutting them off. As the president wrote yesterday, "states have a responsibility to maintain their own efforts to move people from welfare to work, so that we can have a race to independence, not a race to the bottom."

o **A call for bipartisan reform.** Yesterday, President Clinton repeated his call for a strong bipartisan welfare reform bill that gets the job done: "The dignity of work, the bond of family, and the virtue of responsibility are not Republican values or Democratic values. They are American values -- and no child in America should ever have to grow up without them. We can work toward a welfare reform agreement together, as long as we remember the values this debate is really about."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Wednesday, September 6, 1995

WELFARE REFORM: TAKE II

Today, Congress resumes debate on welfare reform. In August, Senator Dole pulled welfare reform from the floor due to a lack of support for his bill. Congress has delayed action -- but President Clinton continues to push forward with real welfare reform. "While Congress continues to debate I will proceed with the far reaching welfare reforms I initiated with the states over the last two years," the president said last month. Today, the Clinton administration approves two additional welfare reform waivers, for Ohio and Florida, allowing them to continue to experiment with innovative welfare reform measures. But, as the president has said, we still need a strong bipartisan bill that ends welfare and replaces it with work, like the Democratic leadership's "Work First" plan. The Dole bill still falls far short of real welfare reform.

- o **Helping states get the job done.** States must have the necessary resources for child care, training, and work in order to move people into jobs. The Democrats' "Work First" plan would cut welfare spending in some areas in order to increase funding to move welfare recipients into the workforce. In contrast, the Dole bill undercuts the ability of states to move recipients from welfare to work by reducing the funding they need to get the job done. By shifting enormous costs to states, the Dole bill makes it harder for states to move people from welfare to work and to support working families and children who need temporary help.
- o **The right incentives for states.** States have a responsibility to maintain their own efforts to move people from welfare to work. The "Work First" bill would make states partners in welfare reform, and reward states for putting people to work. But the Dole bill gives states an incentive to cut people off. States could withdraw their own funds, cut benefits, throw large numbers of people off the rolls, and fail to help people become self-sufficient. As President Clinton has said, welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom -- it should be a race to independence.
- o **Lacking essential child care for work.** If welfare reform is to succeed in moving people into the workforce and keeping them there, adequate child care is essential. The "Work First" plan recognizes that child care is essential to real welfare reform. To enable people to move from welfare to work, "Work First" provides child care assistance for welfare recipients moving to self-sufficiency and working families struggling to stay off the welfare rolls. In contrast, the Dole bill would eliminate the guarantee for child care assistance that people need in order to move from welfare to work. As President Clinton has said, "child care must be the central element of our effort to put welfare mothers to work."
- o **A basis for bipartisan reform.** The Administration supports the "Work First" bill because it requires work, promotes parental responsibility, and protects children. It holds state bureaucracies accountable for real results, and rewards them for putting people to work, not just cutting people from the welfare rolls. It saves money by moving people into jobs, not by expecting the states to handle more problems with less money. And it protects states during recessions, population growth, inflation, and other demographic changes. "Work First" is real reform, and the Administration urges Congress to make it the basis of a strong bipartisan bill.

RENEWING OUR PLEDGE FOR BIPARTISAN WELFARE REFORM

Today's *New York Times* reports that, in a news conference yesterday, President Clinton "renewed his commitment to an overhaul of the welfare system, asserting that the legislation now stalled in the Senate had gotten 'wrapped up' in Republican presidential politics. He urged senators to seek a bipartisan consensus bill during the Congressional recess." As today's *Wall Street Journal*, *Washington Post* and *Los Angeles Times* report, conservative Republican senators continue to demand the inclusion of punitive provisions in welfare reform, while moderate Republicans are demanding that states put up some of their own money and provide child care for those required to work. Here are the issues being debated:

- o **No conservative mandates.** As today's *Los Angeles Times* reports, Senator Gramm continues to call for punitive provisions in welfare reform -- particularly the denial of aid to teen moms and their children. The *Times* reports that "if Gramm wins this battle, Dole could lose moderate Republicans, who find such provisions untenable ... [Senator] Snowe said, 'that could prove problematic for the passage of welfare reform.'" As President Clinton stated yesterday, welfare reform has "plainly been wrapped up to some extent in Republican Presidential politics, and that's bad, because 85 percent of the American people want it."
- o **The right incentives for states.** By not requiring states to contribute a dime of their own money, the Dole bill gives states an incentive to cut people off, rather than put them to work. States could withdraw their own funds, cut benefits, throw large numbers of people off the rolls, and avoid helping people become self-sufficient. Today's *Washington Post* reports that some governors and Republican moderates recognize this flaw in the Dole bill. Requiring states to maintain their stake in moving people from welfare to work has been "cited as crucial not only by Republican moderates, but by President Clinton," the *Post* notes.
- o **Child care for work.** Real reform must provide child care to move people from welfare to work and to keep people from going on welfare in the first place. By placing funding for child care in a block grant with other programs, and by cutting it across the board, the Dole bill fails to guarantee that states will put any money into the child care and work programs that move people into jobs. Some moderate Republicans are beginning to call for specific funding for child care to ensure that people can leave the rolls for work, and that they have adequate child care when they do.
- o **A call for Congress to act.** As today's *New York Times* reports, President Clinton renewed his pledge yesterday to work with Congress to craft a strong, bipartisan bill that moves people from welfare to work: "What we need to do, over this break, is that folks need to get together and figure out how we can put these approaches together and come out with a bill which promotes work, which promotes time limits, which promotes responsible parenting." The American people have waited long enough -- it's time to act now on real welfare reform.

NO STALLING ON WELFARE REFORM

As today's *New York Times* and *Washington Post* report, Senator Dole's decision to postpone action on welfare reform reflects the lack of support for his bill, which is deeply flawed when it comes to the centerpiece of real reform: work. Even the *Washington Times* notes today that, "Given the Democrats' united opposition and the small group of Republicans backing his bill, Mr. Dole didn't have the votes. He found himself in the embarrassing position of having to pull the measure that he had vowed to pass before the August recess." And finally, the *Washington Post* remarks that "Mr. Dole's bill is a jumble whose design Mr. Dole is willing to keep changing as new political needs arise." The bill must be changed, but to reflect the real American values of work, responsibility, and family -- not presidential politics and conservative ideology. Here's more:

- o **Serious about work.** States must have the necessary resources for child care, training, and work in order to move people into jobs. But the Dole bill undercuts the ability of states to move recipients from welfare to work by reducing the funding they need to get the job done. As today's *Washington Post* notes, "large numbers of welfare recipients cannot be put to work unless governments spend more money than they do now. It is cheaper to write a welfare check than to create work opportunities." Republican Governor George Volnovich agrees in this week's *Time* magazine: "it takes money" to move people from the welfare rolls onto private payrolls, he says.
- o **Child care for work.** By combining resources for cash benefits, child care, and employment assistance into one block grant, the Dole bill provides no guarantee that states will invest any money in the child care that's necessary to help move people off welfare. The bill would also reduce current child care spending, despite a huge increase in work requirements imposed on states. In a press conference yesterday, Senator Kennedy said that the "Republican welfare bill is a home-alone bill." Senator Dodd added that the "proposal is child-care-less." In contrast to the Republican approach, Democrats support specific funding for child care to ensure that single parents can find jobs -- and keep them.
- o **No punitive provisions.** As today's *Washington Post* notes, welfare reform has been held up by ideological bickering among Republicans. The *Post* writes that Senator "Gramm has been leading a group of conservatives who have refused to sign on to the Dole plan unless Dole agrees to add provisions to try to reduce out-of-wedlock births by cutting off aid to unwed teenagers..." The American public agrees that this approach is shortsighted -- and the wrong focus for welfare reform. In a poll taken last week by the *Wall Street Journal*, 62 percent of Americans said that the most important goal for welfare reform is "getting people into the work force," while only 19 percent said it's to reduce out-of-wedlock births.
- o **"Work First" has what it takes.** The Democrats' "Work First" proposal is serious welfare reform: it requires people to work; requires teen moms to stay at home and in school; requires welfare recipients to be held to a time limit; requires delinquent parents to pay child support; and requires people on welfare to sign a contract holding them accountable to finding a job. "The American people have waited long enough," President Clinton said this week. "We need a bipartisan bill that ends welfare and replaces it with work. I hope the Senate will place welfare at the top of its agenda in September and take swift action." "Work First" should be the basis of that effort.

THE SENATE MUST TAKE SWIFT ACTION

Yesterday, Senator Dole pulled welfare reform from the Senate floor, unable to draw support for his own proposal. As today's *New York Times* reports, the "decision to defer action on welfare resulted from many factors: deep disagreements over welfare policy, partisan politics, and the keen desire of weary senators to get out of town for a vacation. Another element was the rivalry between Mr. Dole and Senator Phil Gramm of Texas, another Republican seeking his party's nomination for President." President Clinton firmly stated yesterday that Congress must get on with reform: "The American people have waited long enough. We need a bipartisan bill that ends welfare and replaces it with work. I hope the Senate will place welfare at the top of its agenda in September and take swift action."

- o **We want real reform.** As today's *Wall Street Journal* reports, even Republican moderates recognize that the Dole bill is deeply flawed. Among other things, they want "stronger guarantees of child care for welfare mothers. They also sought stronger assurances that states would put up at least some of their own funding to complement federal welfare outlays," the *Journal* notes. Democrats are united behind an alternative bill that would provide the child care people need to move from welfare to work, hold state bureaucracies accountable for real results, and reward states for putting people to work, not just cutting people off. It also saves taxpayers money by moving people into jobs -- not by shipping the states more problems and less resources.
- o **We've made some progress.** As President Clinton said yesterday, the debate over welfare reform has come a long way since he convened a conference at Blair House in January. "At the conference, we agreed on the need for child support to be a part of any welfare reform legislation. Now, the bill passed in the House and the legislation in the Senate includes comprehensive child support reform. Since the conference, we have agreed to drop any inclusion of orphanages in welfare reform. Since the conference, we have agreed to require teen moms to live at home and stay in school as a condition of receiving welfare. Since the conference, we have agreed that all recipients must sign a work contract as a condition of receiving benefits."
- o **The administration has taken action.** President Clinton also noted that his administration is already putting states on a fast track to ending welfare as we know it: "This year alone I have signed a dozen welfare reform experiments. The experiments have included new proposals, among them: requiring people to work for their benefits, requiring teen moms to stay at home and in school, requiring welfare recipients to be held to a time limit, requiring delinquent parents to pay child support, and requiring people to on welfare to sign a contract which would hold them accountable to finding a job. The state experiments now total 32 states reaching 7 million individuals."
- o **We'll continue to act while Congress debates.** "While Congress continues to debate welfare, I will proceed with the far reaching welfare reforms I initiated with the states over the last two years," President Clinton said yesterday. "We will continue to move people from welfare to work. We will continue to require teen moms to stay in school and live at home as a condition of their benefits. I call on this Congress to join me in a bipartisan endeavor, with politics aside and the national interest at the center of our efforts."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Tuesday, August 8, 1995

FIXING WELFARE RIGHT

Yesterday, the Senate opened debate on welfare reform, "in an atmosphere laced with Republican presidential politics," today's *Baltimore Sun* reports. "Despite months of negotiations," *USA Today* notes, "Dole has been unable to unite Republicans around his proposal." One reason is that Dole's bill fails in the primary goal of moving people from welfare to work. As Michael Kramer writes in *Time* magazine this week, "the new bill's changes will make a mockery of the proclaimed goal of 'reforming' welfare by moving people off the dole and into work ... But there's still a chance to improve the bill with floor amendments." That's just what Democrats will do with our "Work First" plan, which will be offered on the Senate floor today.

- o **Rewarding success -- not the status quo.** The Dole bill gives states an incentive to save money by throwing people off the rolls -- instead of shaking up the bureaucracy by rewarding states for success in moving people into the workforce. Real reform means encouraging states to help people find jobs and keep them. That's why the Democrats support a performance bonus for states to focus the welfare bureaucracy and recipients on the central goal of moving people from welfare to work.
- o **Real resources for states.** Republican Governor George Voinovich of Ohio says in *Time* this week that "if we're supposed to get serious about getting people to work, which is what everyone says, then we've got to spend what it takes." Michael Kramer writes in *Time* that "the Senate bill is supposedly all about work -- but that conceit is the biggest sham of all. On paper the bill appears tough: states without 50% of their welfare recipients 'working' by the year 2000 will have their federal funding reduced 5%. But at least 44 states, says the Congressional Budget Office, which is now controlled by the G.O.P., couldn't meet that goal because they'd have to spend about two-thirds of the welfare money they get from Washington just in work programs, thereby leaving way too little for benefit payments." As Senator Breaux said yesterday, the Dole bill "has an Alice in Wonderland approach to putting people to work. It set goals, but doesn't provide the tools for people to go to work."
- o **A contract for work.** As Democrats say today, requiring work means having recipients sign personal responsibility agreements, to ensure that they are moving towards independence from day one. Senator Breaux has said that "our plan is a real contract that promotes work. We invest in people and expect returns. We give the states and people on welfare the tools they need to find and hold down jobs -- then we hold them to their end of the bargain."
- o **Smart funding.** The Dole bill would slash programs for working families in order to pay for its welfare "reforms." As Democrats say today, this just doesn't make sense. "The bill pits essential funding for dislocated workers and high school students trying to gain valuable skills against the needs of governors to finance welfare reform," Senator Breaux says. The administration also stated this week this is the wrong approach to welfare reform: "Not only is the plan's funding insufficient for the Nation's workforce as a whole, the consolidation of these programs means that billions of dollars less will be available to help people stay off welfare and to help others transition from welfare to work."

REAL WELFARE REFORM MUST BE ABOUT WORK

Today, the Senate will begin debate on welfare reform legislation. Over the weekend, Republicans continued to show their divisions on the issue, particularly concerning the denial of benefits to teen moms and their children. The Clinton administration will send senators our Statement of Administration Policy today -- explaining that Senator Dole's bill still falls short of the central goal of real reform -- moving people from welfare to work. Here are four ways that the bill should be changed to ensure that we get the job done:

- o **The right incentives.** The Dole bill contains the wrong incentives for states. By not requiring states to contribute any of their own resources, the bill gives states an incentive to cut people off, rather than put them to work. States could withdraw their own funds, cut benefits, throw large numbers of people off the rolls, and avoid helping people become self-sufficient. As President Clinton has clearly said, welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom -- it should be a race to independence.
- o **A performance bonus for states.** To change the culture of welfare, real reform must encourage success rather than the status quo. The Dole bill gives states an incentive to save money by throwing people off the rolls -- instead of shaking up the bureaucracy by rewarding states for success in moving people into jobs. That's why the administration supports a performance bonus for states to focus the welfare bureaucracy and recipients on the central goal of work.
- o **Child care for work.** Real reform must provide child care to move people from welfare to work and to keep people from going on welfare in the first place. By combining funding for child care, cash benefits, and employment assistance into one block grant and cutting it across the board, the Dole bill fails to guarantee that states will put any money into the child care and work programs that move people into jobs. That's why the administration supports specific funding for child care to ensure that people can leave the rolls for work, and that they have adequate child care when they do.
- o **Protections for states and children.** The block grants in the Dole bill would not adjust to protect states during times of increased unemployment, recession, or economic stagnation. Without the necessary resources, states will either have to raise local taxes or fail to move people into the workforce. While the Dole bill contains a "rainy day" loan fund for states and some extra funding under special circumstances, this finite amount of resources may not be adequate. Real reform means providing resources that allow for shifts in economic conditions and population -- not shifting costs to states and taxpayers.
- o **Work First is real reform.** President Clinton said in his Saturday radio address that "we need a bipartisan agreement that requires people on welfare to work, but makes sure they get the child care they need to stay off welfare for good and to be good parents." The Democrats' "Work First" plan would get the job done; it also holds state bureaucracies accountable for real results, and rewards states for putting people to work, not just cutting people off. It saves taxpayers money by moving people to work, not by shipping the states more problems and less money. The "Work First" plan is real reform, and it should be the basis for a strong bipartisan bill.

**Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Friday, August 4, 1995**

DEMOCRATS ARE UNITED BEHIND REAL REFORM

Tomorrow, the Senate is scheduled to begin floor debate on welfare reform legislation. Meanwhile, as the *Washington Post* reports today, statements from conservative groups this week "highlight divisions within GOP ranks that remain unresolved despite Dole's effort over the past month to create a consensus around his proposal." Today's *Los Angeles Times* also notes that "Republicans remain deeply divided over whether Washington should impose federal restrictions on the way states attack the problem of out-of-wedlock births." "As Senate Republicans continued to negotiate their welfare reform strategies," the *Washington Times* says, "Democratic Senate leaders yesterday introduced their version of welfare reform, which carries President Clinton's stamp of approval." Here's more:

- o **Child care is key.** The Democrats' "Work First" plan recognizes that child care is essential to real welfare reform. To enable people to move from welfare to work, the "Work First" plan provides child care assistance for welfare recipients moving to self-sufficiency and working families struggling to stay off the welfare rolls. As a *Los Angeles Times* editorial noted yesterday, "Dole's bill, on the other hand, is weak on child care." The Dole bill would eliminate the guarantee for child care assistance that people need in order to move from welfare to work. As President Clinton has said, "child care must be the central element of our effort to put welfare mothers to work."
- o **No punitive provisions.** As the press reports today, an issue that continues to divide Republicans is the denial of aid to teen mothers and their children. Our position is clear: cutting off aid to teen moms would do nothing to move them towards self-sufficiency, and it would only punish children for their parents' mistakes. As President Clinton has said, "I want to discourage teen pregnancy. We have to do that -- but not by hurting innocent babies. We should require teen mothers to live at home, stay in school, and turn their lives around -- so they and their children stay off welfare for good."
- o **A good start.** President Clinton said to the nation's governors this week that "I made a personal plea to Senator Dole not very long ago, to try to find a way to make a break from those who were trying to hold the Republican conference in the Senate hostage on this welfare reform issue, so that we can work together ... he proposed getting rid of ideological strings and requirements on states and giving states more say in their programs. And that is a very good start for us to work together."
- o **A basis for bipartisan reform.** The Democrats' plan, President Clinton said yesterday, "sends people to work so they can earn a paycheck, not a welfare check. It provides the child care people need to move from welfare to work, and to enable them to stay off welfare in the first place. It holds state bureaucracies accountable for real results, and rewards states for putting people to work, not just cutting people off. It saves money by moving people to work, not by shipping the states more problems and less money. The Work First plan is real reform, and it should be the basis for a strong bipartisan bill. It's time for Congress to reach across part lines and pass real welfare reform. The American people have waited long enough."

**Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Thursday, August 3, 1995**

"WORK FIRST" WOULD GET THE JOB DONE

Today, Secretary Shalala joins Senators Daschle, Breaux, and Mikulski at a Capitol Hill day care center to introduce the Democrats' Work First bill. With Senate debate on welfare reform possible on Saturday, Democrats are united behind a bill that, as Secretary Shalala says today, "reflects all of President Clinton's principles for welfare reform: real work requirements, strong provisions for teen parents, tough child support enforcement, and a comprehensive approach to teen pregnancy prevention. It also gives states the resources they need -- for child care and other work supports -- to make reform real." Here's what others have to say:

- o **Serious about work.** The Work First plan has all the elements needed to move people from the welfare rolls onto private payrolls. As Senator Daschle says today, it "imposes a work requirement, time limits for benefits (two years at a time and five years over a lifetime) and other conditions welfare recipients must meet if they want to keep their benefits. At the same time, it protects children ... Yet it costs no new money. In fact, our plan will save money in the long run by enabling people to get off welfare -- for good."
- o **Child care is the link.** As Democrats say today, child care is the critical link between welfare and work. Unlike the Republican approach, the Work First plan guarantees the child care assistance that people need to prepare for or go to work. "Single parents must have day care to work," Senator Breaux says today. "Requiring welfare parents to find jobs requires that we try to lift some of the obstacles to affordable day care." *USA Today* quotes Senator Daschle today: "Our plan includes specific funding for child care and transitional health coverage -- the things welfare recipients need to get jobs and keep them." As the Senator also says today, "our plan positions welfare families to succeed."
- o **Mayors agree.** The U.S. Conference of Mayors also recognizes that Work First is real reform. "Everyone agrees that the nation's welfare system is badly in need of reform," the mayors note today. "The U.S. Conference of Mayors has a strong policy in support of meaningful welfare reform that will help move families from welfare to work, from dependence to independence. The nation's mayors believe that the Work First plan is consistent with that policy and that it will move families from welfare to work." County officials also join mayors today in endorsing the Work First approach.
- o **A basis for bipartisanship.** President Clinton says today that, "Instead of maintaining the current welfare system -- which undermines our basic values of work, responsibility, and family -- this plan sends people to work so they can earn a paycheck, not a welfare check. It provides the child care people need to move from welfare to work, and to enable them to stay off welfare in the first place. It holds state bureaucracies accountable for real results, and rewards states for putting people to work, not just cutting people off. It saves money by moving people to work, not by shipping the states more problems and less money. The Work First plan is real reform, and it should be the basis for a strong bipartisan bill."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, July 31, 1995

TAKING BOLD NEW STEPS TO END WELFARE AS WE KNOW IT

Today, President Clinton will address the National Governors' Association's summer meeting in Burlington, Vermont. In his speech, the President will announce bold new measures to help states move people from welfare to work, pressing Congress to act now on bipartisan reform. With these new measures, we're focusing on the centerpiece of real welfare reform: work. Our plan will cut red tape in the waiver process, impose tough new sanctions for failure to work, and put all states on a faster track to ending welfare as we know it.

- o **Fast-track demonstration approval.** Today, President Clinton is simplifying the application process and dramatically cutting approval time from 120 to 30 days for state welfare reform projects that include one or more of these five strategies: States can institute new work requirements, backed up with adequate child care for parents to work. They will be able to impose time limits followed by work, provided they offer jobs to those willing to work. States can also make parents pay child support or go to work. In addition, in order to promote parental responsibility and prevent teen pregnancy, states can require minor mothers to live at home and stay in school. Finally, states can use AFDC and food stamp benefits as cash subsidies for private employers to hire welfare recipients. Under all of the approved demonstrations, the administration will continue to ensure that children are protected and adequate accountability measures are in place.
- o **Tough new sanctions.** Under existing rules, when AFDC recipients fail to play by the rules and participate in mandatory work activities, they lose some of their cash benefits. However, their food stamp benefits increase to offset some of this reduction. President Clinton is now changing federal regulations so that states can impose tougher sanctions on recipients who refuse to work. New regulations will ensure that AFDC and food stamps work together, not at cross purposes with one another. As a result, we're changing the culture of the welfare system to reward those who try to move towards self-sufficiency and send a strong message to those who don't.
- o **A downpayment on our partnership in welfare reform.** Today, President Clinton also announces that the administration has reached agreement on welfare reform waivers for four more states: West Virginia, Utah, Texas, and California -- bringing the total to 32 states that have now been freed up by this administration to promote work and responsibility without being stifled by one-size-fits-all federal rules. These waivers are allowing states to begin implementing welfare reform while Washington continues to debate.
- o **Pressing Congress to act now.** As President Clinton says today, "I hope these actions will spur Congress to get off the dime." Congress must act now to deliver bipartisan welfare reform legislation with real work requirements, time limits, and tough child support enforcement. As today's *Washington Post* reports, President Clinton will also explain that "the bill cannot just dump the welfare problem on the states." Welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom," the President says today, "it should be a race to independence."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Friday, July 28, 1995

WELFARE REFORM THAT WILL MAKE A DIFFERENCE

Today, Secretary Shalala travels to Iowa to address the National Association of Social Workers, the people who are working every day to move welfare recipients to self-sufficiency. Meanwhile, today's *Wall Street Journal* reports that Senate Republicans have decided against block-granting the Food Stamp program -- a move that we applaud. As President Clinton has said, federal nutrition programs work, and we shouldn't fix what's not broken. But this is just one step along the road to crafting a bipartisan bill that will move people from welfare to work. As Secretary Shalala says today, we have a plan for real welfare reform -- "and it will make a real difference -- a positive difference in people's lives." Here's more:

- o **Helping states like Iowa move ahead.** "Iowa has shown a profound commitment to help people get off welfare -- and stay off. And I was pleased to sign the AFDC demonstration waiver for this state," Secretary Shalala says today. "Unfortunately, the House Republicans want to turn their backs on efforts like this one by enacting a bill that gets the priorities all wrong. Make no mistake about it. These are harsh cuts -- and families in Iowa will feel the impact ... Under the House GOP bill, Iowa would lose almost \$400 million in assistance for children and families over five years. That means as many as 36,000 children will be left out in the cold." In order to move ahead under welfare reform, states will need resources to move people into jobs and protect children.
- o **This is real reform?** Current Republican proposals have it all wrong. As Secretary Shalala points out today, "How can they say they want to help families get off welfare, when they ignore the tools they need -- like child care, education, and training -- to get jobs -- and keep them? How can they say they want to protect children, when they punish them for their parents' mistakes? How can they say they want to empower states when they don't give them the flexibility they need to respond to economic downturns, to natural disasters, or to population explosions? And how can they say they want to throw lifejackets to pregnant teens, when they cut them off the rolls and simply say 'sink or swim?'"
- o **We've got it right.** "This President believes we must demand personal responsibility, but offer opportunity in return," Secretary Shalala says to this group of social workers today. "He believes we must demand that people work or train for work -- but offer child care to keep their children safe. He believes we should offer teenage mothers a second chance if they're willing to take it -- by requiring that they stay in school and live at home. And, he believes we can end welfare as we know it without endangering children -- without just passing the buck to leaders like you who provide care and compassion on the front lines. And that's why last month he endorsed a bill -- introduced by Senators Daschle, Mikulski, and Breaux -- that strikes this critical balance."
- o **Rising to the challenge.** As Secretary Shalala concludes today, "we have an historic opportunity to move people who have been left out and locked out into jobs and more fulfilling lives. And we have an opportunity to change a way of thinking and change a way of life. We're hoping that the Senate will rise to this challenge. We're hoping they will reject the politics of extremism and division and honor their tradition of bipartisanship and consensus -- by passing a welfare reform bill in the American ..."

CLEAR SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S APPROACH

As we wait for Congress to act on welfare reform, local newspapers around the country are noting that the Republicans' proposed reforms would have a harsh impact on states, communities, and individuals. Support for President Clinton's approach is clear: Americans want the broken welfare system fixed, but in a way that moves people into jobs; strengthens families; and protects states and taxpayers.

- o **Work is the answer.** Moving people from welfare to work, from dependence to self-sufficiency, is the fundamental goal of real welfare reform. The *Omaha World Herald* reported last week that welfare to work programs in Nebraska are moving people into the workforce. One recipient says that a job placement program "helped restore his self-esteem and gave him the confidence and skills to find a job and keep it." A recent JOBS study also showed that, by focusing on employment and providing transitional supports, welfare-to-work programs in several states are successfully moving recipients into jobs and reducing welfare caseloads and costs. That's real reform.
- o **Making work possible.** As President Clinton said in a recent radio address, "We don't need more latchkey kids. We certainly don't need more neglected children. And we don't want more welfare mothers staying at home, living on welfare, just because they can't find child care. We do want people to be workers and good parents. And if we want parents on welfare to go to work, we have to make sure they can find good, clean, safe places for their children to go during the day." Florida Governor Chiles was also recently quoted by the *Associated Press* as saying that job training, education, and child-care "are essential things that you have to have if you're really going to try to get people off of welfare."
- o **Protections for states and individuals.** "Florida faces money crunch in welfare," the *Miami Herald* announced earlier this month. Current Republican proposals to block grant and freeze funding could put both states and individuals at risk. "Some people in fast-growing states did the math," the *Herald* reports. "The numbers did not look good." As one local official noted, "under the block grant formula that Congress is considering, Florida would be left holding the bag if our welfare population skyrockets." Yesterday's *Philadelphia Inquirer* quoted a representative of the Philadelphia Archdiocese as saying that "we do support welfare reform, but we do not support it on the backs of women and dependent children." We must have real resources for states to ensure that the job gets done right.
- o **Let's get it done.** Representative Clay Shaw said it best in the *Miami Herald*: "We'd better get our stuff together or welfare reform will be a distant memory." President Clinton has said that "every day without welfare reform drains our economic strength, saps our community spirit, and prevents all Americans from living up to their full potential. We need to work together and get this job done."

GETTING ON WITH WELFARE REFORM

"Welfare reform is in deep trouble in the Senate," the *Washington Times* wrote yesterday. "Unless Majority Leader Bob Dole succeeds in his difficult task of crafting a bill acceptable to various intraparty factions, the reform legislation may die altogether. And that would represent a major failure for the Republican Congress." Two major areas of disagreement have frozen welfare reform in the Senate: the denial of aid to teen mothers and the allocation of block-grant funds among states. President Clinton has said that it's time for Congress to put aside partisan politics and deliver a strong, bipartisan bill that he can sign. Americans want real welfare reform. "What a shame if their demands are not met because the Republican majority in the Senate has been unable to resolve its differences," the *Washington Times* concluded.

- o **No punitive provisions.** As the *Washington Times* explained yesterday, among other things, the House-passed welfare bill would require states to deny aid to teen mothers and their children. "Republican Sens. Phil Gramm of Texas and Lauch Faircloth of North Carolina have vowed to hold hostage -- by filibuster, if necessary -- any bill that excludes the House-passed provisions," the *Times* noted. As President Clinton has said, this approach "would punish the innocent children of unmarried teenagers for the mistakes of their parents. This might cut spending on welfare, but it wouldn't reform welfare to promote work and responsible parenting. That's why so many Republicans and Democrats oppose it."
- o **Adequate funding for states.** Another area of disagreement, the *Washington Times* noted, "involves the allocation of block grant funds among the states." Both the House and the Senate Finance Committee bills would freeze federal funding to states at current levels. But a bipartisan group of 30 senators claim that their states would be penalized under this funding formula. Freezing current allocations, they recently wrote to Senator Packwood, would "penalize high-growth states and have devastating results over a five-year period." Real welfare reform means providing resources for work and protecting children in every state.
- o **Bipartisan reform.** "We are now at an historic moment," President Clinton stated in a recent radio address. "The failure to pass welfare reform this year would be a disservice to the American people. It shouldn't become another victim to the politics of gridlock. Republicans and Democrats alike have a real responsibility to bring real change to Washington. And a bipartisan majority in the Senate is prepared to vote for a welfare reform bill with time limits and real work requirements and without moralistic dictates that will do more harm than good ... Let's not let politics stand in the way of making work and responsibility a way of life for the next generation."
- o **The right solution.** Our "Work First" plan has all the elements states need to get the job done. As President Clinton said in endorsing the Democratic bill, "it supports work. It supports doing the things that are necessary to get people into the work force and protecting children, especially dealing with the child care issues and requiring states to continue to support the children of the country who, through no fault of their own, are born into poor families. So I believe this is the right kind of welfare reform. It also saves money. It will help us balance the budget, but it does it in the right way."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, July 24, 1996

COMMON SENSE ON WELFARE REFORM

Today, Secretary Shalala travels to Georgia to address both the National Association of Counties' 60th Anniversary Conference and the Community Forum on Welfare Reform. Meanwhile, today's *Washington Post* notes that the bill introduced by Senator Gramm last week is much "worse than the already flawed bill approved by the Senate Finance Committee, and in some ways worse than the even more flawed bill passed by the House." There's still hope, however, that the Senate will choose real reform over partisan politics. As Secretary Shalala says to NACo today, "if common sense and cooler heads prevail in Congress, we have an historic opportunity to do something positive ... We're hoping that the Senate will take advantage of this opportunity. We're hoping that they'll honor this tradition of bipartisanship and consensus -- and pass a welfare reform bill in the American tradition: a bill that honors work and responsibility." Here's what this entails:

- o **Work.** As Secretary Shalala says to NACo today, work must be the centerpiece of any real welfare reform proposal -- and anyone who can work, must work. This means giving communities the tools they need to help people move into the workforce -- and stay there. But, as the Secretary says to these county officials, the current Republican approach "mandates new work requirements, without giving you the resources you need to reach them. It creates new obstacles to your innovative local programs that are replacing welfare checks with paychecks."
- o **Child care.** As Secretary Shalala says today, "we must demand that people work or train for work -- but offer child care to keep their children safe." Real reform, the Secretary notes, means providing "child care not only for citizens who are moving from welfare to work -- but also for working families struggling to stay off the welfare rolls." Yet the current Republican proposals do "nothing to help you provide your citizens with the resources they need -- like child care, education, and training -- to move from welfare to work."
- o **Parental responsibility.** Both the House bill and Senator Gramm's proposal would deny aid to pregnant teens, not only punishing children for their parents' mistakes but also leaving local governments to pick up the pieces. "These mandates," the *Washington Post* remarks today, "are a phony answer to the genuine problem of out-of-wedlock births." Secretary Shalala says that "we should offer teens a second chance if they're willing to take it -- by requiring that they stay in school and live at home -- instead of just telling them to 'sink or swim.'"
- o **State flexibility.** The *Washington Post* notes that "Mr. Gramm has gone block grant crazy", which is dangerous because "block grants are a bad idea for AFDC and a terrible idea for food stamps, destroying the flexibility that allows federal aid programs to respond to regional economic downturns and population shifts." As Secretary Shalala says to NACo today, welfare reform means giving states the flexibility they need to respond to an ever-changing economy, as well as the resources they need to move people from welfare to work -- without

"IT WILL TAKE SOME LEADERSHIP"

Yesterday, Senator Phil Gramm and other conservative Republican senators unveiled a welfare reform proposal as an alternative to the Senate Finance Committee's bill. As the *Washington Post* reports today, this bill reflects the "deep differences" among Republicans that have been tying up reform in the Senate, injecting "a fresh dose of presidential politics into the welfare reform debate." Despite the growing divisions in the Senate, we're still hopeful we can craft a bipartisan bill. As Secretary Shaiala told the *Post* yesterday, "just because we seem to be hitting rock bottom and getting leaner and meaner proposals, doesn't mean we can't have a bill ... A welfare bill is there to be had. It will take some leadership." Here's what we're looking for:

- o **No punitive provisions.** As President Clinton said yesterday to the National Conference of State Legislatures, "I'm going to do my best to get you a welfare reform proposal which gives more flexibility to the states and doesn't have a lot of ideological prescriptions one way or the other ... I think that is the right way to do it." President Clinton has called for a bipartisan bill that moves people into jobs, encourages parental responsibility, and gives states the tools they need to get the job done -- without punishing children for their parents' past mistakes. We believe that Congress can deliver.
- o **Resources to move people from welfare to work.** In order to end welfare as we know it, states will need real resources for job training, job placement, and child care to help people get jobs and keep them. As President Clinton said yesterday, "we know that most people on welfare will go to work if they're given a chance to do it; we know that the absence of child care is a big problem, a barrier, and we know that the states will figure all this out if they have the tools to do it right."
- o **Protections for states.** States should be rewarded for moving people from welfare to work, and protected in the event of population growth, an economic downturn, a natural disaster, or another unpredictable emergency. As President Clinton said yesterday, "there have to be some protections for the times when the economy goes down in the country as a whole and the times when the economy goes down in some parts of the country but not in others. I have tried to say all along one of the big risks of these block grants is that some states are going to come up short in the next recession, and all states could."
- o **Protections for children.** As the President has repeatedly said, neither food stamps nor the school lunch program should be block-granted. "For a lot of kids in this country -- a lot of kids -- the only decent meal they get every day is the meal they get at school. This program works. If it's not broken, we shouldn't fix it," he said. Only a national system of nutrition programs can establish and meet nutrition standards that respond to economic changes and ensure that children's health will be protected. Children must be helped -- not hurt -- as we move ahead to create real, lasting welfare reform.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE

Today, President Clinton addresses the annual meeting of the National Conference of State Legislatures. The President notes today that the Clinton administration has proven our commitment to giving states the flexibility they need to implement their own welfare reform plans. For example, "Delaware and Ohio," President Clinton says, "have led the way with meaningful welfare reform focused on protecting our children and moving people from welfare to work." But our commitment doesn't end here. The Clinton administration will continue to call on Congress to deliver a welfare reform bill with real work requirements, protections for children, and the resources states need to succeed.

- o **A proven commitment.** As President Clinton says today, "we have given 29 states waivers from federal rules to enact their own welfare reform proposals. In the last two and a half years, more states have received waivers than in the two previous administrations combined." States are already experimenting with time-limited aid programs followed by work, measures to promote parental responsibility, and special requirements for teen mothers to live at home and stay in school. Our approach to welfare reform builds on the knowledge and experience gained through these state initiatives.
- o **Resources for reform.** If states are going to succeed in moving people from welfare to work, they'll need adequate resources to get the job done. "Should the states have more responsibility?" President Clinton asks today. "Yes. Should you deliver primary services? You always have. Can we in Washington do more to free you up? Absolutely. But we must do this in partnership. Simply moving the bureaucracy from one place to another is nothing more than a shell game. Giving you the responsibility without the resources is nothing short of disastrous."
- o **No conservative mandates.** As the *Washington Times* reports today, some conservative Republican senators are pushing to include punitive provisions in welfare reform legislation -- such as cutting off aid to teen moms and their children. Yet such provisions would only punish poor children for their parents' mistakes, without doing anything to move these families towards self-sufficiency. They would also impose conservative micromanagement on states. As President Clinton has said, states need more flexibility, not less, under welfare reform.
- o **Meeting the challenge.** President Clinton said in his speech yesterday at the National Archives that there are "great challenges for our whole country on the home front at the dawn of the 21st century. We've got to find the wisdom and the will to create family-wage jobs for all of the people who want to work, to open the door of college to all Americans, to strengthen families and reduce the awful problems to which our children are exposed, and to move poor Americans from welfare to work."

STATES KNOW WHAT THEY NEED TO SUCCEED

Today, the National Conference of State Legislatures holds its annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. While Congress contemplates block-granting and cutting funds to states, these local representatives have made their position clear. To be credible, they say, welfare reform must provide states with the flexibility, resources, and protections they'll need to successfully move people from the welfare rolls to private payrolls. In a letter last month to Senator Packwood, they wrote that "state legislators are concerned about several provisions under consideration that have the potential to limit state authority, [and] shift major costs to states." Here's more:

- o **Adequate funding to get the job done.** Real welfare reform means giving states the incentives and resources to move people from welfare to work. However, many states now realize that the funding formulas under current block grant proposals would leave them short. As the *Boston Globe* recently reported, "Massachusetts would stand to lose more than \$175 million a year, or one-third of its federal cash welfare funds, under a proposal being advanced by Southern and Western lawmakers on Capitol Hill." As Professor Lawrence Meade told the *Globe*, "if you cut the budget alone, you haven't reformed welfare."
- o **A commitment to child care.** The NCSL wrote in a letter to Senator Packwood last month that "child care is an essential component to support welfare recipients moving from welfare to work and is critical for low-income working families. Our experience suggests that a renewed commitment to work by welfare recipients will require additional funds beyond current levels." President Clinton has said that "we have to require people who can work to go to work, and make sure that they have the child care to do it so that they don't have to hurt their children to do the right thing as citizens. It defies common sense to insist that people go to work when they have very young children if doing so will actually cost them money."
- o **Protections for children.** "State legislators believe that foster care maintenance and adoption assistance payments ... must be maintained as an open-ended entitlement. Children in danger cannot be told that the government ran out of money to protect them," NCSL wrote to Packwood. Cutting child protection is not welfare reform. As Secretary Shalala has said, "basic protection for children should not be an accident of geography. School lunches, food stamps, and assistance to abused, disabled, and neglected children should not be slashed under the guise of 'welfare reform.'"
- o **Protections for states.** "NCSL supports the development of a contingency fund to assist states to respond to changes in population and the economy, rather than a loan fund," the group wrote Packwood. NCSL notes "the absence of adequate protections for states with population growth, economic changes, and disasters," under the Senate Finance Committee bill. As NCSL explains, any legislation must enable states to succeed in moving people from welfare to work and supporting working families and children who need temporary help.

"AMERICANS WANT SOMETHING TO BE DONE"

As the *Washington Post* reports today, a new survey from Covenant House shows that across the country, Americans are calling for real reform that moves people from welfare to work and provides the resources necessary to get the job done. Our approach reflects what Americans want. As President Clinton has said, "my top priority is to get people off welfare and into jobs ... To do that, we have to take some of the money we save and plow it into job training, education and child care ... If we're going to make people on welfare work, then we've got to make it possible for them to work. If we're going to make people self-reliant, we have to make it possible for them to support themselves. We can be tough, but we've got to be practical."

- o **Work, first and foremost.** The American people agree: work must be the centerpiece of any plan to end welfare as we know it. A recent *Washington Post* poll showed that 94 percent of Americans believe that welfare recipients should be required to work or train for work. Welfare reform must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. That's why we would require recipients to develop personal responsibility agreements, ensuring that from the very first day, they would be moving from welfare to work. In addition, time limits would make clear to welfare recipients and caseworkers that welfare is a transitional system leading to self-sufficiency.
- o **Resources to get the job done.** As the *Washington Post* reports, a new survey out today shows that, instead of reducing the services necessary to move people into jobs, Americans believe that "there ought to be more, especially in the areas of job training, job placement, and family counseling." According to the survey, "67 percent of Americans say what we need most is more job training, and 62 percent say there should be more job placement services provided." Yet the Senate Finance Committee bill would make it harder, not easier, for states to move people from welfare to work. As President Clinton has said, "the reason the Senate bill fails on the standard of work, is clear. It takes away the tools that states now use to move people from welfare to work: child care, job training, greater incentives for job placement."
- o **Helping people get ahead -- not cutting them off.** While we must send the strongest possible message to teens that pregnancy and childbearing should be delayed, arbitrarily denying benefits to teen mothers will only punish poor children -- and make a broken system even worse. As the *Washington Post* reports today, the American people agree: "the survey shows that congressional proposals to reduce government programs for those young people - specifically ending welfare payments to teenage mothers -- are sharply at odds with national sentiments." The *Post* quotes Vincent Gray, director of Covenant House, as saying that "this study shows that Americans want something to be done and they don't just want these people to be thrown to the dogs."
- o **"Work First" is the right kind of reform.** President Clinton supports the Democratic leadership's welfare reform bill because it includes all of the elements that are necessary to help recipients move into the workforce -- and stay there. It also has the right incentives for states -- including a performance bonus for states that exceed job-placement targets -- and penalties for those who do not. As President Clinton has said, welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom -- it should be a race to independence.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, July 17, 1995

IT'S TIME FOR REAL WELFARE REFORM

As the *New York Times* reported over the weekend and the *Wall Street Journal* notes today, partisan politics are tying up welfare reform in the Senate. On Sunday, the *New York Times* wrote that Republican Senators Phil Gramm and Bob Dole have clashed over welfare reform, "in a display of the Republican split that has stalled the legislation in a Senate increasingly roiled by Presidential politics." Meanwhile, the people who work on the front lines of the issue are in Washington today for the American Public Welfare Association Conference. These people know what real welfare reform is all about -- and it's not partisan politics. As Mary Jo Bane, Assistant Secretary for Children and Families, says to the conference today, welfare reform is about moving people into jobs; increasing parental responsibility; helping children grow into independent adults; and giving states the flexibility and the tools they need to succeed.

- o **Real work requirements.** As Assistant Secretary Bane says today, real welfare reform is first and foremost about work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. This means that state bureaucracies should be rewarded for getting people to work or prepare for work -- not for cutting people from the rolls. Recipients must sign personal responsibility agreements, and move toward work and self-sufficiency from the very first day. Welfare must be a transitional system leading to independence.
- o **Parental responsibility.** Child support enforcement is a crucial part of welfare reform, because it sends a strong signal to young people about the responsibility of both parents to the children they bring into the world. If we're going to demand responsibility of mothers, we should demand responsibility of fathers too. As Mary Jo Bane says today, we're pleased that the House and Senate Finance bills finally included all of the Administration's proposals: measures designed to identify the father in every case; find delinquent parents who move from job to job or state to state to avoid paying child support; speed up payments; and invoke tough penalties, like drivers license revocation, for nonpayment.
- o **Helping children.** True reform should make it easier for poor children to grow into productive adults -- not harder. Teenage parents should not be denied cash assistance -- instead, help should be conditioned on their staying in school, living at home, and identifying their child's father. As President Clinton has said, we shouldn't punish children for their parents' mistakes. Instead, we ought to be building strong families and independent workers.
- o **Resources and flexibility for states.** As Assistant Secretary Bane says today, we won't have welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives states more burdens and fewer resources. To be credible, welfare reform legislation must provide states with resources for job training, job placement, and child care to help people get jobs and keep them. A recent JOBS study revealed that, by focusing on employment and providing transitional supports, welfare-to-work programs in several states are successfully moving recipients into jobs and reducing welfare caseloads and costs. That's real reform.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Friday, July 14, 1995

LET'S GET THE JOB DONE

Yesterday, President Clinton, Secretary Shalala, and Democratic members of Congress called on Senate Republicans to stop practicing "just say no politics" and move forward in creating a strong, bipartisan welfare reform bill that the President can sign. "While Senate Republicans have fumbled with welfare reform," the *Washington Times* reports today, "Senate Democrats ... have unveiled a welfare reform proposal that has been endorsed by Mr. Clinton." And Reuters adds that "Democrats are united behind their own bill." We're ready to proceed. As the President said yesterday, "it's time to move away from the extreme position toward the common ground of sensible welfare reform."

- o **What's the holdup?** The *Washington Times* reports today, "Welfare reform has been stalled in the Senate since the Finance Committee passed its bill in May with tepid support." As President Clinton said yesterday "some people on the far right are blocking any action on welfare reform that doesn't cut off children and parents if the parents are poor, young, and unmarried. I think that's a terrible mistake. We shouldn't punish babies for their parents' mistakes. We ought to be building strong families and independent workers."
- o **Falling short of reform.** As Senator Breaux said yesterday, the Senate Finance bill would fail to provide states with enough money to move people into jobs. "Because the GOP bill doesn't provide new resources for child care and work programs, states would have to raise taxes to pay for the new costs," Breaux noted. "In short, their welfare bill is an enormous unfunded mandate on state and local governments -- a \$35 billion unfunded mandate over the next seven years." Over seven years, California and New York would have to raise an additional \$5.3 billion and \$3.4 billion respectively in order to comply with the Senate Finance bill's work requirements.
- o **We know what works.** "Now, there is an alternative," the President said yesterday. "We basically all agree on what ought to be in a welfare reform proposal." Our "Work First" bill would get the job done. This plan includes all of the elements necessary to move young parents into the work force. It also promotes parental responsibility, protects children, strengthens child support enforcement, and give states the flexibility and the tools they need to succeed.
- o **It's time to get the job done.** As the Associated Press reports, President Clinton believes that "lawmakers should be able to build on a developing consensus to overhaul the nation's welfare system." Senator Breaux said yesterday that "it's time Democrats and Republicans pass welfare reform legislation based on the mainstream principles we can all agree on: work and responsibility." As President Clinton noted, "every day without welfare reform drains our economic strength, saps our community spirit, and prevents all Americans from living up to their full potential. We need to work together and get this job done."

A CHANCE FOR CHANGE

Today, President Clinton, Secretary Shalala, and members of Congress meet to discuss the direction welfare reform is taking in the Senate. As President Clinton says today, some conservative Republican senators are holding up reform by calling for the inclusion of punitive provisions that will hurt, rather than help, poor families and children. The Clinton Administration believes that welfare reform is too important to let partisan politics stand in its way. As President Clinton says today, "the American people have made it abundantly clear that they want the broken welfare system fixed. It doesn't work for the people who are stuck on it, and it doesn't work for the taxpayers." Congress must move now to deliver a welfare reform bill that will give people a new chance at independence.

- o **We know what we need.** As President Clinton says today, "We ought to be able to do this. We've come a long way in this welfare debate. There's a broad consensus, for example, on tougher child support enforcement requirements." We also agree that we need to put strict time limits on welfare, demand work from anyone who can work, and provide child care so that parents can go to work.
- o **What's stalling reform?** President Clinton says today that partisan politics are standing in the way of ending welfare as we know it. As the President explains, "some people on the far right are blocking any action on welfare reform that doesn't cut off children and parents if the parents are poor, young, and unmarried. I think that's a terrible mistake. We shouldn't punish babies for their parents' mistakes. We ought to be building strong families and independent workers." Catholic Bishops, meeting yesterday with President Clinton, said they also oppose these punitive provisions that would do more harm than good.
- o **Investing in the future.** President Clinton said in his Saturday radio address that "we ought to look at our problems with a view toward the long-term. Moving people from welfare to work will save a lot more money in the long run than throwing children off the rolls. They will be in trouble, and they will cost us a lot of money in the long run, and a lot of our national life as well. We are never going to end welfare unless people have the training and child care to be good workers and good parents."
- o **Working together to get the job done.** "Every week that goes by," President Clinton says today, "thousands of welfare mothers stay on welfare instead of going to work, simply because they can't get child care. Every week that we don't make our child support laws as tough as we possibly can, we leave 800,000 people on welfare who could be off it tomorrow if they got the child support to which they are legally entitled. Every day without welfare reform drains our economic strength, saps our community spirit, and prevents all Americans from living up to their full potential. We need to work together and get this job done."

REDEDICATING OURSELVES TO BIPARTISAN REFORM

Today, Secretary Shalala will speak at a conference marking the 20th Anniversary of the National Child Support Enforcement Program. Secretary Shalala says today, "the President has shown extraordinary leadership in convincing Congress to make tough child support enforcement provisions a key part of welfare reform legislation now under consideration. We're pleased that the strong child support enforcement provisions in all the major bills have received bipartisan support. They must become law as part of a comprehensive bipartisan welfare reform bill. It is critical that the House and Senate work promptly to resolve their differences and deliver to the President's desk a bipartisan bill that he can sign."

- o **Parental responsibility.** In a letter commemorating today's anniversary, President Clinton writes that "strong child support enforcement measures are crucial not only because they help provide children with economic security, but because they send a clear signal to young men and young women that they should not have children until they are prepared to care for them. And those who do have children must not be permitted to walk away from them. Governments don't raise children; parents do. We cannot rest until parents across our nation begin to shoulder that responsibility. We must act now to give our children the future they deserve."
- o **We're making progress.** As Secretary Shalala notes today, the National Child Support Enforcement Program has made important progress in increasing support for children. Last year, the federal-state system collected a record \$10 billion from non-custodial parents, an 11 percent increase from 1993 to 1994. In addition, 36,000 more paternities were established in 1994 than the previous year. And we're doing more to improve the system: our new in-hospital paternity establishment provisions, the President's executive order to improve child support enforcement among federal employees, and the Justice Department's aggressive pursuit of parents who cross state lines without paying are working together to increase collections.
- o **The strongest possible message.** As Secretary Shalala says today, welfare reform legislation must include tough child support enforcement measures like streamlined paternity establishment, new hire reporting, uniform interstate child support laws, computerized statewide collections, and license revocation. These five Administration-backed improvements would increase child support collections by \$24 billion in the next 10 years alone -- helping millions of children who deserve the support of both parents. And they'd reduce federal welfare costs by \$4 billion over the same period.
- o **A rededication to bipartisan reform.** "As we celebrate the successes of the past two decades," President Clinton writes today, "we should rededicate ourselves to working across party lines to pass the strongest possible child support and welfare reform legislation." Secretary Shalala also says today that "we believe the broad agreement on child support enforcement can be used as a foundation to build this bipartisan relationship on addressing welfare reform -- as it was 20 years ago when a Democrat named Russell Long and a Republican named Gerald Ford worked together to create today's child support system."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Tuesday, July 11, 1995

"DO SOMETHING"

Today, *Washington Post* columnist Mary McGrory writes on the status of welfare reform in the Senate. She notes that Senate Majority Leader Dole and House Majority Leader Dick Armey have said the chances for passing welfare reform this year are slim. Dole "wouldn't bet the farm" on it. What's stalling reform? As McGrory and others have recently noted, senators are divided over the formula used to allocate funds to states under proposed block grants. President Clinton has called on Congress to deliver real welfare reform legislation this year -- and that means making sure that each state has the funding it needs to move people from welfare to work.

- o **Fair funding for states.** "If the debate over ideological differences has been volatile and rhetorical, the *Washington Post* said last month, "the fight over funding formulas has been more like trench warfare." Senators continue to disagree over the allocation of funds under the House and Senate bills' block grant approach. As Mary McGrory notes today, a bipartisan group of 30 senators recently wrote to Senator Packwood, asserting that their states "would be penalized if the House version were to prevail." The senators wrote that freezing current allocations would "penalize high-growth states and have devastating results over a five-year period."
- o **Protections for states.** As Mary McGrory notes, many senators are now realizing that the House bill's funding formula would leave them short. McGrory says that Senators Phil Gramm of Texas and Al D'Amato of New York represent states that would face different dangers under the funding formula: "Gramm voicing Sun Belt states' concern over high population growth that would not be covered by allocations that would be frozen for five years, and D'Amato speaking for a northern state with generous benefits that would be left no cushion for recession."
- o **"Work First" will get the job done.** In order to end welfare as we know it, we need real work requirements backed up with the resources states need to get the job done. Our "Work First" proposal would give states the resources they need to move people into the work force and support working families and children who need temporary help. Under "Work First," states would be rewarded for moving people from welfare to work, and protected in the event of population growth, an economic downturn, a natural disaster, or another unpredictable emergency.
- o **Moving ahead with reform.** Republican Senator John Chafee, McGrory writes today, recognizes that the American people want Congress to "do something about welfare." As President Clinton said in Saturday's radio address, "Republicans and Democrats alike know what's needed to get this job done. A majority of senators in both parties agree with me that welfare reform must require everyone who can work to go to work. We agree on the need for the toughest possible child support enforcement. And we agree that no one who can work should be able to stay on welfare forever. So, we are close. Congress could put a bill on my desk -- a good bill -- within the next few weeks. After a generation of debate, we have a chance -- finally -- to do what's right for the taxpayers who pay for a failed welfare system, and for the people who are trapped by it."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, July 10, 1995

REAL REFORM -- NOT PARTISAN POLITICS

In his Saturday radio address to the nation, President Clinton focused on the need to pass bipartisan welfare reform legislation that is serious about moving people from welfare to work. "I want Congress to send me a bill that requires work, demands responsibility, and provides the child care people need to move from welfare to work," the President said. "After a generation of debate, we have a chance -- finally -- to do what's right for the taxpayers who pay for a failed welfare system, and for the people who are trapped by it." Yet, as President Clinton said on Saturday, a group of conservative Republican senators is holding up real reform by demanding punitive provisions that will do more harm than good. "When the vast majority of Americans and members of Congress agree on an issue like welfare reform, a small minority shouldn't be able to get away with just say no politics."

- o **Helping children, not punishing them for their parents' mistakes.** As the President said on Saturday, "a handful of senators are threatening to hold welfare reform hostage to their own political views. They're threatening to block a vote on any bill that doesn't cut off all help to children whose mothers are poor, young, and unmarried. I believe their position is wrong ... This approach also would punish the innocent children of unmarried teenagers for the mistakes of their parents. This might cut spending on welfare, but it wouldn't reform welfare to promote work and responsible parenting. That's why so many Republicans and Democrats oppose it."
- o **Investing in the future.** President Clinton said in his address that "we ought to look at our problems with a view toward the long-term. Moving people from welfare to work will save a lot more money in the long run than throwing children off the rolls. They will be in trouble, and they will cost us a lot of money in the long run, and a lot of our national life as well. We are never going to end welfare unless people have the training and child care to be good workers and good parents."
- o **Moving ahead with real reform.** President Clinton also said that "we shouldn't just berate the worst in America. We ought to spend more time concentrating on the best. That's what I have done by giving 29 states the freedom from burdensome federal government regulation so they can lead the way in helping to find new ways to end welfare." And states are succeeding. As last week's study on the JOBS program revealed, welfare-to-work programs in several states are moving recipients into the work force and reducing welfare caseloads and costs. That's real reform.
- o **Bipartisan consensus, not partisan politics.** "We are now at an historic moment," President Clinton stated. "The failure to pass welfare reform this year would be a disservice to the American people. It shouldn't become another victim to the politics of gridlock. Republicans and Democrats alike have a real responsibility to bring real change to Washington. And a bipartisan majority in the Senate is prepared to vote for a welfare reform bill with time limits and real work requirements and without moralistic dictates that will do more harm than good ... Let's not let politics stand in the way of making work and responsibility a way of life for the next generation."

JOBS IS HELPING FAMILIES SUCCEED

Today, HHS releases preliminary results from a study of the JOBS program in Georgia, Michigan, and California. The report, by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, shows that the three work-oriented programs produced the largest welfare savings measured to date and resulted in large increases in the number of people working. As Secretary Shalala says today, "this study proves that a dedicated investment in moving welfare recipients to work is effective and can reduce the burden of welfare costs for the American people. Our challenge is now to enact real, meaningful welfare reform legislation that can help more single parents achieve self-sufficiency." We know what we need to meet this challenge:

- o **Moving people to work.** This study shows that welfare-to-work programs can make a difference. Two years after entry into the JOBS programs in these three states, participants were receiving 22 percent less welfare benefits and were 24 percent more likely to be employed. Participants also received 14 percent less food stamp benefits and had 26 percent higher earnings. Because the program sites differ widely in grant levels, economic conditions, and welfare caseloads, the results show that welfare-to-work programs can be successful in many different environments.
- o **Resources for states to get the job done.** As this study highlights, real work requirements must be backed up with resources for job training and job placement to help people get jobs and keep them. However, the Senate Finance Committee bill combines unrealistic work requirements with reduced funding for states -- making it harder, not easier, to move people from welfare to work. Even the Congressional Budget Office concluded that only six out of the 50 states would be able to meet the bill's work requirements. As Assistant Secretary Mary Jo Bane says today, "States need resources for employment services and child care in order to help families achieve independence. Without this investment, states will have less support to help families succeed."
- o **The right incentives.** While we must give states more flexibility in welfare reform, we must also make sure that they continue to fulfill their responsibilities. The Senate Finance Committee's bill gives states an incentive to save money by throwing people off the rolls. In contrast, the Democratic leadership bill, endorsed by President Clinton, has the right incentives for states -- including a performance bonus for states that exceed job-placement targets -- and penalties for those who do not. It has all of the elements that are necessary to help recipients move into the workforce -- and stay there.
- o **Tough, but practical.** Able-bodied welfare recipients should be required to go to work after a specified period of time, but they must also have access to job training and job placement in order to achieve and maintain self-sufficiency. As President Clinton has said, "My top priority is to get people off welfare and into jobs ... To do that, we have to take some of the money we save and plow it into job training, education and child care ... If we're going to make people on welfare work, then we've got to make it possible for them to work. If we're going to make people self-reliant, we have to make it possible for them to support themselves. We can be tough, but we've got to be practical."

A CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT SOLUTION

As today's *Wall Street Journal* and *Washington Post* report, disagreements among Republicans have stalled welfare reform legislation in the Senate. The *Wall Street Journal* quotes Senator Phil Gramm as saying: "I don't see any progress." We're disappointed that Republican divisions are holding up efforts to end welfare as we know it, especially because, as President Clinton said in his Saturday radio address to the nation, "though there are very different approaches in the bills now before Congress, we have agreed on much of what we need to do. We agree there must be time limits on welfare, after which all who can must work. And I'm pleased that Congress has now agreed with me that we must enforce child support with the toughest possible laws." As today's *Post* reports, the Clinton Administration has proposed a comprehensive plan to track down parents who fail to pay:

- o **The strongest possible signal.** According to a recent Census Bureau report, only \$11.9 billion in child support was paid in 1991, far short of the \$48 billion that could potentially be collected. Many noncustodial parents who owe support have successfully eluded state officials, leading to a perception among many that the system can be beat. This perception must change. Payment of child support should be inescapable, and collection must be swift and certain. A variety of enforcement tools have been tried successfully in a number of states -- including license revocation and new hire reporting. The Administration is building on these state successes -- we're working to enact the toughest child support enforcement program ever proposed.
- o **Paying up.** As the President has said, governments don't raise children -- parents do. To send that message loud and clear to men and women -- those who already have children and those who don't -- welfare reform must include tough child support enforcement measures like streamlined paternity establishment, new hire reporting, uniform interstate child support laws, computerized statewide collections, and license revocation. These five Administration-backed improvements would increase child support collections by \$24 billion in the next 10 years alone -- helping millions of children who deserve the support of both parents. And they'd reduce federal welfare costs by \$4 billion over the same period.
- o **An interstate solution.** As today's *Post* reports, one part of our child support enforcement plan is a national new hire database to help find non-paying parents, even when they cross state lines. Many states have found that requiring employers to report all new hires to the state has proven highly effective in finding parents who owe support. Having this information sent to one national directory will allow delinquent parents to be located anywhere in the country. In addition, it will allow parents to be found more quickly, and make it easier to find parents who change jobs frequently.
- o **"It's the answer."** Today's *Post* quotes Mitchell Adam, Massachusetts's commissioner of revenue: "If all child support across the nation worked this way, there would be an enormous increase in the amount of dollars and families getting the appropriate support." Elisabeth Donahue, of the National Women's Law Center, is also quoted as saying that "once you centralize the information, the payoff is enormous." In fact, the Clinton Administration estimates that such a national computerized database would increase child support collections by \$6.4 billion in the next 10 years -- and would also reduce federal welfare payments by \$1.1 billion over 10 years.

A NEW INDEPENDENCE DAY

This Fourth of July weekend, President Clinton devoted his Saturday radio address to the importance of helping people achieve independence. In addition to announcing that his administration has given Virginia the freedom to implement welfare reform on a local level, President Clinton also laid out a fundamental requirement for national welfare reform. As the President said on Saturday, "if we're going to end welfare, we must do more about a crucial element that is missing from the current approach of many in Congress. Instead of providing the child care people need to get off welfare, some in Congress actually are trying to cut child care. So, today I say to Congress, child care must be the central element of our effort to put welfare mothers to work."

- o **Making work possible.** As President Clinton said, "it is pure fantasy to believe we can put a welfare mother to work unless we provide child care for her children. We don't need more latchkey kids. We certainly don't need more neglected children. And we don't want more welfare mothers staying at home, living on welfare, just because they can't find child care. We do want people to be workers and good parents. And if we want parents on welfare to go to work, we have to make sure they can find good, clean, safe places for their children to go during the day."
- o **Smart, not shortsighted, reforms.** As President Clinton said on Saturday, cutting funding for child care and other temporary supports "will make it harder for parents to get off and stay off welfare. It will therefore cost us far more down the road than it will ever save in the near term." Today's *New York Times* agrees: "All of the Republican block grant proposals pose a grave danger to the poor because the G.O.P. will not insist that states maintain their own contributions at current levels. That leaves them with the option of cutting back their own welfare spending entirely. States will be under tremendous pressure to cut spending to the poor to save money in these tight financial times and to drive the poor elsewhere."
- o **Preventing teen pregnancy.** We must take strong action to address the problem of teen pregnancy, but we should not give up on teenage parents and their children. As President Clinton said, "some people in Congress want to take even more extreme steps that will hurt, not strengthen families. They don't want welfare reform unless it cuts off all help to children whose mothers are poor, young, and unmarried. I want to discourage teen pregnancy. We have to do that -- but not by hurting innocent babies. We should require teen mothers to live at home, stay in school, and turn their lives around -- so they and their children stay off welfare for good."
- o **A new Independence Day.** "Though there are very different approaches in the bills now before Congress, we have agreed on much of what we need to do," President Clinton said. "We agree there must be time limits on welfare, after which all who can must work. And I'm pleased that Congress has now agreed with me that we must enforce child support with the toughest possible laws ... I am hopeful that we'll move forward on a bipartisan welfare reform bill. I don't want fillbusters. I don't want vetoes. I don't want gridlock. But I do want real welfare reform that requires work, demands responsibility, and provides the child care people need to move off welfare, and to be successful as workers and parents. It's time to get to work so we can give millions of other Americans a new Independence Day."

THE RIGHT WAY TO PREVENT TEEN PREGNANCY

Today, Democratic senators will join representatives of Catholic Charities, the U.S. Catholic Conference, Covenant House, and other organizations in protesting proposals to deny aid to teen mothers and their children under welfare reform. Like the Clinton Administration, these groups believe that provisions to help teen mothers prepare for work should be a central component of any real welfare reform proposal. Yet the welfare bill passed by the House would simply give up on these young people and their children -- by denying them both benefits and the incentives to prepare for work. As Secretary Shalala said of the House bill last month, "We don't believe we can call it welfare reform when there are no provisions to require teenage mothers to finish school or enroll in a job training program that puts them on the road to employment." Here's what we would call real welfare reform:

- o **The strongest possible message.** Our approach -- like the one presented today -- would require teen mothers to live at home or in an adult-supervised setting, finish high school, and prepare for work. But we would also give them the help they need to become good role models and providers for their children. As Senator Conrad says today, we must "help young mothers break the cycle of poverty by helping them gain the education and parenting skills to allow them to succeed in life." Senator Daschle adds that "to prevent teen pregnancy in the first place, we will give states and communities the resources they need to develop teen-pregnancy prevention programs that are tailored to their specific needs."
- o **Smart, not shortsighted, reforms.** Simply denying assistance to a teenage mother, as the House bill proposes, won't do anything to move her toward self-sufficiency. The bill's approach is also mean-spirited: it cuts people off because they are poor, young and unmarried -- and small children pay the price for their parents' mistakes. As Senator Daschle says today, "it's a fact that simply punishing these women -- and their children -- is not enough to get them into jobs, and keep them there." President Clinton has also said that this approach "is bound to lead to more dependency, not less; to more broken families, not fewer; to more burdens on the taxpayers over the long run, not less."
- o **Bipartisan agreement.** As the *Washington Post* reported yesterday, a group of Republican senators are also protesting the House bill's punitive ban on aid to teen mothers and their children. "These restrictions are inconsistent with the stated goal of providing maximum flexibility to the states," the senators wrote to Senator Dole last week. They also point out that "mandates of this kind will only appear punitive because it is the children who will be denied much-needed assistance through no fault of their own." Nonetheless, Senator Faircloth and other conservative Republican senators continue to demand that these punitive provisions be included in the Senate bill.
- o **Helping parents and kids get ahead.** As President Clinton said last month in Iowa, "We should never punish children for the mistakes of their parents. And these children who become parents prematurely, we should say, 'you made a mistake, you shouldn't do that - - no child should do that. But what we're going to do is to impose responsibilities on you for the future, make you a responsible parent, a responsible student, a responsible worker.'" Senator Daschle adds today that "we'll help you get on your feet. But you've got to take responsibility for your children and your future."

TDDPC STAFF

DAILY POINTS

PRESIDENT CLINTON DEMANDS REAL WELFARE REFORM

July 13, 1995



"Every week that politics stops real reform, thousands of welfare mothers stay on welfare instead of going to work, simply because they can't get child care. Every week that we don't make our child support laws as tough as possible, we leave 800,000 people on welfare who could be off it tomorrow if they got the child support they deserve. Every day without welfare reform drains our economic strength, saps our national spirit, and prevents all Americans from being able to truly make the most of our future."

President Clinton
Thursday, July 13, 1995

Today, President Clinton meets with Senate Majority Leader Daschle, House Majority Leader Gephardt and Governor Tom Carper of Delaware to discuss the pressing need for welfare reform.

We Must Reform the Welfare System. The American people have made it clear that they want the broken welfare system fixed. The system does not work for the people stuck on welfare, and it doesn't work for the taxpayers who foot the bill.

We Have Come a Long Way Toward Consensus. Not long ago, some liberals opposed work requirements, and many conservatives opposed providing child care to move people from welfare to work. Now, we have bipartisan agreement to do both. We agree that we need:

- Strict time limits on welfare;
- To demand work from everyone who can work.
- The toughest possible child support enforcement, and
- Child care so parents can go to work.

Far Right Blocking Action. Some people on the far right are blocking any action on welfare reform that doesn't cut off children whose parents are poor, young, and unmarried. That's wrong. They have decided it's in their own political interest to block welfare reform. There is no reason on earth why the U.S. Senate should stand for "just say no" politics when the broken welfare system is one of the biggest problems in our country, and we can fix it.

Should Not Punish Babies for their Parent's Mistakes. Yesterday, the President met with a group of Catholic Bishops who deeply oppose the position of the far-right Senators. The bishops are leading the fight against it. They think it's cruel, and they are afraid it will lead to more abortions.

Welfare Reform Talking Points: "WORK FIRST"

July 1995

"I want to endorse today the bill authored by Senators Daschle, Breaux and Mikulski ... It supports work. It supports doing the things that are necessary to get people into the work force and protecting children, especially dealing with the child care issues and requiring states to continue to support the children of the country who, through no fault of their own, are born into poor families. So I believe this is the right kind of welfare reform. It also saves money. It will help us balance the budget, but it does it in the right way."
President Clinton, 6/14/95

"Ending welfare as we know it." "Work First" replaces AFDC with time-limited conditional assistance for poor families with children. In order to receive assistance, all recipients must sign a contract spelling out an individualized plan to move from welfare to work as quickly as possible. From day one, all recipients would be required to look for work and accept a job that's offered. Recipients who fail to live up to their contract would see their benefits reduced or eliminated. In addition, the Democratic alternative would change the culture of welfare offices, by turning them into employment offices and retraining caseworkers to focus on employment.

Real work requirements. In order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real work requirements backed up with the resources states need to get the job done. "Work First" would cut welfare spending in some areas in order to increase funding to move welfare recipients into the workforce. In contrast, the current Republican approach combines unrealistic work requirements with reduced funding for states -- making it harder, not easier, to move people from welfare to work. Even the Congressional Budget Office concluded that 44 states would not have enough funding to meet the work requirements in the Senate Finance Committee's bill.

Real incentives. President Clinton and the Democratic leadership agree that states should be rewarded for moving people onto private payrolls -- not for simply cutting them from the welfare rolls. That's why this bill includes a performance bonus for states that exceed job-placement targets -- and penalties for those who do not. Welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom, it should be a race to independence.

Parental responsibility. "Work First" recognizes that child support enforcement is critical to welfare reform. If we're going to demand responsibility of mothers, we should demand responsibility of fathers too. That's why the leadership bill contains tough child support enforcement measures to encourage both parents to meet their responsibilities. In addition, under this bill, teen parents would be required to stay in school, live at home, and prepare for work in order to receive assistance. We must send a strong message to the next generation that having children is an immense responsibility, rather than an easy route to independence.

Hope for bipartisanship. Senators Daschle, Breaux, Mikulski and others have presented a bold plan to end welfare as we know it, and we hope it will lead to a bipartisan agreement on welfare reform legislation. As President Clinton has said, he would "cut welfare, but save enough to protect children and move able-bodied people from welfare to work ... this debate must go beyond partisanship; it must be about what's good for America, and which approach is more likely to bring prosperity and security to our people over the long run." The Democratic alternative bill takes a step forward in this process -- towards the President's goal of having real, bipartisan welfare reform legislation that gets the job done.

Welfare Reform Talking Points: **OVERALL PLAN**

July 1995

"I want to endorse today the bill authored by Senators Daschle, Breaux and Mikulski ... It supports work. It supports doing the things that are necessary to get people into the work force and protecting children, especially dealing with the child care issues and requiring states to continue to support the children of the country who, through no fault of their own, are born into poor families. So I believe this is the right kind of welfare reform. It also saves money. It will help us balance the budget, but it does it in the right way."

President Clinton, 6/14/95

The President's commitment to welfare reform is part of his longstanding commitment to the middle class values of work, responsibility and family. While governor of Arkansas, President Clinton worked closely with elected officials from both parties to pass the Family Support Act. As President, he has given more than half the states the flexibility to reform welfare at the local level and introduced the most comprehensive welfare reform legislation ever proposed. And he's endorsed the "Work First" plan in the Senate, which combines real work responsibilities with protections for children.

Welfare reform means real work requirements. Real welfare reform is first and foremost about work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. States must have the necessary resources for child care, training, and work in order to get the job done. State bureaucracies should be rewarded for getting people to work or prepare for work -- not for cutting people from the rolls. Recipients must sign personal responsibility agreements, and move toward work and self-sufficiency from the very first day. Time limits must make clear to welfare recipients and caseworkers that welfare is a transitional system.

Welfare reform means requiring parental responsibility. Child support enforcement is a crucial part of welfare reform, because it sends a strong signal to young people about the responsibility of both parents to the children they bring into the world. If we're going to demand responsibility of mothers, we should demand responsibility of fathers too. That means welfare reform should include measures designed to identify the father in every case; find delinquent parents who move from job to job or state to state to avoid paying child support; speed up payments; and invoke tough penalties, like drivers license revocation, for nonpayment.

Children should not be punished for their parents' mistakes. True reform should make it easier for poor children to grow into productive adults - not harder. Teenage parents should not be denied cash assistance - instead, help should be conditioned on their staying at school, living at home, and identifying their child's father. Needy children should be assured basic protections wherever they live. School lunches, Food Stamps, and assistance to abused, disabled and neglected children should not be slashed under the guise of "welfare reform."

States must have flexibility -- and resources -- to get the job done. The federal-state partnership should be retained, because we won't have welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives states more burdens and fewer resources. Any legislation must enable states to succeed in moving people from welfare to work and supporting working families and children who need temporary help. States should be rewarded for moving people from welfare to work, and protected in the event of population growth, an economic downturn, a natural disaster, or another unpredictable emergency.

STALLED AT THE FINISH LINE

Today, Senator Lautenberg and 41 other Democratic senators will send a letter to Senator Dole expressing their concerns about the direction welfare reform is taking in Congress. These senators, like the Clinton Administration, believe that welfare reform is too important to be tied up in budget reconciliation. Meanwhile, the *Washington Post* notes that a conservative push for punitive restrictions on aid to teen mothers is also tying up reform. Finally, as the *New York Times* reports, a funding formula fight continues to brew -- and the "struggle has already helped stall the welfare overhaul bill in the Senate." Republican Senator Grassley summed it up best in the *Post*: "If the Senate cannot resolve its differences and approve a bill, it will be viewed as a failure of leadership."

- o **Getting the priorities straight.** As Senator Lautenberg and others write to Senator Dole today, "welfare reform is more than just a budget issue ... While any welfare reform legislation may have budgetary effects, the primary purpose is to protect the well-being of children, help welfare recipients move into productive work and make other positive changes in the programs involved." The senators add that "the Senate rules governing consideration of reconciliation measures are a poor environment in which to consider welfare reform ... [and] will leave little time for a substantive debate on welfare policy."
- o **No conservative mandates.** As the *Washington Post* reports, a group of Republican Senators have written Dole to protest the inclusion of the House bill's punitive ban on aid to teen mothers and their children. "These restrictions are inconsistent with the stated goal of providing maximum flexibility to the states," the senators write. In addition, they note that such restrictions will punish poor children for their parents' mistakes: "mandates of this kind will only appear punitive because it is the children who will be denied much-needed assistance through no fault of their own." Nonetheless, Senator Faircloth continues to threaten a filibuster if these provisions are not included in the Senate bill.
- o **Fair funding for states.** "If the debate over ideological differences has been volatile and rhetorical, the *Washington Post* says, "the fight over funding formulas has been more like trench warfare." As both the *Post* and the *Times* report today, Senators continue to disagree over the allocation of funds under the House and Senate bills' block grant approach. As the *Times* notes, a bipartisan group of 30 senators recently wrote to Senator Packwood, asserting that freezing current allocations would "penalize high-growth states and have devastating results over a five-year period." The bottom line, as the *Times* explains, is that "giving the Sun Belt states more would mean giving the Northern states less."
- o **A commitment to bipartisanship.** As we've said all along, the American people want their elected officials to put aside partisan differences and get the job done. As Senators note today in their letter to Dole, "It is our hope that this year's welfare reform bill would enjoy similar bi-partisan support," given to the 1988 Family Support Act. "However, we believe that including it in a reconciliation bill will make this unlikely." President Clinton has also said that if welfare reform is included in the budget process, "there will be no need for a bipartisan consensus on welfare reform. But welfare reform is too important for that kind of Washington game. It should be open. It should be bipartisan. And we should get on

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Tuesday, June 27, 1995

WISCONSIN'S LESSONS

Around the country, states are using innovative programs to move people from welfare to work. This week, *Time* magazine focuses on the working poor, while *U.S. News and World Report* highlights Wisconsin's demonstration project. Both pieces offer some valuable lessons as Congress considers welfare reform legislation for the entire nation:

- o **Broad agreement on the President's approach.** *U.S. News* writes that "there is broad agreement that strict deadlines and work requirements are necessary to give recipients an 'extra push' toward self-sufficiency," the core of our approach to welfare reform. As President Clinton has said, "we propose to offer people on welfare a simple contract. We will help you get the skills you need, but after two years, anyone who can go to work, must go to work ... Work is preferable to welfare. And it must be enforced."
- o **Real resources for work.** As the President has said, in order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real work requirements backed up with the resources states need to get the job done. Edward Schilling, who runs a Wisconsin welfare-to-work program, agrees in *U.S. News*, noting that "there's no such thing as welfare reform on the cheap." Wisconsin's Republican Governor, Tommy Thompson, has often stated the obvious: "it costs more to change the system."
- o **Making work pay.** One lesson of the Wisconsin experiment, *U.S. News* reports, is that "work habits can be learned only through practice, even in a low-wage job." Wisconsin has also found that child care and other supports are necessary to help people find jobs -- and keep them. But, as *Time* magazine reports, Republicans "are talking of substantially reducing the EITC. They are opposed to an increase in the minimum wage. What's gotten lost in the message is that programs that offer help for the working poor could be partially if not completely reversed by the new agenda." We agree.
- o **A commitment to state innovations.** The Clinton Administration has now put 29 states on the road to ending welfare as we know it. As the President said this month to the National Governors' Association, "in Missouri, Vermont and Wisconsin, Governors Carnahan, Dean and Thompson are using their waivers to impose time limits and to require work. In Ohio and Oregon, Governors Voinovich and Kitzhaber are moving people to work by using money now spent on welfare and food stamps to subsidize private-sector jobs ... Every governor I've ever spoken with, without regard to party, understands that welfare reform is important and must first and foremost be about work."

HELPING STATES MOVE AHEAD

Today, the welfare reform spotlight is where it belongs -- on state efforts to move people from welfare to work. As *USA Today* highlights reform efforts in Kentucky, Carol Rasco, President Clinton's Domestic Policy Adviser, travels to Hawaii to visit a welfare-to-work program. We believe that states need both flexibility and resources in order to move people into jobs. But, as *USA Today* reports today, "the Congressional Budget Office says 44 out of 50 states won't be able to meet the GOP's work targets" under the Senate's current bill. The fixed block grants in the bill fall to provide "enough money to pay for job training, support families and provide needed child care," *USA Today* notes. Here's what states such as Hawaii and Kentucky will really need to move ahead:

- o **Real partnerships.** Hawaii's welfare demonstration program is already moving people towards self-sufficiency. Under a waiver granted by the Clinton Administration in June 1994, the state is placing job-ready welfare recipients in subsidized private-sector jobs -- providing them with work experience and valuable skills. We want to set states like Hawaii up for success -- and that means giving them the tools they need to continue these innovative reforms.
- o **Real flexibility.** Some conservative Republican senators are still demanding that the Senate include the House bill's ban on cash assistance to unmarried teen mothers and the "illegitimacy bonus" that entangles welfare reform in abortion politics. But denying assistance to a teenage mother won't do anything to move her toward self-sufficiency -- instead, it only punishes children for their parents' mistakes. As President Clinton has said, "It's bound to lead to more dependency, not less; to more broken families, not fewer; to more burdens on the taxpayers over the long run, not less." A vocational school teacher from Kentucky quoted in *USA Today* agrees: "We've got to get people to be better family members, better parents, better in their relationships with each other."
- o **Real resources.** As the *Honolulu Advertiser* recently said, the block grant approach "allows no room for growth or unexpected events and -- if needs increase at the local level -- would in effect become one of those 'unfunded mandates' the GOP is so anxious to eliminate." Under the House bill, Hawaii alone would lose \$325 million in federal funding over five years. The block grants and funding cuts under both the House and Senate Finance bills would make it harder, not easier, for states such as Hawaii to move people from welfare to work.
- o **Real supports.** "Potentially good reforms, such as the demand that welfare be accompanied by work for the able-bodied, must be supported by adequate child care for youngsters left behind while Mom is on the job," the *Honolulu Advertiser* notes. But the House bill would reduce federal funds for child care by \$6 million over five years -- leaving more than 1,140 children in the state home alone. And similar effects are possible under the Senate Finance Committee's bill.

RESOURCES AND INCENTIVES TO GET THE JOB DONE

As we've said from the start, in order to end welfare as we know it, states must have the tools to get the job done. That means real work requirements must be backed up with real resources for training and work activities to help people get jobs and keep them -- as the National Governors' Association, the American Public Welfare Association, and the National Conference of State Legislatures have said. Across the country, editorial boards are sounding the same message:

- o **Real resources.** We won't have real reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives states more burdens and fewer resources. As the *San Jose Mercury News* said last month, "Fixed sum 'block grants' ... will make it harder for states to reduce child poverty and welfare dependence. Welfare spending wouldn't keep up with inflation ... Little, if anything, will be left for programs that help adults move from welfare to work." Block grants also don't keep up with increases in population or poverty. From 1989 to 1994, for example, the number of children in California increased by more than 12 percent, and the number of poor children skyrocketed by 39 percent in just three years.
- o **Real incentives.** States should be rewarded for getting people to work or prepare for work - not for cutting people from the rolls. But, as the *San Jose Mercury News* notes, the incentives in both the House and the Senate Finance Committee bills point in the wrong direction. The *News* says that, "by letting states decide who qualifies for welfare benefits, the GOP senators make it easy for indifferent states to simply throw the poor overboard and abandon welfare-to-work ideas." The House told poor families to sink or swim -- we want the Senate to help them to get ahead.
- o **Real supports.** As President Clinton has said, welfare recipients should be required to go to work, but their children shouldn't be left home alone. It defies common sense to require work without providing adequate child care. The *Oregonian* agrees that "day care can make a huge difference between staying independent and sliding back into welfare dependency." But, as the *New York Times* recently noted, the House bill would cut funding for child care just when single parents would need help most. "The bill is an affront to parents who already have a hard time finding and paying for child care," the *Times* states. "Above all, it slights hundreds of thousands of children who deserve better of their country."
- o **A true partnership.** While we must give states more flexibility in welfare reform, we must also make sure that they continue to fulfill their responsibilities. But, as the *Washington Post* recently said, under the House bill, "states would get their federal welfare block grants no matter how much money of their own they spent -- the same amount if they spent less as if they spent more -- and the bill includes no maintenance of effort provision, so that states would be free to reduce their welfare spending as much as they chose."
- o **"Work First" has it all.** The "Work First" plan is the right kind of reform. It includes all of the elements that are necessary to help recipients move into the workforce -- and stay there. It also has the right incentives for states -- including a performance bonus for states that exceed job-placement targets -- and penalties for those who do not. We want to set states up for success -- and that means giving them the tools they need to move people to independence.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Thursday, June 22, 1995

WHAT STATES NEED TO SUCCEED

Where is welfare reform? Today's *Washington Times* gives the answer: "Welfare reform is currently stalled in Congress while Republican Senators grapple with issues such as block-grant funding formulas, work requirements, and mandates to the states to discourage unwed pregnancies." Yesterday, a group of conservative Republican senators held a press conference to announce that the Senate Finance Committee's welfare reform bill "does not get the job done." We agree -- but unlike those senators, we believe that states need more flexibility, not less. And they certainly don't need the conservative micromanagement that the House bill would impose. As Secretary Shalala said at yesterday's *U.S. News and World Report's* welfare reform debate, we're committed to giving states both the flexibility and the tools they need to succeed.

- o **Real resources.** In order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real work requirements backed up with the resources states need to get the job done. But the Finance Committee bill expects states to do much more with much less -- setting them up for failure, as a recent CBO report reveals. As Vermont Governor Howard Dean said yesterday, "we need more job training, not less, and we need more child care, not less, as is in the block grants ... So what Congress has done is addressed the right problem the wrong way."
- o **Real incentives.** Incentives and rewards need to point in the right direction: states should be rewarded for moving people onto private payrolls -- not for cutting them from the welfare rolls. As Secretary Shalala said yesterday, "we have insisted that the states have more flexibility, but that welfare reform be focused on work and the incentives to get people to work." Welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom -- it should be a race to independence.
- o **Protections for states -- and individuals.** As Secretary Shalala said yesterday, "a plan without money is not much of a plan. And the point about block grants is if there's an economic downturn the resources aren't going to be there to pick up formerly working families who lose their jobs and suddenly need some help." Governors from both parties have spoken out against the funding formula of the Senate Finance Committee bill -- they support the creation of a grant, rather than a loan fund, to protect states in the event of high population growth, a recession, or an unpredictable emergency.
- o **What states need to succeed.** Secretary Shalala summed it up best yesterday: "Let's get welfare reform now, but it has to be focused on work, not focused on beating up on teenagers, not focused on increasing the number of abortions, but focused on moving people from welfare to work. And that means that we have to have child care and strong work requirements and the kind of resources states need to get the job done." The President has challenged Congress to send him a strong, bipartisan bill that gives every state the tools they need to succeed in moving people from welfare to work.

WORK DEFINES THE DEBATE

Today, Secretary Shalala will participate in *U.S. News and World Report's* "Welfare Reform Debate." She joins a bipartisan panel of congressmen, governors, and local officials discussing the welfare reform proposals currently before Congress. As the Secretary will say today, there really is no debate: the "Work First" plan includes all of the elements necessary to move young parents into the work force. It also promotes parental responsibility, protects children, strengthens child support enforcement, and gives states the flexibility and the tools they need to succeed. Here's more:

- o **"Ending welfare as we know it."** As Secretary Shalala says today, we have a proposal to end the status quo. Under "Work First," in order to receive assistance, all recipients must sign a contract spelling out an individualized plan to move from welfare to work as quickly as possible. From day one, all recipients would be required to look for work and accept a job that's offered - or lose their benefits. But, while welfare recipients should be required to go to work, we believe their children shouldn't be left home alone. It defies common sense to require work without providing adequate child care. As *USA Today* reports, President Clinton told mayors yesterday that the prospects for bipartisan compromise look good.
- o **Real resources.** In order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real work requirements backed up with the resources states need to get the job done. That's why "Work First" cuts welfare spending in some areas in order to give states the resources they need to move people into jobs. In contrast, the Finance Committee bill expects states to do much more with much less -- setting them up for failure, as a recent CBO report reveals. Even Wisconsin Governor Tommy Thompson says that "it costs more to change the system."
- o **Real incentives.** Welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom, it should be a race to independence. Incentives and rewards need to point in the right direction: states should be rewarded for moving people onto private payrolls - not for cutting them from the welfare rolls. That's why "Work First" includes a performance bonus for states that exceed job-placement targets -- and penalties for those who do not. Real reform means investing in the future -- the Republican proposals are a budget boomerang.
- o **No conservative mandates.** The House told poor kids to sink or swim -- we want the Senate to help poor kids get ahead. But, as Secretary Shalala notes today, a group of Senate conservatives wants to change the Senate bill to make it more like the House-passed welfare measure. As Governor Thompson says in *USA Today*, "It's all screwed up." But we're still hoping that the Senate is smarter -- and that they'll eliminate punitive provisions like the ban on aid to teen moms and the "illegitimacy bonus," which entangles welfare reform in abortion politics.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Tuesday, June 20, 1995

LET'S GET IT DONE

Yesterday, the bipartisan U.S. Conference of Mayors passed a resolution endorsing the Democratic leadership's "Work First" welfare reform plan. As President Clinton says in his speech to the group today, this proposal can lead to strong, bipartisan legislation to end welfare as we know it -- if leaders in Washington can work together as cooperatively as the country's mayors have. Here's what it will take:

- o **A bipartisan commitment.** President Clinton, in remarks to the Conference of Mayors today, noted that the "Work First" plan should serve as a blueprint for strong bipartisan welfare reform legislation. "This ought to be a bipartisan effort," the President said, as he called on members of Congress to work together across party lines.
- o **Real resources.** Yesterday, the U.S. Conference of Mayors stated that the Senate Finance Committee's bill still falls short in crucial areas. Primarily, "it does not provide sufficient jobs, child care, or health care needed to assist welfare recipients to transition to employment," the mayors said. This builds on what the Conference of Mayors said at a press conference last month: in order for reform to be real, we need a welfare "system based on incentives rather than one that is punitive in nature."
- o **Local flexibility -- not cost shifting.** The Senate Finance Committee's bill also "has the potential to shift significant costs to local governments," the mayors noted yesterday. Last month, they joined other associations of local officials in opposing the House bill's cost-shifts to states and localities. That bill, they said, includes "poorly funded block grants containing no assurances that local governments will be provided with adequate program funding. The loss of this 'safety net'... will force city and county governments to bear the unshared costs of caring for these families and dealing with the increase in homelessness, medical expense, hunger and crime in communities."
- o **"Work First."** The Democratic leadership has presented a bold plan to end welfare as we know it -- and local leaders are showing their support. The Conference of Mayors, in endorsing "Work First" yesterday, stated that it would "provide significantly greater assistance with which to facilitate the transition from welfare to work." As Las Vegas Mayor Jones said last week, it's "the only proposal that's not going to come back and be a burden on the cities, a cost to cities."

A BIPARTISAN ENDORSEMENT FOR REAL REFORM

As today's *Washington Post* and *Washington Times* report, Republican divisions seem to be stalling progress in the Senate on national welfare reform legislation. But meanwhile, the bipartisan U.S. Conference of Mayors, meeting in Miami, has passed a resolution endorsing the "Work First" welfare reform plan drafted by Senators Daschle, Breaux and Mikulski. They believe, as the President does, that this proposal can lead to strong, bipartisan welfare reform legislation. In the meantime, President Clinton is committed to giving states the flexibility they need to proceed on their own. Today, in fact, the President has written Delaware Governor Carper to note the enactment of welfare reform legislation made possible by a waiver of federal rules our Administration granted last month.

- o **Local leaders speak out.** The Conference of Mayors now joins other associations representing local officials who have expressed strong reservations about the alternative welfare reform bill drafted by the Senate Finance Committee. Groups such as the National League of Cities, the National Governors Association, the National Association of Counties, and the National Conference of State Legislatures have now told Senator Packwood that his plan falls short in crucial areas.
- o **Putting states on the road to reform.** While Republican disagreements may delay national reform, the Clinton Administration is helping states move ahead to implement bold new welfare reforms that meet their local needs. The Delaware plan mirrors some of the same elements in the "Work First" proposal the President endorsed last week -- it supports work; protects children; improves child support enforcement; and increases parental responsibility. As President Clinton writes to Governor Carper today, "I look forward to working together to ensure that Congress passes a bipartisan welfare reform bill that reinforces, not undermines, the reforms you have begun."
- o **A contract for work.** Delaware is combining strong incentives with tough sanctions to move people from welfare to work. As under President Clinton's and the Democratic leadership's approach, Delaware recipients must develop a personal responsibility plan -- identifying the education, job training, and job placement services they need to achieve and maintain self-sufficiency. And the state is making work pay through extended child care and medical benefits. In return, individuals must comply with their contracts' requirements -- by establishing their child's paternity, participating in education or training, and taking a job when offered -- or face a loss of benefits.
- o **"Work First."** Governor Carper has also joined other Democratic leaders in endorsing the "Work First" plan. In a letter to Senator Daschle, he wrote: "we view the current Republican proposals coming out of Congress to be largely a cost shift of enormous proportions to states under the guise of flexibility. We believe that the principles in your proposal more adequately recognize the critical issue of work and we appreciate your recognition of the essential need to provide adequate child care in order for welfare-to-work programs to be successful."

WHERE'S WELFARE REFORM?

As President Clinton's July 4 deadline for welfare reform legislation nears, progress seems to be slowing in the Senate. As the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* report today, sharp divisions among Senate Republicans have forced them to delay floor debate on a bill. The *Washington Post* notes that "the collapse of the party's consensus this week points to a prior problem involving an incoherence of design and a contrived attempt to bale together contradictory concepts. Having put off a vote, the Senate needs to reconsider its whole package." Here's what needs to be revisited:

- o **No conservative mandates.** The *Washington Post* says today that a group of Senate conservatives, "wants to change the Senate bill to make it more like the House-passed welfare measure. Among other things, they would have the feds bar cash assistance to unmarried mothers under the age of 21. But this sort of specific mandate on states is the very thing that so many Senate supporters of the block grant wanted to get away from." Nonetheless, North Carolina Senator Lauch Faircloth has threatened to filibuster any bill that lacks these punitive provisions.
- o **Real work.** In order to end welfare as we know it, states must be rewarded for moving people onto private payrolls -- not simply cutting them from the welfare rolls. The *New York Times* reports that some Republican senators are lining up behind a bipartisan amendment that would require states to maintain funding for child care, job training, and work. The proposal, the *Times* reports, "would give states a financial stake in welfare reform, making them more accountable to both state and Federal taxpayers."
- o **Fair funding for states.** The *Washington Post* notes today that some Republican senators are finally realizing that any proposal to block grant and freeze federal funding to the states "would create large practical problems." And the *New York Times* reports that even "Senator Alfonse D'Amato, Republican of New York, denounced the proposal." As the Senator stated, "This is not welfare reform. It's a redistribution of dollars. It shifts money to Texas and Florida. It penalizes states like New York that have met their moral obligation to take care of impoverished children." As we've repeatedly said, in order to end welfare as we know it, states must have the resources necessary to get the job done.
- o **We know what works.** As the *Associated Press* reports today, mayors "are lining up behind a Democratic plan to redesign the nation's welfare system as Senate Republicans continue to feud over their welfare overhaul legislation." Seattle Mayor Norm Rice led Democratic mayors yesterday in endorsing the Democratic leadership's plan. Chicago Mayor Daley and Las Vegas Mayor Jones also support the leadership proposal, because, as Mayor Jones said yesterday, it's "the only proposal that's not going to come back and be a burden on the cities, a cost to cities."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Thursday, June 15, 1995

THE RIGHT KIND OF REFORM

Yesterday, the President met with Democratic senators to endorse "Work First," a Democratic alternative to the Senate Finance Committee's welfare reform bill. As the *Washington Post* reports today, "While the Democrats seemed to be reaching a unified position on welfare, Republicans yesterday appeared to slip into disarray over how to change the system and divide funding among the states." As we've said all along, the requirements for welfare reform are simple: real work requirements, parental responsibility, and protections for states and individuals are essential to any plan that is truly about ending welfare as we know it.

- o **The right kind of reform.** As the President said yesterday, "I want to endorse today the bill authored by Senators Daschle, Breaux and Mikulski ... It supports work. It supports doing the things that are necessary to get people into the work force and protecting children, especially dealing with the child care issues and requiring states to continue to support the children of the country who, through no fault of their own, are born into poor families. So I believe this is the right kind of welfare reform. It also saves money. It will help us balance the budget, but it does it in the right way."
- o **Real work requirements.** The President said to the National Governors' Association last week that welfare reform "legislation should have real work requirements, but it ought to be backed up with the resources necessary to get people into jobs and keep them there." The NGA, the American Public Welfare Association, and the National Conference of State Legislatures agree that we won't have welfare reform or state flexibility without resources to get the job done: "Adequate and separate funding for child care is necessary to ensure that states will be able to serve children of individuals who are required to work, as well as the working poor," they wrote in a letter to senators yesterday.
- o **State and local flexibility -- not cost shifting.** The National League of Cities releases a report today on the devastating impact the House-passed welfare reform bill would have on local governments. A survey of city officials shows that "four out of five city leaders (80 percent) fear that federal efforts to redesign welfare programs are likely to shift more of the welfare burden onto local communities." The NLC's Carolyn Long Banks notes that "city leaders throughout American want to help bring about reforms to end welfare as we know it, but that challenge will not be met if one level of government simply transfers responsibilities, but not resources, to another level of government."
- o **A fundamental commitment.** As the President said at his meeting with Democratic leaders yesterday, "Last night I laid before the nation my plan to balance the budget in 10 years in a way that is consistent with the long-term prosperity of the American people and our fundamental interests. And one of the priorities I stated was pursuing the right kind of welfare reform. I still believe that the Republican bill is too tough on children and too weak on work, and runs the risk of undermining our fundamental commitment to the welfare of children without moving people from welfare to work."

PRESIDENT CLINTON SAYS "WORK FIRST"

Today, President Clinton meets with Democratic senators to endorse "Work First," a Democratic alternative to the Senate Finance Committee's welfare reform bill. Unlike the legislation passed by the Senate Finance Committee, "Work First" includes all of the elements necessary to move young parents into the work force. It also promotes parental responsibility, protects children, strengthens child support enforcement, and gives states the flexibility and the tools they need to succeed. Here's more:

- o **"Ending welfare as we know it."** "Work First" replaces AFDC with time-limited conditional assistance for poor families with children. In order to receive assistance, all recipients must sign a contract -- similar to the President's proposal -- spelling out an individualized plan to move from welfare to work as quickly as possible. From day one, all recipients would be required to look for work and accept a job that's offered. Recipients who fail to live up to their contract would see their benefits reduced or eliminated.
- o **Real work requirements.** In order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real work requirements backed up with the resources states need to get the job done. "Work First" would cut welfare spending in some areas in order to increase funding to move welfare recipients into the workforce. In contrast, the Finance Committee bill combines unrealistic work requirements with reduced funding for states -- making it harder, not easier, to move people from welfare to work. Even the Congressional Budget Office concluded that states would not have enough funding to meet the work requirements in the Senate Finance Committee's bill.
- o **Real incentives.** President Clinton and the Democratic leadership agree that states should be rewarded for moving people onto private payrolls -- not for simply cutting them from the welfare rolls. That's why this bill includes a performance bonus for states that exceed job-placement targets -- and penalties for those who do not. Welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom; it should be a race to independence.
- o **Parental responsibility.** "Work First" recognizes that child support enforcement is critical to welfare reform. If we're going to demand responsibility of mothers, we should demand responsibility of fathers too. That's why the leadership bill contains tough child support enforcement measures to encourage both parents to meet their responsibilities. In addition, under this bill, teen parents would be required to stay in school, live at home, and prepare for work in order to receive assistance. We must send a strong message to the next generation that having children is an immense responsibility, rather than an easy route to independence.
- o **Hope for bipartisanship.** Senators Daschle, Breaux, Mikulski and others have presented a bold plan to end welfare as we know it, and we hope it will lead to a bipartisan agreement on welfare reform legislation. As President Clinton said last night, he would "cut welfare, but save enough to protect children and move able-bodied people from welfare to work ... this debate must go beyond partisanship; it must be about what's good for America, and which approach is more likely to bring prosperity and security to our people over the long run." The Democratic alternative that President Clinton endorses today takes a step forward in this process -- towards the President's goal of having real, bipartisan welfare reform legislation on his desk by Independence Day.

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT IS ESSENTIAL

Today, Assistant Secretary for Children and Families Mary Jo Bane testifies on child support enforcement before the House Subcommittee on Human Resources. The Clinton Administration believes that child support is critical to ensuring economic security for millions of single-parent families -- both those leaving welfare for work and those struggling to stay off the welfare rolls. As Assistant Secretary Mary Jo Bane testifies today, "despite ongoing program improvements, fundamental changes are needed to reform the system. Census data shows that in 1991, of the over 11 million men and women potentially eligible for child support, 46 percent did not even have an award, and another 13 percent had an award, but actually received nothing." Here's what we're doing to close this gap -- and what we still need to do:

- o **Parental responsibility.** The Administration recognizes that both parents must support their children, and is working to enact the toughest child support enforcement program ever proposed. Parenthood brings clear obligations and those obligations must be enforced. Child support enforcement is also a crucial part of welfare reform, because it sends a strong signal to young people about the responsibility of both parents to the children they bring into the world. If we're going to demand responsibility of mothers, we should demand responsibility of fathers too.
- o **Strong steps.** Since taking office, President Clinton has taken strong steps to improve our nation's child support enforcement system. In 1994, we collected a record \$10 billion in child support payments from non-custodial parents, due to the increased resources we've devoted to child support enforcement and the IRS' withholding of income tax refunds from non-paying parents. In addition, our new in-hospital paternity establishment provisions, the President's executive order to improve child support enforcement among federal employees, innovative federal-state pilot projects, and the Justice Department's aggressive pursuit of parents who cross state lines without paying will work together to further improve the system.
- o **Tough new measures.** As President Clinton has said, governments don't raise children -- parents do. To send that message loud and clear to men and women -- those who already have children and those who don't -- welfare reform must include tough child support enforcement measures like streamlined paternity establishment, new hire reporting, uniform interstate child support laws, computerized statewide collections, and license revocation. These five Administration-backed improvements would increase child support collections by \$24 billion in the next 10 years alone -- helping millions of children who deserve the support of both parents. And they'd reduce federal welfare costs by \$4 billion over the same period.
- o **Demanding legislation.** While the House debate was often divisive, the "silver lining" was the bipartisan agreement on tougher child support enforcement, with the House accepting every major child support provision in the Clinton Administration's original welfare reform bill. We're pleased that the House bill, the Senate Finance Committee bill, and the bill offered by Senate Democrats include all of the effective measures we've demanded from the start. We hope that the full Senate will now follow suit before the July 4 recess -- and help all single parents move towards independence.

SECRETARY SHALALA SAYS "CHILD CARE COUNTS"

Today, Secretary Shalala will speak at the Department of Labor's "Working Women Count" child care forum in Ohio. As the *New York Times* reported last week, these forums are part of the Clinton Administration's effort to increase awareness of the need for quality child care for working families as well as single mothers making the transition from welfare to work. As the Administration has said from the start, child care is essential to moving recipients into permanent jobs -- and to keeping low-income women in the workforce.

- o **The Clinton commitment.** As Secretary Shalala wrote to senators last month, "The Administration supports an approach to child care that genuinely supports work for parents, and safety and healthy development for children. Such an approach must guarantee child care for families moving towards self-sufficiency, and must expand child care opportunities for working families who want to avoid welfare dependency. We believe that any serious proposal must ensure quality choices for parents and provide for continuity of services for children and families."
- o **Making work possible.** Real welfare reform is first and foremost about work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. Despite the critical link between child care and work, the House bill would cut federal assistance for child care by \$1.6 billion over the next five years. As the Secretary says today, Ohio alone would lose \$88 million in child care funding over five years. This means that in the year 2000, more than 16,000 children in Ohio would be left home alone. And similar effects are possible in the Packwood bill, which undercuts state efforts by reducing the funding available for both work programs and child care.
- o **Safe and reliable care.** A report last week from the National Research Council presents evidence that "the successful completion of job training is contingent on child care that is reliable and of acceptable quality and that matches parents' scheduling needs, [and] highlights the pivotal role that child care plays in facilitating work effort among families in poverty." This research supports other recent findings that state the obvious: adequate child care is essential to helping people move into the workforce -- and stay there.
- o **Common sense.** Senator Packwood himself has acknowledged that "single parents must have day care in order to work. Day care costs money. A family is on welfare because it doesn't have money. It can be a vicious downward spiral." As the President said last week to the NGA, "we have to require people who can work to go to work, and make sure that they have the child care to do it so that they don't have to hurt their children to do the right thing as citizens. It defies common sense to insist that people go to work when they have very young children if doing so will actually cost them money."

DEMOCRATS OFFER REAL WELFARE REFORM

Yesterday, the Senate Democratic leadership proposed their alternative to the Senate Finance welfare reform bill. As Secretary Shalala said in a statement yesterday, "This is a bold plan to end the current welfare system and replace it with a new, transitional program focused on work." Here's what others had to say:

- o **A paycheck, not a welfare check.** Democratic governors noted yesterday that, in order to end welfare as we know it, work requirements must be backed up with the resources states need to get the job done. They wrote in a letter to Senator Daschle yesterday that, "as governors on the front line of welfare reform, we view the current Republican proposals coming out of the Congress to be largely a cost shift of enormous proportions to the states under the guise of flexibility. We believe that the principles in your proposal more adequately recognize the critical issue of work and we appreciate your recognition of the essential need to provide adequate child care in order for welfare-to-work programs to be successful."
- o **Rewarding work.** For reform to work, states must be rewarded for putting people on private payrolls -- not for simply cutting them from the welfare rolls. As the *Wall Street Journal* reports today, "the Congressional Budget Office concluded that the states would not get enough job-training or child care money ... to meet the work requirements in the GOP welfare bill." In contrast, the Democratic bill would provide child care and other supports that recipients need to get private-sector jobs -- and keep them. "The Democratic bill would also set up a reward program, offering states bonuses for successful efforts to move people into jobs," the *Journal* notes.
- o **A race to independence.** As Secretary Shalala stated yesterday, "welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom, it should be a race to independence. This welfare reform plan, unlike the legislation passed by the Senate Finance Committee, includes all of the elements that are necessary to move young parents into the work force. It also promotes parental responsibility, protects children, strengthens child support enforcement, and gives states the flexibility and the tools they need to succeed."
- o **A basis for bipartisanship.** Secretary Shalala and Senator Breaux noted yesterday that the Daschle/Breaux/Mikulski bill could lead to a bipartisan agreement on real welfare reform. As Breaux said, "they can't get a bill signed into law without working with us." The *New York Times* reports today that elements of the leadership bill could be accepted by Republicans as part of a centrist compromise, because some Republicans believe that the Packwood bill, like the House bill, "went too far."

DEMOCRATS SAY "WORK FIRST"

Today, Senators Daschle, Mikulski, and Breaux will hold a press conference to announce the Democratic leadership's alternative to the Senate Finance Committee bill. As the Senators say today, their "Work First" plan "promotes work -- but protects kids." Here's the blueprint for reform that the senators will outline today:

- o **"Ending welfare as we know it."** The Democratic plan replaces AFDC with time-limited conditional assistance for poor families with children. In order to receive assistance, all recipients must sign a contract -- similar to the President's proposal -- spelling out an individualized plan to move from welfare to work as quickly as possible. From day one, all recipients will be required to look for work and accept a job that's offered. Recipients who fail to live up to their contract will see their benefits reduced or eliminated. As Senator Breaux says today, "We give the states and people on welfare the tools they need to find and hold down jobs -- then we hold them to their end of the bargain."
- o **Real work requirements.** Democrats know that in order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real work requirements backed up with the resources states need to get the job done. "Work First" would increase funding for states to help recipients move into the workforce -- and stay there. The plan also provides child care and health care assistance for welfare recipients moving to work and working families struggling to stay off the welfare rolls. In contrast, the Finance Committee bill combines unrealistic work requirements with reduced funding for states -- making it harder, not easier, to move people from welfare to work. As Senator Daschle says today, "that's not reform. It's a retreat."
- o **A performance bonus.** For reform to work, states must be rewarded for putting people on private payrolls -- not for simply cutting them from the welfare rolls. That's why this bill includes a performance bonus for states that exceed job-placement targets -- and penalties for those who do not. As the President said to the NGA on Tuesday, "I want a performance bonus, but one that will force the welfare bureaucracy and the welfare recipients to focus on work."
- o **Parental responsibility.** As we've said from the start, if we're going to demand responsibility of mothers, we should demand responsibility of fathers too. The leadership plan contains tough child support enforcement measures to encourage both parents to meet their responsibilities. Teen parents would also be required to stay in school, live at home, and prepare for work in order to receive assistance. We must send a strong message to the next generation that having children is an immense responsibility, rather than an easy route to independence.
- o **A bipartisan effort.** As President Clinton has said, "The reason the Senate bill fails on the standard of work, it seems to me, is clear. It takes away the tools that states now use to move people from welfare to work: child care, job training, greater incentives for job placement. I very much want to work across party lines to solve this problem." The Democratic alternative announced today takes a step forward in this process -- towards the President's goal of having real, bipartisan welfare reform legislation on his desk by Independence Day.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Wednesday, June 7, 1995

REWARDING WORK

Yesterday, President Clinton spoke at the NGA's Summit on Young Children. In his remarks, he laid out his fundamental goal for real welfare reform: "Welfare reform should provide real incentives to reward the states who do succeed in putting people to work -- not for cutting them off." As the President has said from the start, work must be front and center in any plan that is truly about ending welfare as we know it. Here's more:

- o **Requiring work.** Real welfare reform is first and foremost about helping parents go to work -- this means providing work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. "First," President Clinton said, "we have to require people who can work to go to work, and make sure that they have the child care to do it so that they don't have to hurt their children to do the right thing as citizens. It defies common sense to insist that people go to work when they have very young children if doing so will actually cost them money."
- o **Real resources.** The President also said that "legislation should have real work requirements, but it ought to be backed up with the resources necessary to get people into jobs and keep them there." He added that "the proposed legislation contains no incentives or requirements for states to maintain their own funding for cash assistance or for child care or work supports." We won't have welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives states more burdens and fewer resources to get the job done.
- o **Incentives for independence.** "Welfare reform should have real incentives to reward the states who do succeed in putting people to work, not for cutting them off." The President added that "if we're going to change the culture of welfare, we have got to reward success, we've got to depart from the status quo." A work-bonus fund would "give financial incentives to states that exceed targets for moving welfare beneficiaries into jobs," the *Washington Post* says today. Another solution, as Gerald Seib writes in today's *Wall Street Journal*, would be a federal contingency fund -- supported by Republican governors -- "which would give federal grants to states in a welfare pinch," as long as they matched it with their own dollars.
- o **Helping children.** As we move ahead to create real, lasting welfare reform, we must keep some fundamental goals in mind, the President said. "We should avoid mean-spirited restrictions on benefits to children, we should avoid cuts in child nutrition and adoption and child-protected services. We should give states more flexibility, but we should also make sure states continue to fulfill their responsibilities . . . We can have welfare reform, we can balance the budget, we can shrink the government and still be faithful to our fundamental responsibilities to our children and our future. Let's don't make it either/or. Let's do it all, do it right, and take this country to the next century in good shape."

A RACE TO INDEPENDENCE

Today, the National Governors' Association is sponsoring a National Summit on Young Children. The summit will bring together a bipartisan group of governors, mayors, and state and local officials to discuss the needs of America's children. President Clinton will also address the group today -- focusing on the importance of creating real welfare reform that helps children grow into independent, productive adults. Here are the points he'll make:

- o **Batting 1,000 on work.** Real welfare reform is first and foremost about helping parents go to work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. As President Clinton says today, while the Senate Finance bill is a step in the right direction from the House bill, it still misses the mark. According to the Congressional Budget Office, only six out of the 50 states would be able to meet the bill's work requirements -- a 120 batting average which wouldn't even cut it in the minor leagues. That's not ending welfare as we know it -- that's politics as usual.
- o **Resources to get the job done.** As President Clinton has repeatedly said, we won't have welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives states more burdens and fewer resources. To be credible, the President says, welfare reform legislation must have real work requirements, backed up with real resources for education, training, and job placement to help people get jobs and keep them. According to the CBO, it would cost states \$10 billion a year by the year 2000 to meet the requirements in the Senate bill -- and yet the bill expects them to do this with less money than they have now. Unfunded mandates have no place in real welfare reform legislation.
- o **True state flexibility.** As the President says today, states have become the real laboratories of reform in this country -- especially in the area of children and families. We've already given 29 states the flexibility to reform welfare at the local level -- granting more waivers than both of the previous two administrations combined. In Vermont and Wisconsin, Governors Dean and Thompson are using their waivers to require and reward work. And in Ohio, Governor Voinovich is moving people to work by using money now spent on AFDC and food stamp benefits to subsidize private sector jobs. That's real welfare reform.
- o **A race to independence.** While we must give states more flexibility in welfare reform, we must also make sure that they continue to fulfill their responsibilities. The Senate bill contains no incentives or requirements for states to maintain their own funding for cash assistance, child care, and supports for work. As the President says today, state should be rewarded for getting people to work or prepare for work -- not for cutting people from the rolls. Welfare reform should not be a race to the bottom -- it should be a race to independence. The President has challenged Congress to send him a real welfare reform bill by July 4th -- Independence Day -- to give every state a chance to succeed in moving people from welfare to work.

THE CALL FOR REAL WELFARE REFORM

Since the Senate Finance Committee voted on welfare reform legislation last month, editorial boards from across the country have offered their views of what real welfare reform means - and how the Finance bill falls short. As these editorials explain, the requirements for welfare reform are simple: real work requirements, parental responsibility, and protections for states and individuals are essential to any plan that is truly about ending welfare as we know it.

- o **Real work requirements.** Real welfare reform is first and foremost about work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. States must have the necessary resources for child care, training, and work in order to get the job done. As the *Austin-American Statesman* writes, "increasing state control of welfare can be beneficial, but certainly not without adequate funding to help people become self-sufficient." And the *Springfield News-Leader* notes that "for people to get off welfare they must acquire skills to make them employable; we must remove the disincentives that in some instances lower their standards of living when they get jobs; and there must be consequences for not trying to become employed."
- o **Requiring parental responsibility.** Child support enforcement is a crucial part of welfare reform, because it sends a strong signal to young people about the responsibility of both parents to the children they bring into the world. If we're going to demand responsibility of mothers, we should demand responsibility of fathers too. The *South Carolina State* writes that "absolutely no excuses should be accepted from men who don't accept responsibility for the children they father." The *State* adds that license revocation is the way to go, and "President Clinton wants federal legislation to revoke professional, recreation, commercial, and driving licenses of parents" who fail to pay support.
- o **Children should not be punished for their parents' mistakes.** True reform should make it easier for poor children to grow into productive adults -- not harder. Teenage parents should not be denied cash assistance -- instead, help should be conditioned on their staying at school, living at home, and identifying their child's father. Needy children should be assured basic protections wherever they live. As the *San Jose Mercury News* wrote last week, "assuring support for poor children requires widespread school breakfasts and clinics, parenting programs for teen moms, and so on."
- o **State flexibility.** Any legislation must enable states to succeed in moving people from welfare to work and support working families and children who need temporary help. The *San Jose Mercury News* writes that fixed-sum block grants "will make it harder for states to reduce child poverty and welfare dependence. Welfare spending wouldn't keep up with inflation ... Little, if anything, will be left for programs that help adults move from welfare to work." And the *Austin-American Statesman* adds that the "GOP funding formula is based on current welfare dollars going to the states. If the number of people seeking welfare increases in a given budget year, there would be no money to accommodate the new clients. In fast-growing states such as California, Florida, and Texas, this could be disastrous."

CUTTING NUTRITION PROGRAMS ISN'T WELFARE REFORM

Today, the Food Research and Action Center holds a press briefing on current congressional proposals affecting the Food Stamp program. While the House has already approved deep cuts in Food Stamps, some in the Senate are contemplating going even further -- by eliminating the program and sending it in a fixed block grant to the states. The Clinton Administration has proposed improvements in the Food Stamp program to better serve to better serve American children and families, ensure that benefits are issued and used properly, and give states more flexibility in operating the program. But we are opposed to block granting federal nutrition programs. These programs provide an important foundation for children to grow on. Children's nutrition and health must be protected -- not jeopardized -- under welfare reform.

- o **Kids should not go hungry.** The Clinton Administration believes that only a national system of nutrition programs can establish and meet nutrition standards that respond to economic changes and ensure that children's health will be protected. As Secretary Glickman said before the Senate Agriculture Committee last month, "The health of children, working families, and the elderly should not be jeopardized by eliminating the national nutrition and food safety net. We cannot support the creation of a system that does not respond to economic changes, reduces food spending and harms the economy. For these reasons, the Administration is strongly opposed to block grants and such deep cuts for the Food Stamps and Child Nutrition programs."
- o **Cuts in the name of reform.** Under the House bill, funding for child nutrition programs would be cut by \$6.6 billion over five years. According to the Children's Defense Fund, these cuts would deprive over 2 million school children of free meals. In addition, the House bill would create wide variations in nutrition standards across states, without any accountability mechanisms to ensure that those standards would be met. Children's health would suffer if states shifted resources away from nutrition programs to meet budget shortfalls.
- o **Nutrition programs work.** A survey released in April by the National Association of WIC Directors shows that a majority of Americans support the WIC program, with more than half of those polled stating that more federal money should be spent on nutrition for poor pregnant women and children. WIC, Food Stamps, School Lunches, and other federal nutrition programs get food to people who need it. And they've produced significant, measurable results in improving the health and nutrition of the people they serve. As Secretary Glickman said before the Senate, "Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp program and the introduction of WIC, our children are healthier."
- o **A glimmer of hope.** Majority Leader Dole is on record in support of a national commitment to child nutrition: "The nutrition area is one that does not easily lend itself to state responsibility ... It is appropriate that the federal government retain primary responsibility for nutrition programs in order to guarantee some standardization of benefits ... This Senator believes that child nutrition should remain a national priority," he said at a 1982 hearing. We'll continue to work with members of both parties to fix what's broken, rather than what's not.

WHAT REAL WELFARE REFORM MEANS

From the start, the Clinton Administration has laid out our requirements for real welfare reform. In order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real, fundamental change that helps move people from welfare to work, encourages responsible behavior, and sends a strong message to the next generation that people should not have children until they are ready to care for them. Here's what real welfare reform means:

- o **Real work requirements.** Real welfare reform is first and foremost about work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. States must have the necessary resources for child care, training, and work in order to get the job done. State bureaucracies should be rewarded for getting people to work or prepare for work -- not for cutting people from the rolls. Recipients must sign personal responsibility agreements, and move toward work and self-sufficiency from the very first day. Time limits must make clear to welfare recipients and caseworkers that welfare is a transitional system, not a way of life.
- o **Requiring parental responsibility.** Child support enforcement is a crucial part of welfare reform, because it sends a strong signal to young people about the responsibility of both parents to the children they bring into the world. If we're going to demand responsibility of mothers, we should demand responsibility of fathers too. That means welfare reform should include measures designed to identify the father in every case; find delinquent parents who move from job to job or state to state to avoid paying child support; speed up payments; and invoke tough penalties, like drivers' license revocation, for nonpayment.
- o **Children should not be punished for their parents' mistakes.** True reform should make it easier for poor children to grow into productive adults -- not harder. Teenage parents should not be denied cash assistance -- instead, help should be conditioned on their staying at school, living at home, and identifying their child's father. Needy children should be assured basic protections wherever they live. School lunches, Food Stamps, and assistance to abused, disabled and neglected children should not be slashed under the guise of "welfare reform."
- o **States must have flexibility -- and resources -- to get the job done.** The federal-state partnership should be retained, because we won't have welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives states more burdens and fewer resources. Any legislation must enable states to succeed in moving people from welfare to work and support working families and children who need temporary help. States should be rewarded for moving people from welfare to work, and protected in the event of population growth, an economic downturn, a natural disaster, or another unpredictable emergency.
- o **A long way to go.** As Secretary Shalala stated last week, the Administration is pleased that the Senate Finance legislation "eliminates some of the extreme and punitive provisions in the bill passed by the House of Representatives. But it still has a long way to go on what should be the centerpiece of real reform: helping people earn a paycheck, not a welfare check ... Our requirements for welfare reform are clear. We want a bill that is serious about moving people from welfare rolls to payrolls, and we remain committed to working with Congress in a bipartisan way to achieve that goal."

CHILD CARE COUNTS

Today, the Department of Labor holds a "Working Women Count" forum in New York, continuing its series of public forums on child care across the country. This is part of the Clinton Administration's effort to increase awareness of the need for quality child care for both working families as well as single mothers making the transition from welfare to work. As we've said from the start, welfare reform must have real requirements and supports -- such as child care, education, and training -- for people to achieve and maintain self-sufficiency. And it should continue help with child care for working women too.

- o **The Clinton commitment.** As Secretary Shalala has stated, "The Administration supports an approach to child care that genuinely supports work for parents, and safety and healthy development for children. Such an approach must guarantee child care for families moving towards self-sufficiency, and must expand child care opportunities for working families who want to avoid welfare dependency. We believe that any serious proposal must ensure quality choices for parents and provide for continuity of services for children and families."
- o **Getting real about child care.** Despite the critical link between child care and work, the Senate Finance bill would repeal three federal programs that provide direct child care assistance for more than 640,000 children. The bill would dramatically cut child care for low income working families who risk falling onto welfare without such assistance and for families making the transition from welfare to work. It cuts the child care people on welfare need to go to work and working people need to stay off welfare in the first place. It defies common sense to take away child care just when we are trying to move more parents into the workplace.
- o **Providing resources for work.** Real welfare reform is first and foremost about work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. As the *New York Times* reported on Sunday, "States that have done the best job of moving single parents off welfare have spent more on child care, health care, and transportation and other work-related expenses to keep former welfare recipients employed." But the Packwood bill undercuts state efforts by reducing the funding available for work programs and for child care. It provides nothing to reward states who move people from welfare to work. Real welfare reform means giving states the incentives and resources to get the job done.
- o **Getting the picture.** State and national leaders agree on the importance of child care. "Our experience suggests that a renewed commitment to work by welfare recipients will require additional child care funds above current levels," the National Conference of State Legislatures emphasized in a recent letter to Senator Packwood. Senator Packwood himself has acknowledged that "single parents must have day care in order to work. Day care costs money. A family is on welfare because it doesn't have money. It can be a vicious downward spiral." And Governor Voinovich of Ohio wrote to Senator Dole that "no work program can succeed without a commitment to making quality child care available for recipients." Investments in child care are a necessary down payment on real welfare reform.

SETTING STATES UP FOR FAILURE

On Friday, the Senate Finance Committee approved a welfare reform bill that would block grant and reduce federal funding to the states by more than \$31 billion over the next five years. Secretary Shalala said in a statement Friday: "I am pleased that the legislation eliminates some of the extreme and punitive provisions in the bill passed by the House of Representatives. But it still has a long way to go on what should be the centerpiece of real reform: helping people earn a paycheck, not a welfare check."

- o **Not real work.** As the *New York Times* reported over the weekend, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that "only six states could meet the work requirements" of the Senate Finance bill. CBO predicts that 44 states would simply pay a fine for failing to meet the legislation's work requirements, rather than invest in the job training and child care necessary to move recipients into work. Secretary Shalala stated Friday, "As the Congressional Budget Office concluded today, the bill in its current form will ultimately fail to move people from welfare to work, because it does not contain the necessary resources or incentives. Rather than reward states for success, it sets them up for failure."
- o **No resources for work.** In the first two years, the Senate Finance bill requires no additional people to work. Then, the work requirements escalate unreasonably. By the year 2000, the participation rate would require states to place 45 percent of their AFDC recipients in the JOBS program -- an increase of more than 1 million people over current law. According to an HHS analysis, in order to meet these requirements, states would have to spend an additional \$9.6 billion on JOBS services and child care. Instead, the legislation would *reduce* funding to states by \$4 billion -- undercutting the ability of states to move recipients from welfare to work.
- o **States -- and individuals -- will be stuck.** As Secretary Shalala wrote to the Finance Committee last week, "real welfare reform is first and foremost about work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. States must have the necessary resources for child care, training, and work in order to get the job done. State welfare bureaucracies should be rewarded for getting people to work or prepare for work -- not for cutting people from the rolls."
- o **A bipartisan commitment.** Although the Finance Committee's bill moves in the right direction by eliminating some of the more punitive provisions in the House bill, it still falls short of the kind of real welfare reform that Americans in both parties expect. It does not provide states the resources or incentives necessary to move recipients from welfare to work. In many respects it is still tough on children. It shifts costs to the states and undermines our obligation to hold state welfare bureaucracies accountable for results. Secretary Shalala said on Friday that "our requirements for welfare reform are clear. We want a bill that is serious about moving people from welfare rolls to payrolls, and we remain committed to working with Congress in a bipartisan way to achieve that goal."

REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS SAY STATES WILL BE STRAPPED

Today, HHS releases an analysis of the state impacts under the Senate Finance Committee's welfare proposal. While the bill would reduce federal support for all states by \$31 billion overall, the impact on individual states will be dramatic. As the *Washington Post* reports today, governors from both parties have spoken out against the funding formula of the Packwood proposal -- they support an amendment that would create a grant, rather than a loan fund, for states in the event of high population growth, a recession, or an unpredictable emergency. As the *Post* notes, Republican Governors "Whitman and Voinovich have argued strongly that financially strapped states should not be forced to borrow funds and that instead, the federal government should set up a system of grants."

- o **Strapping states.** As Secretary Shalala wrote yesterday to Finance Committee members, "The Administration is concerned that the fixed block grant in the proposed legislation makes inadequate allowances for potential growth in the need for cash assistance because of economic downturn, population growth or unpredictable emergencies. By failing to provide for the changing needs of states, it poses a danger that many growing or economically distressed states will not be able to meet the needs of their people, and will be unable to provide the child care and supports necessary to move recipients into work."
- o **Ohio objects.** Ohio would lose more than \$1 billion in federal funding over five years under the Senate Finance proposal. As Governor Voinovich wrote in a recent letter to Senator Packwood, the committee "bill does not provide sufficient protections for states in the event of an economic downturn. The federal-state partnership should not end when economic caseloads worsen and caseloads increase." Voinovich adds that under a grant fund, "states could receive matching funds for an economic downturn, to provide additional services, such as day care or job training to meet the bill's work requirements, or to meet increased demand caused by population growth."
- o **New Jersey in need.** Under the Packwood proposal, New Jersey would lose \$941 million over five years -- making it harder, not easier for the state to move people from welfare to work. Governor Whitman also wrote to Senator Packwood that the bill's rainy day loan fund is "inadequate" for states to get the job done: "It is unrealistic, however, to think that states facing an economic downturn will be able to borrow money from the federal government and pay loan funds back with interest."
- o **State flexibility -- not cost shifting.** As Secretary Shalala wrote yesterday, "The Chairman's mark undercuts the ability of states to move recipients from welfare to work by reducing the funding available for work programs and child care. It provides nothing to reward states in movement to work. Real welfare reform means giving states the incentives and resources to move people from welfare to work ... We will not achieve real welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress simply gives states more burdens and less money and fails to make work and responsibility the law of the land."

OUR VIEW OF REAL WELFARE REFORM

Today, the Senate Finance Committee will walk through Senator Packwood's welfare reform proposal, with a vote on the legislation scheduled for tomorrow. While the proposal has taken a small step by omitting one of the more punitive provisions of the House bill -- the ban on aid to teen mothers and their children -- it still has a long way to go in moving people from welfare to work. Our view of real welfare reform is simple: it should be tough on work, not on innocent children. As Secretary Shalala writes in a letter to Senator Packwood and committee members today, "the Chairman's mark still falls short of the kind of real welfare reform that Americans in both parties expect."

- o **Real work requirements.** As Secretary Shalala states today, "real welfare reform is first and foremost about work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves." States must have the necessary resources for child care, training, and work in order to get the job done. But, as Senator Rockefeller says today, the Packwood proposal "just passes the buck to the states, and not many bucks at that." State bureaucracies should be rewarded for getting people to work or prepare for work -- not for cutting people from the rolls.
- o **Requiring parental responsibility.** As the Secretary writes today, "child support enforcement is an integral part of welfare reform, particularly because it sends a strong signal to young people about the responsibility of both parents to support their children. If we're going to demand responsibility of mothers, we should demand responsibility of fathers too. That means welfare reform should include measures designed to identify the father in every case; find delinquent parents who move from job to job or state to state to avoid paying child support; speed up payments; and invoke tough penalties, like drivers license revocation, for nonpayment." We're pleased that the committee proposal includes all of these effective measures we've demanded from the start.
- o **Helping children.** As Secretary Shalala writes today, "true reform should make it easier for poor children to grow into productive adults -- not harder." Teenage parents should not be denied cash assistance -- instead, help should be conditioned on their staying at school, living at home, and identifying their child's father. As the Secretary writes, "it is wrong to punish children for their parents' mistakes, and the Senate should resist any effort to do so." There are some signs that the Senate is listening -- Senator Packwood's proposal retains the current entitlement for foster care and adoption services, and has less draconian cuts in aid to disabled kids than the House bill. But it's still got a long way to go.
- o **State flexibility.** As Secretary Shalala writes, "we will not achieve real welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress simply gives states more burdens and less money and fails to make work and responsibility the law of the land." The Secretary adds that any legislation must enable states to succeed in moving people from welfare to work and support working families and children who need temporary help. States should be rewarded for moving people into jobs, and protected in the event of population growth, an economic downturn, a natural disaster, or another unpredictable emergency.

SENATORS SPELL OUT REAL REFORM

Today, Senators Daschle, Breaux, and Mikulski will hold a press conference on welfare reform -- in anticipation of the Senate Finance Committee's markup of welfare reform legislation tomorrow. These senators know what welfare reform is really about -- moving people from welfare to work, encouraging responsible behavior, and providing incentives and resources for states to get the job done. Here's what these senators have to say today:

- o **Real work requirements.** Real welfare reform is first and foremost about work -- and the system must provide work-based incentives for states, caseworkers, and welfare recipients themselves. This means that states must have the necessary resources for child care, training, and work in order to get the job done. But the Senate Finance proposal actually ends existing programs that provide the supports -- like job training and child care -- that single moms need to enter the work force. "The goal of any welfare reform plan must be to help people get good jobs and keep them," Senator Daschle says today. "Just throwing families off welfare into the streets is not the answer."
- o **Realistic about child care.** By abolishing the child care programs that serve single parents struggling to leave welfare -- or stay off -- the Senate Finance bill will make it harder for millions of women with children to go to work. Not only does the legislation lump child care funds into a block grant aimed mainly at paying cash benefits, it also eliminates all existing child care guarantees for low-income working families and those making the transition from welfare to work. As Senator Breaux says this morning, "The Republicans' welfare reform proposal is not real reform -- it simply gives states a check and requires nothing in return. Under the GOP's block-grant proposal, states could take the money they now spend to help poor families and use it for anything -- and that's not fair."
- o **Helping kids.** True reform should make it easier for poor children to grow into productive adults -- not harder. Teenage parents should be required to stay in school and live at home. And needy children should be assured basic protections wherever they live. But the Senate Finance proposal slashes assistance to poor and disabled children under the guise of "welfare reform." As the senators say today, the welfare of America's children is too important to be caught up in partisanship and budget-cutting.
- o **True state flexibility.** The federal-state partnership should be retained, with both doing their share to make welfare recipients self-sufficient. States should be rewarded for moving people from welfare to work, and protected if population growth, an economic downturn, a natural disaster, or another unpredictable emergency causes an increase in need and applications for aid. As Senator Breaux says today, "We need a federal-state partnership to share both in the cost of putting welfare recipients to work and the responsibility of protecting innocent children."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, May 22, 1995

EMPOWERING PEOPLE IN ARIZONA

Today, Arizona becomes the 29th state to receive a welfare reform waiver from the Clinton Administration, continuing our commitment to let states implement bold new welfare reforms that meet their local needs. Arizona's "Employing and Moving People Off Welfare and Encouraging Responsibility (EMPOWER)" project builds on President Clinton's vision for national welfare reform -- tough on work and responsibility, but fair to children. As Secretary Shalala said today, "with this waiver, the Clinton Administration continues to deliver on its promise of state flexibility in welfare reform."

- o **Real work requirements.** Today, Arizona becomes the 16th state to place a time-limit on benefits -- sending a strong message to welfare recipients and caseworkers that welfare is a transitional system to self-sufficiency. The state will impose tough sanctions on recipients who fail to comply with education and training requirements under the state's JOBS program. Arizona is also increasing the amount of earned income and assets recipients can keep, and extending child care and medical benefits to families after they leave the welfare rolls. As President Clinton has said, "If we're going to make people on welfare work, then we've got to make it possible for them to work."
- o **Parental responsibility.** Following President Clinton's approach, Arizona is sending a clear message to teen parents that having children is an immense responsibility rather than an easy route to independence. Arizona is promoting parental responsibility by requiring minor mothers to live at home or with a responsible adult, requiring minor parents and pregnant teens to stay in school, and encouraging two-parent families to work and stay together.
- o **Work and training.** In one part of the state, Arizona is going even further to reward work and responsibility. Welfare benefits will be used to subsidize jobs in the private sector, so recipients can earn a paycheck, not a welfare check. And while individuals work in a subsidized job, the time limit will be temporarily suspended and child support collections will not be counted as income.
- o **True state flexibility.** The *New York Times* reported last week that Arizona Governor Symington has expressed his objections to the funding formula of the House bill, which would limit his state's efforts to achieve real reform. In a letter to Senator Dole, Symington said that "the proposal for block grants would penalize states like Arizona with high population growth and comparatively low levels of welfare spending," according to the *Times*. We believe that the federal-state partnership should be retained, because we won't have welfare reform or state flexibility if Congress just gives states more burdens and fewer resources.

THE CALL FOR REAL WELFARE REFORM

Next week, the Senate Finance Committee will begin marking up a welfare reform bill. While we have yet to see the details, we know what legislation must contain in order to be credible. Real work requirements, parental responsibility, and protections for states and individuals are essential to any plan that is about ending welfare as we know it. But don't just take our word for it -- listen to what regional editorial boards have been saying all along:

- o **Real work requirements.** Real welfare reform is about work, first and foremost. That means time-limited benefits, personal responsibility agreements, and resources for states to get the job done. The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* says that the House bill "gives no consideration to safety-net features -- among them job training, a reasonable number of day-care slots, health insurance benefits, and above all, a robust economy -- that would truly liberate poor people and make them employable." And the *Springfield News-Leader* adds, "for people to get off welfare they must acquire skills that make them employable; we must remove the disincentives that in some instances lower their standards of living when they get jobs; and there must be consequences for not trying to become employed."
- o **Personal responsibility.** Child support enforcement is a crucial part of welfare reform, because it sends a strong signal that both parents must be responsible for the children they bring into this world. The *Des Moines Register* writes that President Clinton's approach "would mean that pregnancy and children could no longer be used by irresponsible teens as tickets to withdrawing from parental authority. An applicant for AFDC could not receive help unless she named the father of her child or children, and helped authorities find him. If the father refused to pay child support, his driver's license could be withdrawn and his wages garnished. Worthy proposals, all."
- o **True state flexibility.** As the *Denver Post* wrote last month, the House bill would just give states more burdens with fewer resources necessary to move people into jobs. And, "the worst aspect of this fiscal nightmare: the GOP plan doesn't account for rapid growth in some states, nor does it make room for economic downturns. Many of the allocations would be capped or trapped in a rigid formula ... the GOP plan as now conceived is too arbitrary and potentially counterproductive." And the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* asks: "Who will care for the next wave of victims once benefits are cut and recessions send more people into unemployment lines and below the poverty line ... the Senate must not follow the House's lead by approving this bill."
- o **Protections for children.** True reform should make it easier for children to grow into productive adults -- not harder. This means that school lunches, food stamps, and assistance to abused and disabled children should not be slashed under the guise of "welfare reform." As the *Denver Post* wrote last week, "the proposal now on the table is far too Draconian, and relieves Uncle Sam of any responsibility for caring for America's impoverished children ... This situation cannot stand. Congress must send its budget-cutters back to the drawing table -- with orders to make sure that impoverished kids don't pay the highest price."

AN INCENTIVE TO MOVE FROM WELFARE TO WORK

Last week, the Treasury Department issued a report on the Republicans' plan to cut funding for the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), a refundable tax credit designed to help the working poor. The Clinton Administration's recent expansion of the EITC was an important bipartisan step forward in helping working families lift themselves out of poverty -- but some Republican proposals in Congress would take a step backwards in this effort.

Real welfare reform must both move people from welfare to work and prevent welfare dependency in the first place. Our approach would combine the EITC with supports such as education, training, and child care, to help reward work over welfare. In contrast, some members of Congress would reduce these important work incentives -- and use the money to give a tax break to the very wealthy.

- o **Making work pay.** The EITC helps ensure that more working people escape poverty - because it amounts to a pay raise for the working poor. For each dollar earned, low income families get a matching credit of 40 cents. The passage of the EITC expansion in 1993 fulfilled President Clinton's promise to reward families who work hard and play by the rules.
- o **An incentive to leave welfare.** The EITC is fundamental to our goal of rewarding work over welfare. When combined with essential supports such as child care and child support enforcement, it will help ensure that working families who play by the rules are able to support their families. As President Clinton recently said to the National Association of Counties: "If you work full-time and you have children in the home, you should not be in poverty. And there should never be an incentive to stay on welfare instead of going to work. That's what the Earned Income Tax Credit expansion was all about."
- o **A program with bipartisan support.** The EITC has long been championed by presidents and members of Congress from both parties. President Reagan described it as "the best anti-poverty, the best pro-family, the best job creation measure to come out of the Congress." Senator Packwood has said that the EITC is "a key means of helping low-income workers with dependent children get off and stay off welfare." As the *Wall Street Journal* notes, "since its inception in 1975, the EITC has been the darling of Republicans and Democrats alike ... even in this time when Congress is aggressively looking for ways to slash government spending, the GOP attack on the EITC is surprising. The program rewards work."
- o **A bad idea.** The Treasury Department's report says that the Republican proposal would hurt 12.2 million EITC recipients, costing them on average \$235 in 1996, and \$1,542 in tax hikes over the next seven years. Even the *Wall Street Journal* wants to know: "What is going on? Republicans say the reason they are coming down hard on the EITC is because of rampant fraud. But the real reason may be that they are looking for big money to help fund their tax-cut proposals." As Secretary Rubin has said, "It is a bad idea to increase taxes on lower-income working families as a means for reducing the deficit. We should support workers who choose work over welfare."

BIPARTISAN LOCAL LEADERS HAVE THEIR SAY

Today, the National Association of Counties (NACo), the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and local school officials will hold a press conference -- giving their front-line views on the direction welfare reform should take. For some time now, these groups have been voicing their objections to the House-passed legislation -- saying that it's phony on work, tough on children, and unfair to states and localities. Here's an update on what they have to say:

- o **No conservative mandates.** State, county, and city leaders in both parties object to the combination of conservative mandates and budget cuts in the House bill. NACo wrote Senator Packwood last month that "the federal government must provide the flexibility to tailor programs to meet local needs. Many of the restrictions in the legislation passed by the House of Representatives go against the concept of state and local flexibility, and have the added consequence of hurting children." There's some hope here that the Senate is listening -- and considering eliminating punitive provisions in the House bill that would deny benefits to the children of minor mothers, disabled children, and some legal immigrants.
- o **State flexibility -- not cost-shifting.** At today's press conference, this coalition of local government groups will go on record against the House bill's funding cuts and cost-shifts to states and localities: "As passed, H.R. 4 eliminates the needs-based nature of public assistance, replacing it with poorly funded block grants containing no assurances that local governments will be provided with adequate program funding. The loss of this 'safety net,' along with cuts in benefit eligibility and denial of job training to recipients will force city and county governments to bear the unshared costs of caring for these families and dealing with the increase in homelessness, medical expense, hunger and crime in communities," the coalition says.
- o **Real work requirements.** The position of local officials is clear: requiring work also means providing the supports -- such as child care, education, and training -- necessary for people to achieve and maintain self-sufficiency. Today, the National League of Cities sums it up best: "True welfare reform is about facilitating the transition from welfare to work. Achieving that involves education, training, and support services that will enable working parents to keep a job. Solutions that lack a realistic employment strategy and essential support services are dead-end strategies ... If work requirements are written into welfare reform, the National League of Cities believes that measures to provide affordable child care must also be part of the program."
- o **Protections for children.** NACo states that the "federal government must maintain its responsibility to ensure a level of assistance and support services to children and families, and that programs are administered on an equitable basis." In particular, NACo opposes the House-passed block grants for foster care and adoption services -- important programs which protect abused, neglected and abandoned children. "These programs are designed to protect our most vulnerable children and provide them a safe and nurturing out-of-home placement," the county leaders explain. "A capped block grant will result in higher caseloads and could put these children in even greater risk."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Tuesday, May 16, 1995

MISSING IN ACTION: WORK

Major newspapers report today that Senator Packwood has made some progress in his efforts to draft a welfare reform bill. But with a markup date of May 24th apparently set, major questions still remain unanswered. Chief among them: where are the details about what should be the centerpiece of reform: incentives to move people from welfare to work?

- o **Where are the work requirements for individuals?** We believe that measures to reward work and responsibility are key to any reform effort. The big test of welfare reform is whether or not it moves people from welfare to work -- and Senator Packwood has yet to put forward any details about this crucial issue. As the President said last month, "We must demand work and responsibility by setting definite time limits for welfare recipients and enforcing strict work requirements. We must promote family and responsibility by passing the toughest possible child support enforcement, including our plan to deny drivers' licenses to parents who refuse to pay their child support."
- o **Where are the incentives for states?** Packwood has said that there will be some work requirements in his bill -- but that they're not figured out yet. We believe work should be the centerpiece of welfare reform, not an afterthought. States need incentives to refocus the energies of caseworkers into moving people into jobs -- instead of simply cutting them off. As the President has said, "We won't have real welfare reform or state flexibility, if Congress just gives the states more burdens and less resources, and fails to make work and responsibility the law of the land."
- o **Where are the resources to get the job done?** Packwood says that his proposal would cut about \$30 billion in federal funding to the states -- about the same amount that would be cut from these programs under the House bill. But if funds are cut for work and child care, how can states successfully move people from the welfare rolls to the work force? As the President has said, "My top priority is to get people off welfare and into jobs. I want to replace welfare with work, so people earn a paycheck, not a welfare check. To do that, we have to take some of the money we save and plow it into job training, education, and child care ... If we're going to make people on welfare work, then we've got to make it possible for them to work."
- o **Will it be welfare reform, or budget cutting?** Polls have always shown that the public wants welfare reform to be about work, not about punishing children for their parents' past mistakes. An April *Washington Post* poll showed that 94 percent of Americans believe that welfare recipients should be required to work or train for work. And today's *Washington Post* reports that 52 percent of Americans now oppose further cuts in welfare spending to reduce the deficit -- up from 34 percent in January. As the President has said, "I want welfare reform that moves people from dependence to independence; from welfare to work. So my proposal is a welfare to work plan, not just a welfare plan that cuts welfare."

ENDING WELFARE AS WE KNOW IT

While welfare reform discussions in the Senate are still general, we know what the specific requirements of any real welfare reform plan should be. Americans of both parties agree: we must restore the mainstream values of work, responsibility, and family to the broken welfare system. Here's where we are:

- o **Real work requirements.** To be credible, welfare reform legislation must have real requirements for work -- but it must also have incentives and resources for states to help people achieve self-sufficiency. President Clinton's approach would require recipients to develop personal responsibility plans -- contracts for work. From the very first day, recipients must identify the education, training, and job placement services they'll need to move into work. As President Clinton said last week, "These contracts were an important part of the welfare reform legislation I sent to Congress last year, and are essential to real welfare reform that moves people from welfare to work."
- o **Personal responsibility.** In addition to requiring work, welfare reform must send a strong message of parental responsibility. As the President has made clear, strong child support enforcement must be part of any real welfare reform legislation -- and the Administration is pleased that the House bill finally included all of the tough measures we proposed. As President Clinton said recently in Iowa, to "these children who become parents prematurely, we should say, 'you made a mistake, you shouldn't do that -- no child should do that. But what we're going to do is to impose responsibilities on you for the future, make you a responsible parent, a responsible student, a responsible worker.'"
- o **Protections for children.** As far as we're concerned, the House-passed welfare bill is not real welfare reform -- it's phony on work and tough on kids, confusing budget cutting with welfare reform. Our approach would require work and responsibility, while ensuring that children aren't punished for their parents' past mistakes. As the President has said, "Welfare reform must be tough on work and on parents who walk away from their responsibilities -- not tough on children."
- o **A step in the right direction?** Measured against this yardstick, the plan being discussed in the Senate may turn out to be a step forward. According to Senator Packwood on "Meet the Press," it will delete one of the most punitive provisions in the House bill -- the ban on aid to teen mothers and their children. But on work, it remains to be seen whether it will give states incentives to move people into jobs -- and not just cut them off. In the days ahead, we'll be reviewing Senate action closely. As President Clinton said last week, "I will continue to work with Congress to enact welfare reform legislation that includes real work requirements and the incentives and resources for states to move people from welfare to work."

IMPROVING -- NOT ELIMINATING -- FOOD STAMPS

Today, the Department of Agriculture will announce a new initiative to strengthen the federal Food Stamp program. The Clinton Administration is offering a responsible plan for reform -- to better serve American children and families, ensure that benefits are issued and used properly, and give states more flexibility in operating the program.

While the Administration is committed to improving the Food Stamp program to better serve states and families, we are opposed to block granting nutrition programs, as Congress is contemplating. The measures announced today will offer a reasonable -- and responsible -- blueprint for change:

- o **Real results.** The Clinton Administration is committed to providing a strong nutritional safety net for poor children and families -- and food stamps are a vital part of that strategy. In addition to WIC, School Lunch, and other federal nutrition programs, they get food to people who need it. And they've produced significant, measurable results in improving the health and nutrition of the people they serve.
- o **Fighting fraud.** Today's proposals build on comprehensive anti-fraud proposals USDA has already introduced and add new measures to ensure that states deliver benefits appropriately. These reforms will crack down on recipients and retailers who misuse benefits, and improve access to the Electronic Benefits Transfer system -- creating a stronger link between food stamps and the people they are meant to serve.
- o **Requiring responsibility.** To help individuals move towards self-sufficiency, new measures will strengthen child support enforcement for food stamp recipients. These provisions will require states to aggressively pursue and collect child support that is owed to food stamp recipients, increasing parental responsibility and creating savings for federal taxpayers. We must ensure that both parents -- fathers and mothers alike -- take responsibility for the children they bring into this world.
- o **Cutting red tape.** The Clinton Administration is working to replace red tape with a streamlined system that gives states the ability -- and flexibility -- to meet national goals. While federal standards are essential, we agree that the Food Stamp program must be more flexible and easier for states to administer. We will eliminate unnecessary regulations and statutory requirements that tell states what to do, and replace them with a partnership agreement enabling states to design their own guidelines to meet national goals.
- o **Kids should not go hungry.** As the President has repeatedly said, neither food stamps nor the school lunch program should be block-granted. "For a lot of kids in this country -- a lot of kids -- the only decent meal they get every day is the meal they get at school. This program works. If it's not broken, we shouldn't fix it," he said in Iowa. Only a national system of nutrition programs can establish and meet nutrition standards that respond to economic changes and ensure that children's health will be protected. Children must be helped -- not hurt -- as we move ahead to create real, lasting welfare reform.

THE CHILD SUPPORT GAP

Today, the Census Bureau releases a report that highlights the need for stronger national child support enforcement. From the start, the Clinton Administration has called for tough child support provisions as part of welfare reform. In fact, the "silver lining" in the House-passed welfare bill was its inclusion of all the tough measures we proposed. As Secretary Shalala says today, this "report shows the unmistakable need for a stronger child support enforcement system in our country." Here's why:

- o **Poor collections.** According to today's report, fewer than half of non-custodial parents make any payments at all for their children's support, and only about a quarter pay the full awarded amount. As a result, only \$11.9 billion in child support was paid in 1991, far short of the \$34 billion that could potentially be collected. "This report confirms that a wide gap persists in the area of child support," Secretary Shalala says. "Only about half of single parents have any child support award in place at all. And even for those who do have awards, payment is too often unreliable. It is shameful and unacceptable that so many of our children should be living without the support of both parents."
- o **Poor support.** The Census report also shows that mothers living with children from an absent father had a poverty rate of 35 percent, more than four times the rate for married couples with children. And, among custodial mothers without child support awards in place, nearly half were poor. "We know that many families, deprived of child support, are forced to go on welfare," says assistant secretary for children and families Mary Jo Bane. "Child support combined with work is a crucial link for families seeking self-sufficiency."
- o **Tough new measures.** The Clinton Administration wants to send the strongest possible message that both parents -- fathers and mothers alike -- must take responsibility for the children they bring into this world. Our proposed child support improvements could increase child support payments by \$24 billion over 10 years. These measures include new hire reporting, uniform state laws, computerized statewide collections, streamlined paternity establishment, and revocation of licenses for those who fail to pay child support awards. And they would supplement improvements we've already put in place, like in-hospital paternity establishment and swift garnishment of income tax refunds.
- o **Demanding legislation.** In a radio address last month, the President again challenged Congress to act swiftly on his proposals for child support legislation. "The welfare reform plan I sent to Congress last year included the toughest possible child support enforcement," he said. "And now the Speaker and his colleagues in the House have taken our child support measures and put them into their bill -- including our plan to ask states to deny drivers' licenses and professional licenses to deadbeat parents." The Senate should now follow suit before the July 4 recess, and we hope they will.

"A PRESCRIPTION FOR DISASTER"

Today, Florida Governor Lawton Chiles speaks to the National Press Club about the House welfare bill's impact on his state and the rest of the nation. As the Senate considers block-granting and cutting assistance programs for poor children and families, governors such as Chiles are speaking out -- and pointing out that the House bill will hurt, not help, state efforts to create real, lasting welfare reform. As Governor Chiles stated last week, "When I look at the [House bill] and what it does to Florida, I'm dead. We're killed." Here's why:

- o **Cost shifting.** The House bill's block grant funding formula, Chiles says, is a "prescription for disaster" for Florida -- and most states. "Shifting new responsibility to the states without a fair, equitable shifting of resources is not any kind of 'New Federalism,'" Chiles adds. "It is a shallow attempt to balance the federal budget on the backs of the states - - and, even worse, on the backs of children, the elderly, the poor and the sick. That's just plain wrong."
- o **Eliminating resources -- and state flexibility.** According to an HHS analysis, Florida would lose more than \$3.6 billion over five years under the House bill. More than 230,000 children would be denied AFDC benefits, and in the year 2000, 15,040 children would be left home alone because of the bill's cuts in child care funding. "Flexibility is promised," Chiles says today, but "a hammer-lock is delivered -- with real cutbacks for seven years. That's the view from Florida -- and it looks much the same for California, Texas, Arizona, and some other states."
- o **Ending state innovation.** Under a welfare waiver granted by the Clinton Administration, Florida is already moving people from welfare to work. As Chiles says, "welfare reform is not a theory in Florida -- it is a working reality. And, we'd like to keep it that way. We've implemented time-limited, transitional welfare reform in Florida and are expanding it this year ... But this kind of reform will be stopped in its tracks if the welfare reform proposal passed by the House prevails."
- o **Children at risk.** Chiles says that "this is really not about block grants -- nor is it about giving the states more flexibility to better manage our programs and solve our problems. This is about budget cuts -- pure and simple. This is about giving a tax cut to the wealthy." And he adds that "national standards are vital -- so that children are treated fairly -- no matter where they live."
- o **Joining the chorus.** Across the country, others are objecting to provisions in the House bill that are weak on work, tough on kids, and unfair to states. As the *New York Times* pointed out this week, "Because poverty is a product of national forces, it is not appropriate for states with large concentrations of poor people to have to bear the overriding burden of caring for them." The *Dallas Morning News* also notes that the House bill's funding "approach does not reward efficiency or allow federal dollars to follow people in need." The *Denver Post* recently wrote that "the impact could be severe" under the House bill. And last week, the *Philadelphia Inquirer* offered Mayor Rendell's prediction: "These kinds of numbers could spell catastrophe for Philadelphia."

CHILD CARE COUNTS

This week, the Department of Labor begins holding public forums on child care across the country. Today's "Working Women Count" forum in San Francisco is part of the Clinton Administration's effort to increase awareness of the need for quality child care for both working families as well as single mothers making the transition from welfare to work. Tomorrow, Secretary Shalala will make a similar point in a speech to the National Child Care Health Forum: If welfare reform is to be credible, it must have real requirements and supports -- such as child care, education, and training -- for people to achieve and maintain self-sufficiency. And it should continue help with child care for working women too.

- o **The Clinton commitment.** As Secretary Shalala has stated, "The Administration supports an approach to child care that genuinely supports work for parents, and safety and healthy development for children. Such an approach must guarantee child care for families moving towards self-sufficiency, and must expand child care opportunities for working families who want to avoid welfare dependency. We believe that any serious proposal must ensure quality choices for parents, and provide for continuity of services for children and families."
- o **Home alone.** The House-passed welfare bill would reduce federal funding for child care by \$1.6 billion, or 15 percent, over five years. In the year 2000, over 320,000 child care slots would be lost under the bill - even though real welfare reform will require more child care, not less, as single mothers leave the rolls for work. This legislation would reduce already scarce child care slots and pit working families against welfare recipients for child care assistance -- making it harder, not easier, for single parents to move from welfare to work.
- o **Tough, but practical.** President Clinton has already laid out the Administration's bottom line: "My top priority is to get people off welfare and into jobs ... To do that, we have to take some of the money we save and plow it into job training, education and child care ... If we're going to make people on welfare work, then we've got to make it possible for them to work. If we're going to make people self-reliant, we have to make it possible for them to support themselves. We can be tough, but we've got to be practical."
- o **Getting it straight.** There are some signs that members of Congress are beginning to see the link between requiring work and providing adequate child care under welfare reform. Senator Kassebaum has acknowledged that "making that transition to work requires support for good child care." And Senator Packwood recently noted that "single parents must have day care in order to work. Day care costs money. A family is on welfare because it doesn't have money. It can be a vicious downward spiral." Ohio Rep. Deborah Pryce is also on record: "It is clear that a lack of affordable child care is an obstacle to many parents, especially mothers. If we are going to require work, and we should, our children shouldn't be forgotten." And Utah Rep. Enid Waldholtz draws the bottom line this way: "It doesn't make any sense to force a mother on welfare to go to work when there is no child care available."

**Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, May 8, 1995**

A CONTRACT FOR WORK

Today, Delaware becomes the 28th state to receive a welfare reform waiver from the Clinton Administration, continuing our commitment to let states implement bold new welfare reforms that meet their local needs. Delaware's "A Better Chance" project also builds on President Clinton's vision for national welfare reform -- tough on work and responsibility, but fair to children. As President Clinton has said, "we propose to offer people on welfare a simple contract. We will help you get the skills you need, but after two years, anyone who can go to work, must go to work ... Work is preferable to welfare. And it must be enforced."

- o **A contract for work.** Today, Delaware becomes the 15th state to require welfare recipients to sign self-sufficiency contracts -- combining strong incentives with tough sanctions to move people from welfare to work. As under President Clinton's own proposal, Delaware recipients must develop a personal employability plan -- identifying the education, job training, and job placement services they need to achieve and maintain self-sufficiency. And they must comply with the contract's requirements -- by establishing their child's paternity, participating in education or training, and taking a job when offered -- or face a loss of benefits.
- o **A compact of responsibility.** Delaware, adhering to President Clinton's call for stronger national child support enforcement, is working to ensure that both parents -- fathers and mothers alike -- give their children the financial and emotional support they deserve. Delaware will impose strong sanctions on parents who do not cooperate with child support enforcement efforts, including paternity establishment. But the state will also offer education and training to non-custodial parents, so that they may work and meet their child support obligations.
- o **Making work pay.** Delaware is also encouraging families to leave welfare for work, by extending transitional child care and medical benefits, improving access to the Earned Income Tax Credit, and increasing resource and automobile asset limits. As a *Washington Post* story illustrates today, welfare recipients need both incentives and sanctions to join the workforce -- and stay there.
- o **Focusing on teens.** Following President Clinton's approach, Delaware is sending a clear message to teen parents that having children is an immense responsibility rather than an easy route to independence. Delaware is promoting parental responsibility and preventing welfare dependency by requiring minor mothers to live at home or with a responsible adult, providing incentives for minor parents to stay in school, and encouraging two-parent families to work and stay together.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS WORK

Recent reports in the press suggest that the Senate is considering preserving the national School Lunch and WIC programs -- rather than sending them to the states with reduced funding, as the House bill proposes. While this is a good sign, today's *Wall Street Journal* reports that Senator Packwood and the Finance Committee might still try to fix what's not broken, by block-granting the Food Stamp program. The Clinton Administration believes that federal nutrition programs provide an important foundation for children to grow on. Children's nutrition and health must be protected -- not jeopardized -- under welfare reform.

- o **Kids should not go hungry.** The Clinton Administration is opposed to block-granting nutrition programs. We agree that these programs must be more flexible and easier for states to administer. But we won't support changes that jeopardize children's health. Only a national system of nutrition programs can establish and meet nutrition standards that respond to economic changes and ensure that children's health will be protected. As the President said last week, neither food stamps nor the school lunch program should be block-granted. "For a lot of kids in this country -- a lot of kids -- the only decent meal they get every day is the meal they get at school. This program works. If it's not broken, we shouldn't fix it."
- o **Cuts in the name of reform.** Under the House bill, funding for child nutrition programs would be cut by \$6.6 billion over five years. According to the Children's Defense Fund, these cuts would deprive over 2 million school children of free meals. In addition, the House bill would create wide variations in nutrition standards across states, without any accountability mechanisms to ensure that those standards would be met. Children's health would suffer if states shifted resources away from nutrition programs to meet budget shortfalls.
- o **Surveys show ... WIC works -- and reports of preliminary discussions suggest that the Senate recognizes this.** A survey released in April by the National Association of WIC Directors shows that a majority of Americans support the WIC program, with more than half of those polled stating that more federal money should be spent on nutrition for poor pregnant women and children. As Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman has said, "In a block grant, WIC could become a handful of vitamins and a brochure."
- o **A glimmer of hope.** Majority Leader Dole is on record in support of a national commitment to child nutrition: "The nutrition area is one that does not easily lend itself to state responsibility ... It is appropriate that the federal government retain primary responsibility for nutrition programs in order to guarantee some standardization of benefits ... This Senator believes that child nutrition should remain a national priority," he said at a 1982 hearing. We'll continue to work with members of both parties to fix what's broken, rather than what's not.

CUTTING CHILD PROTECTION ISN'T WELFARE REFORM

One of the crucial areas that must be approached with reason -- not rhetoric -- in the welfare reform debate is child protection. However, the House-passed welfare bill has its priorities all wrong when it comes to kids -- especially for foster care, adoption, and child welfare services. This legislation would cut federal funding and eliminate federal oversight of state systems which are already functioning poorly -- placing abused, neglected, and abandoned children at increased risk of real harm.

While members of Congress are debating cuts to child welfare and protection services, governors, local officials, and the American people are speaking out -- saying that children must be helped -- not hurt -- as we move ahead to end welfare as we know it.

- o **Children at risk.** When fully implemented, the welfare bill passed by the House would eventually deny cash assistance to more than 5 million children. Many of these children could be pushed into a child protection system which, according to a recent report by the U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect, is already failing to provide the most essential services. Yet, the bill would also cut funding for child welfare services by **twelve percent, or more than \$3.5 billion, over five years.** The House bill would decrease -- not increase -- funding for these programs when children will need them most.
- o **Governors object.** A recent letter from the National Governors Association objects to the House bill's child protection block-grant proposal: "While some growth is built into funding for the child protection block grant, it is not clear whether it will be adequate especially given that states are likely to be required by the courts to honor existing adoption assistance contracts. Governors will continue to protect abused and neglected children by intervening on their behalf and we believe that federal funding must continue to be available for these services."
- o **Protests from local officials.** Last week's letter from the National Association of Counties also opposes block-granting programs that protect abused, neglected and abandoned children: "These programs are designed to protect our most vulnerable children and provide them a safe and nurturing out-of-home placement. A capped block grant will result in higher caseloads and could put these children in even greater risk."
- o **"It will only get worse."** The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* writes this week that "members of Congress should reconsider eliminating federal child protection programs and replacing them by block grants." And the *Kansas City Star* recently noted that the House bill runs against the U.S. Advisory Board's recommendations because it "calls for less, not more, federal involvement in child protection." In addition, "when the money is spent" under the bill, "there is no more." But Alinda Dennis, director of the Metropolitan Child Abuse Network, sums it up best: "Children are dying every day from abuse and neglect. It's a despicable situation that will only get worse if this bill becomes law."

REFORM FOR THE NEXT GENERATION

As the Senate holds confirmation hearings this week for Dr. Foster, members are discussing what we already know: teen pregnancy prevention is a crucial national task. In particular, special provisions to help teen mothers prepare for work should be a central component of any real welfare reform proposal. Yet the welfare bill passed by the House would simply give up on teen mothers and their children -- by denying them benefits without providing the supports necessary to move them towards self-sufficiency. As Secretary Shalala said of the House bill last week, "We don't believe we can call it welfare reform when there are no provisions to require teenage mothers to finish school or enroll in a job training program that puts them on the road to employment."

- o **The facts.** Preventing teen pregnancy and out-of-wedlock births is a critical part of welfare reform, because the link between teen births and poverty is clear. Approximately 80 percent of the children born to teenage parents who dropped out of high school and did not marry are poor. In contrast, just eight percent of children born to married high school graduates aged 20 or older are poor.
- o **Preventing teen pregnancy.** We need to send the strongest possible signal to teens that pregnancy and childbirth should be delayed. To prevent welfare dependency in the first place, teenagers must get the message that staying in school, postponing pregnancy, and preparing to work are the right things to do. As President Clinton has said, "Nobody should get pregnant or father a child who isn't prepared to raise the child, love the child and take responsibility for the child's future."
- o **Smart, not shortsighted, reforms.** Simply denying assistance to a teenage mother, as the House bill proposes, won't do anything to move her toward self-sufficiency. The bill's approach is also mean-spirited: it cuts people off because they are poor, young and unmarried -- and small children pay the price for their parents' mistakes. And, as President Clinton has said, "It's bound to lead to more dependency, not less; to more broken families, not fewer; to more burdens on the taxpayers over the long run, not less."
- o **Our solution.** Our approach would require teen mothers to live at home with their parents, identify their child's father, finish high school, and work. But we would also give them the help they need to become good role models and providers for their children. As President Clinton said last week in Iowa, "We should never punish children for the mistakes of their parents. And these children who become parents prematurely, we should say, 'you made a mistake, you shouldn't do that -- no child should do that. But what we're going to do is to impose responsibilities on you for the future, make you a responsible parent, a responsible student, a responsible worker.'"

A GOVERNOR OBJECTS

Last week, the National Association of Counties (NACo) wrote a letter to Senate Finance Committee Chairman Bob Packwood, objecting to provisions in the House welfare bill that are tough on children, weak on work, and unfair to states. The U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, and the National Governors Association have already gone on record against some of the more punitive, cost-shifting measures in that legislation.

Today, the *Washington Post* reports that Governor Lawton Chiles of Florida is also speaking out against the House bill's potential impact on his state. As the *Post* notes, "Chiles is the first of the big-state governors to challenge the House welfare measure, which would eliminate the federal guarantee that every eligible American is entitled to benefits, regardless of cost." His arguments are worth listening to:

- o **No cost-shifting.** Governor Lawton ^{Chiles} notes that more than half the states -- and their poor children -- will suffer under the House bill's block grant funding formula: "When I look at [the House bill] and what it does to Florida, I'm dead. We're killed." The mayors are also on record: "In addition to the significant negative impact the proposal would have on low income people, it will also further strain local budgets. It basically shifts costs our way." And NACo writes that "poorly funded block grants and cuts in benefit eligibility will force county and city governments to bear the unshared cost of caring for families and dealing with the unintended consequences such as increased homelessness, medical expenses, hunger and crime." As the *Wall Street Journal* noted yesterday, "even well-run states face a major challenge" under the House bill.
- o **No conservative mandates.** Mayors, county officials, and governors are speaking out against the conservative micromanagement in the House bill. As the *Washington Post* reports, NACo has "asked Packwood to drop House-passed restrictions on payments to teenage parents, to children whose paternity has not been established, and to families who have additional children while on welfare." In order to end welfare as we know it, states will need more flexibility, not less.
- o **Protecting children.** "How can a poor child in Florida be worth one-third less than a poor child in Massachusetts?" Governor Chiles asks. Under the House bill, states that have historically spent more on welfare programs will receive a larger share of block-grant funds than others, regardless of the number of poor children they must protect. Lawton is asking the Congress to "treat all poor children equitably, and not favor any state's children at the expense of another's."
- o **Preserving child welfare services.** Last week's NACo letter also opposes House-passed block grants for important programs which protect abused, neglected and abandoned children. "These programs are designed to protect our most vulnerable children and provide them a safe and nurturing out-of-home placement. A capped block grant will result in higher caseloads and could put these children in even greater risk." And a *LA Times* article over the weekend notes that "foster care would have to compete with other programs" under the House block-grant proposal. "States would no longer be accountable to the federal government if they didn't measure up."

FIXING "A MESS OF CONTRADICTIONS"

While the Senate Finance Committee finished hearings last week on welfare reform, editorial boards from around the country were offering their own views of the House-passed welfare bill -- and what the Senate should do to remedy its shortcomings. Yesterday's *Washington Post* editorial describes the House bill best: "a mess of contradictions." Here are some of the ways that its flaws should be fixed:

- o **No conservative mandates.** The House bill, according to the *Post*, "contains a slew of new requirements on how states can and can't spend money." As city, county, and state leaders read the fine print in that legislation, they are beginning to speak out against punitive measures that would deny aid to the children of minor mothers, disabled children, and legal immigrants. As the *Denver Post* has noted, "the GOP plan as now conceived is too arbitrary and potentially counterproductive." States need more flexibility, not less -- and they certainly don't need the conservative micromanagement that the House bill would impose.
- o **Reason -- not rhetoric.** President Clinton has called on Congress to act on welfare reform by July 4 -- without burying this critical issue in a larger budget bill. As the *Detroit Free Press* states, "The President's challenge to the Republican-majority Congress to treat welfare reform as a critical policy matter rather than a wedge issue to be exploited for votes, was a particularly deft illustration of his continued ability to seize the initiative ... Republican congressional leaders would do well in the next 100 days to work with him to develop and pass a moderate, sensible, consensus-based welfare reform bill."
- o **Getting the priorities straight.** Welfare reform shouldn't be used as a cover to finance tax cuts for the wealthy. Yet, as the *Post* explains, the House bill "would reduce spending on a variety of welfare programs. House leaders count on the savings to pay for their various tax cuts. The much talked about goals of the bill -- decentralization and work -- have in fact been subordinated to the narrower purpose of cutting spending." And the *Detroit Free Press* says that "the President remains correct that ending welfare as we know it is a matter of giving as many recipients as possible the tools to move from the dole to independence, not merely of funding a tax cut for more fortunate households."
- o **Resources to get the job done.** As the *Post* explains, "The states cannot be expected to put lots of welfare recipients into jobs when they will have less money to spend. If Congress really cares as much about work as its members keep saying, it will need to come up with the funds to support it." The *Miami Herald* agrees: "The bill that tore through the House of Representatives in a blur last month mostly hands states a list of tough-sounding goals, providing no time and dwindling funds with which to reach them." And the *Detroit Free Press* sums it up best: President Clinton's approach acknowledges that real work requirements "must be accompanied by an increased federal investment in job training. That's a connection bottom-line Republicans refuse to concede."

LOCAL OFFICIALS IN BOTH PARTIES SPEAK OUT

Today, the U.S. Conference of Mayors holds a meeting of human resource directors to discuss what's really needed to reform the broken welfare system. Opposition to the House-passed bill is building within the National Association of Counties and the National Governors Association too. All of these groups are now stating the obvious: real welfare reform must be tough on work and compassionate toward children -- and it must not pass the buck to states and localities with reduced resources and conservative micromanagement. The public agrees: the *Wall Street Journal* reports today that, by 48 to 37 percent, Americans "think Republicans will go too far on welfare overhaul."

- o **No conservative mandates.** State, county and city leaders in both parties are speaking out against provisions in the House bill that would deny benefits to children of minor mothers, disabled children, and legal immigrants. This week, the head of the National Association of Counties wrote Senator Packwood to warn that "many of the restrictions in the legislation passed by the House of Representatives go against the concept of state and local flexibility, and have the added consequence of hurting children." And the *New York Times* reports that "the governors also oppose provisions of the House bill that would prohibit Federal welfare payments to unmarried teen-age mothers and additional children born to women already receiving welfare." Conservative micromanagement, combined with more than \$66 billion in budget cuts, is not welfare reform.
- o **State flexibility -- not cost-shifting.** The mayors are also on record: "In addition to the significant negative impact the proposal would have on low income people, it will also further strain local budgets. It basically shifts costs our way." And NACo writes that "Poorly funded block grants and cuts in benefit eligibility will force county and city governments to bear the unshared cost of caring for families and dealing with the unintended consequences such as increased homelessness, medical expenses, hunger and crime." Governors agree that states and poor children will suffer under the House bill's block grant funding formula.
- o **Real work requirements.** NACo's position is clear: requiring work also means providing the supports necessary for people to achieve and maintain self-sufficiency: "While NACo generally supports the concept of time-limited assistance we also firmly believe that in order for it to work, there have to be jobs, education and training, and support services available. And mayors have said that the House bill "does not provide the jobs, child care or health care needed to assist welfare recipients to transition to employment." As President Clinton has said, "we can be tough, but we've got to be practical."
- o **Protecting children.** NACo's letter also opposes House-passed block grants for important programs which protect abused, neglected and abandoned children. "These programs are designed to protect our most vulnerable children and provide them a safe and nurturing out-of-home placement. A capped block grant will result in higher caseloads and could put these children in even greater risk." And Senator Chafee, according to today's *New York Times*, also opposes the House bill's changes to these programs.

"WELFARE REFORM SHOULD BE BIPARTISAN"

Today, the Senate Finance Committee holds its final hearing on welfare reform. Democratic and Republican Senators, as well as other witnesses, will offer their ideas on what real welfare reform should -- and shouldn't -- look like. While there are some differences of opinion, the possibility of bipartisan agreement remains. Some common sense rules should help shape the debate in the Senate:

- o **Bipartisanship.** As the President said in Iowa on Tuesday, "We need a welfare bill that is tough on work and compassionate toward children -- not a welfare bill that is weak on work and tough on children. I feel that should be a bipartisan principle that all of us should be able to embrace." Today, Senators Harkin and Bond will introduce a strong, bipartisan bill -- and if they can agree across party lines, other Senators should too. As Harkin says today, "Welfare reform should be bipartisan. Neither party has a corner on the market of good ideas. We should come together on a plan that includes the best of both, providing a balanced approach with broad support."
- o **Real work provisions.** Real -- not phony -- measures to move recipients from welfare to work should be the centerpiece of welfare reform. Even Senator Santorum admits today that in the rush to cut the budget, "the focus on work has been seemingly lost in the debate until the President's remarks last week." Senator Harkin testifies today that to qualify as real welfare reform, "we have to make work pay more than welfare and provide recipients with the tools and incentives to become self-sufficient ... Welfare reform's success should be measured not on the short term budget savings it may achieve, but on how many people it moves from welfare to self-sufficiency, from dependence to independence."
- o **Open debate.** President Clinton has called on the Congress to act on welfare reform by July 4th -- a realistic date. And Senator Packwood is quoted in today's *Washington Post* as saying that he would rather pass welfare reform as a separate measure this summer, rather than putting it in a budget bill where debate is limited. "I have some hesitancy about putting everything into that bill," Packwood states. "It's not a wise way to govern." We agree.
- o **If it ain't broke, don't fix it.** As the President said in Iowa, neither Food Stamps nor the school lunch program should be block-granted. "For a lot of kids in this country -- a lot of kids -- the only decent meal they get every day is the meal they get at school. This program works. If it's not broken, we shouldn't fix it." Senator Packwood seems to agree on school lunches, though not on Food Stamps. But we'll continue to encourage members of both parties to focus on what's broken, rather than what's not.
- o **Protecting children.** The Finance Committee also seems disinclined to place foster care and adoption assistance programs into the block grant proposed by the House bill -- which is \$3.5 billion short of what is needed to maintain current services. Hopefully, steps toward protecting kids will continue as the Senate moves forward.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Wednesday, April 26, 1995

CHILDREN AT RISK

Today, the Senate holds one of its final hearings on welfare reform, focusing on child welfare and child protection services. As we have said from the start, the House welfare bill is both weak on work and cruel to kids -- especially when it comes to foster care, adoption, and child welfare. That legislation would not only slash federal funding, it would virtually eliminate federal oversight of state systems which are already functioning poorly. As a result, abused, neglected and abandoned children will be at increased risk of real harm.

We're hoping that the Senate takes a more thoughtful look at child protection programs -- and that they listen today to the people who work within the system itself:

- o **Children at risk.** When fully implemented, the welfare bill passed by the House bill would eventually deny cash assistance to more than 5 million children. Many of these children could be pushed into a child protection system which, according to a report released today by the U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect, is already failing to provide the most essential services. As Secretary Shalala has said, the House bill "responds to these increasingly serious problems by consolidating existing programs that protect children into a block grant with nominal federal oversight. The Administration has serious concerns about this approach."
- o **Increasing need, decreasing resources.** According to an HHS analysis, the House bill would, in fact, cut funding for child welfare services by ten percent, or more than \$2.5 billion, over five years. Cuts in this crucial area can't and shouldn't be disguised as "welfare reform." As Peter Digre, Director of the Los Angeles Department of Children and Family Services, testifies today, "Unless funding can expand to meet the needs of increasing numbers of children requiring protection ... 'Local flexibility' will mean little more than local governments eliminating services and protections to abused and neglected children."
- o **Improving -- not eliminating -- national standards.** Peter DiBari, from Child and Family Services in Rhode Island, testifies today that "the federal government has an important role in enabling the states to do their jobs by providing guidelines for protection and enforcing the protections when they are ignored ... The federal government must ensure that children, regardless of their geographic location, receive the basic services they need to ensure their safety." And Peter Digre adds that, "rather than eliminating these national standards and protections, they should be enhanced."
- o **"The consequences may well be tragic."** Under the House bill, Peter Digre concludes, "there would be a drastic decline in the quality of care and safety for children in the child protection system as 'capped' resources are required to provide for growing numbers of children. There will be more children per caregiver, less support and less training per caregiver, less supervision and treatment for children, less preparation for independence, fewer adoptions, fewer family preservation efforts... the consequences may well be tragic."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Tuesday, April 25, 1995

IOWA'S INVESTING IN FAMILIES

Today, President Clinton travels to Iowa to address the Iowa state legislature. The Administration granted a welfare reform waiver to Iowa in August 1993 -- making it the second state to receive a green light to implement welfare reform on a local level.

Iowa's "Family Investment Program" builds on President Clinton's fundamental vision for welfare reform -- this state, like 26 others across the nation, is moving ahead to ensure that real welfare reform is about a paycheck, not a welfare check.

- o **Requiring work.** Iowa was the second state in the nation to place a time-limit on benefits. Like President Clinton's plan, the Iowa program requires recipients to sign a personal self-sufficiency agreement that establishes a time frame for moving from welfare to work. As the President has said, "we must demand work and responsibility by setting definite time limits for welfare recipients and enforcing strict work requirements."
- o **Making work pay.** By increasing resource limits and the amount of employment income recipients may keep, Iowa has created an economic support system that gives families a strong incentive to leave welfare for work. In order to ensure that recipients can get off welfare and stay off, the state will also extend child care assistance to families as they make the transition to economic self-sufficiency. And Iowa has also put measures in place that encourage two-parent families to work and stay together.
- o **Real results.** Since the demonstration project was first implemented in January 1994, approximately 27,000 welfare recipients have signed self-sufficiency agreements. In October 1993, 18 percent, or roughly 6,600 of the welfare caseload was working. As of March 1995, that number has almost doubled -- to 32.8 percent of the caseload, or 12,119 individuals, in jobs.
- o **Preventing dependency.** The Clinton Administration and the American people agree that the best reform of the welfare system is ensuring that people don't need it in the first place. That's why Iowa has created an "Individual Development Account," that allows welfare recipients to save assets for the future. The deposited funds are not counted as ordinary income -- and they can only be used to pay for education, training, home ownership, or a financial emergency.
- o **Paving the way.** States such as Iowa are using innovative measures to ensure that real welfare reform is about work, first and foremost. The Clinton Administration is committed to letting states move ahead on welfare reform -- even as we continue to press for national legislation in Washington. As President Clinton has said, "Let's prove to the American people that we can reform welfare, really reform it, without letting this issue divide us. It's time to end welfare as we know it, to put people to work without punishing children."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, April 24, 1995

"MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITY IN MISSOURI"

Today, Secretary Shalala travels to Kansas City, Missouri, to visit TransAmerica, a local company that trains and employs former welfare recipients. Less than a year ago, President Clinton unveiled his own welfare reform proposal in Kansas City, and last week, his Administration granted its most recent welfare reform waiver to the state. Missouri's waiver reflects our commitment to let states move ahead in "ending welfare as we know it" -- even as we continue to press for national welfare reform legislation in Congress.

Missouri's "Families Mutual Responsibility Plan," like President Clinton's approach, will move people from welfare to work by making work pay, promoting parental responsibility, and reaching out to the next generation.

- o **Work.** Missouri's demonstration project, championed by Governor Carnahan, has both strong work opportunities and strong work requirements. Like President Clinton's plan, Missouri requires welfare recipients to sign a self-sufficiency contract and places a two-year time limit on benefits. In return, Missouri is making work pay by allowing recipients to keep a larger portion of the income they earn from employment. As the President said last week, Missouri is "committed to require people to go to work within two years. That's the same time limit I called for when I ran for President and that I called for last year."
- o **Responsibility.** Like the Clinton Administration, Missouri is seeking to ensure that children receive financial and emotional support from both parents. Missouri is working to increase child support payments among non-custodial parents by providing them with the education and training they may need to get a job and pay support, and by giving those who volunteer for the state's JOBS program credit against support they may already owe. "There are too many parents," Secretary Shalala says in a speech today, "who are skipping town and leaving their spouses and the taxpayers with a big fat bill."
- o **Reaching the next generation.** Like President Clinton's welfare reform plan, Missouri is sending a clear message to teen parents that having children is an immense responsibility rather than an easy route to independence. Missouri requires minor mothers to live at home in order to receive benefits, and provides strong incentives for them to stay in school and prepare for work. And, by encouraging two parent families to work and stay together, Missouri is also creating a better future for the next generation.
- o **State flexibility.** Through these innovative welfare reform strategies, Missouri is working to move families from dependency to self-sufficiency. Since taking office, the Clinton Administration has approved a total of 30 welfare demonstrations in 27 states, granting them freedom from federal rules to reward work, make welfare a transitional system, demand parental responsibility, and strengthen child support enforcement. More than half the states are now moving ahead to end welfare as we know it, and President Clinton has urged Congress to do the same.

✓ ① Tell Melissa these are OK
✓ ② CC to Jeremy - FYI

**Welfare Reform Talking Points
The House Bill**

- ✓ **We're for change.** Government programs should reflect the values of work, responsibility, and opportunity. But in order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real, fundamental change that helps move people from welfare to work, encourages responsible behavior, and sends a strong message to the next generation that people should not have children until they are ready to care for them.
- ✓ **The House bill is not welfare reform.** The focus of real welfare reform is a paycheck, not a welfare check. In contrast to our proposals, the House bill is weak on work and responsibility, and tough on kids. It confuses welfare reform with more than \$66 billion in budget cuts -- at the expense of the nutrition, health, and safety of America's children. As President Clinton has said, "We will not achieve real reform or state flexibility, if Congress just gives the states more burdens and less flexibility, and fails to make work and responsibility the law of the land."
- ✓ **Weak on work.** The original work requirements in the House bill were so weak that even fewer people would be working than under current law. Then, after Democrats protested, the requirements were strengthened -- but in such a slipshod manner that even the Congressional Budget office criticized them as unworkable -- and thus unreal. In addition, the bill allows caseload reductions to count as "participation in work," giving states a perverse incentive to just cut people off welfare -- whether or not they've moved into jobs. And it includes none of the supports -- like education and child care -- that single moms need to enter the work force.
- ✓ **Tough on kids.** The House bill would cut assistance to 5.6 million children, through provisions that would deny aid to the children of minor mothers, to children born to mothers already on welfare, and to mothers who have received benefits for five years. Cuts in child care would leave more than 320,000 children home alone. According to a recent study by the Children's Defense Fund, over 2 million children would lose school lunches because of cuts in child nutrition programs. And, upon enactment, the bill would deny cash benefits and Medicaid to more than 157,000 disabled children.
- ✓ **Hope for bipartisanship.** Welfare reform should build on the consensus for change that has brought Democrats and Republicans, rich and poor, and religious leaders of all faiths to the conclusion that the status quo must go. While the House debate was often divisive, the "silver lining" was the bipartisan agreement on tougher child support enforcement. Such teamwork and consensus is possible on the Senate's broader welfare reform legislation, but only if work is the cornerstone of a real effort that puts long-term gains ahead of short-term politics.
- ✓ **A realistic deadline.** The President has stated that Congress can and should act by July 4 -- Independence Day -- and Representative Clay Shaw has already called that "a very realistic date." Welfare reform is too important for the typical kind of Washington game where crucial proposals like welfare reform are buried in a larger budget bill. The debate on an issue this important should be open, and should be bipartisan.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Friday, April 21, 1995

"THE PRESIDENT IS RIGHT"

This week, the President held a news conference -- putting welfare reform at the top of his agenda and urging Congress to complete action on a bill by July 4. As the President said Tuesday night, "We all know what we need: we need time limits for welfare recipients; we need strict work requirements; we need very tough child-support enforcement; we need more flexibility for the states."

Across the nation, Americans are calling for Congress to create real, lasting welfare reform that moves people from welfare to work and gives children the opportunity to become independent adults. And editorials in *USA Today* and the *Los Angeles Times* this week give a clear picture of what real welfare reform would -- and would not -- look like:

- o "Incentive and opportunity." *USA Today* writes, "To get people off welfare and keep them off, they need two essentials: incentive and opportunity." But, "threatening families while slashing their lifeline promotes nothing but despair." The House bill "is too harsh on children," agrees the *L.A. Times*. In contrast, President Clinton's plan "would require work, set a time limit for receiving benefits, strengthen child support enforcement and provide job training and other support to help poor parents make the transition from welfare to work."
- o Encouraging work. "Clinton insists on a stronger work requirement," than the House bill contains, says the *L.A. Times*. "Throughout his presidency he has preached the value of work to organize a life and provide for a family. Along with work he advocates job creation, a reduction in the unemployment rate and a push to raise the minimum wage. He argues, persuasively, that people who work should be paid a livable wage. A decent wage would encourage more of the poor to work." Today's *Washington Post* makes the same point.
- o Real reform -- not budget cutting. "Money must be spent in order to save money," *USA Today* explains. "Yet the House bill would require states to do more with even less. Given the fiscal crunch many states are already feeling, it could easily come down to: food and housing aid for the poor or educational and training programs. In that scenario, states, no doubt, will jettison the very experimental programs that are crucial to finding the paths out of poverty."
- o Flexibility for states. The *L.A. Times* notes that President Clinton, as a former governor, "favors greater federal flexibility for states without giving up all standards for denying help to all who are eligible." *USA Today* also notes that many states, including California and Florida, "have been experimenting with work programs" and "have produced measured successes" in job placement and welfare savings.
- o Reason -- not rhetoric. "As the Senate prepares to address welfare reform, reflection and reason -- not rhetoric -- should guide its debate," urges *USA Today*. President Clinton has laid out his bottom line for reform: "All the proposals are still too weak on work and helping people move from welfare to work. We can and must work together to pass a welfare reform bill that I can sign into law this year. Delaying reform any further would be a betrayal of what the American people want." In the welfare reform debate, the *L.A. Times* concludes, "the President is right."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Thursday, April 20, 1995

LEADING BY EXAMPLE

Today, federal agencies will begin implementing President Clinton's executive order to strengthen child support enforcement in the federal workplace. As the President explained, the executive order will "ensure that federal employees who owe child support live up to their responsibilities as parents, and that the federal government will do its utmost to help find parents with delinquent child support claims." The American Bar Association has called the executive order "an important signal that child support is a national priority."

Today's meeting of federal personnel officers is just one example of the Administration's actions to improve child support enforcement for children across the country:

- o **Setting an example.** President Clinton signed the executive order on February 27th, in order to make it easier to identify and to collect child support from federal employees. The executive order makes the federal government a model employer by requiring every agency to fully cooperate in efforts to establish paternity, and to ensure that children of federal employees receive the support they are due. As the President said when signing the order, "Any parent who is avoiding his or her child support should listen carefully: we will find you, we will catch you, and we will make you pay."
- o **Demanding legislation.** In a recent radio address, the President again challenged Congress to act swiftly on his proposals for child support legislation. "The welfare reform plan I sent to Congress last year included the toughest possible child support enforcement," he said. "And now the Speaker and his colleagues in the House have taken our child support measures and put them into their bill -- including our plan to ask states to deny drivers' licenses and professional licenses to deadbeat parents." The Senate should now follow suit before the July 4 recess, and we hope they will.
- o **Setting new records.** In 1993, the federal-state child support enforcement system collected a record \$9 billion from non-custodial parents. This increase was due in part to a number of new Administration initiatives: more resources for collection efforts, an improved effort to garnish income tax refunds, better measures to establish paternity early, and a new criminal statute to find and punish delinquent parents who cross state lines. IRS garnishment of income tax refunds alone brought in an additional \$703 million for single parents and their children.
- o **Requiring responsibility of both parents.** As the President has said, governments don't raise children -- parents do. To send that message loud and clear to men and women -- those who already have children and those who don't -- welfare reform must include tough child support enforcement measures like streamlined paternity establishment, new hire reporting, uniform interstate child support laws, computerized statewide collections, and license revocation. These five Administration-backed improvements would increase child support collections by \$24 billion in the next 10 years - helping millions of children who deserve the support of both parents. And they'd reduce federal welfare costs by \$4 billion over the same period.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Wednesday, April 19, 1995

MOVING TO INDEPENDENCE

In last night's news conference, President Clinton made clear that welfare reform is on the top of his agenda. The President announced that he had granted two more states -- Missouri and Montana -- the flexibility to reward work over welfare. And he called on Congress to continue his efforts to create real, lasting welfare reform for the entire nation by July 4.

The debate on welfare reform "should be open, it should be bipartisan, and we should get on with it right away," the President said. "I want to challenge Congress to pass a bipartisan welfare reform bill and put it on my desk by July the 4th so that we can celebrate Independence Day by giving Americans on welfare the chance, the opportunity, the responsibility to move to independence."

- o **"We know what we need."** The President said it best last night: "We all know what we need: we need time limits for welfare recipients; we need strict work requirements; we need very tough child-support enforcement; we need more flexibility for the states." With these areas of agreement already in place, the possibility of a bipartisan agreement on welfare reform is very real -- if Congress is willing to put aside politics as usual. Even a bill introduced by Senators Dole, Brown, Gramm and Packwood last year - similar to one that attracted broad Republican support in the House of Representatives -- included many provisions in the President's own proposal.
- o **A partnership for reform.** As the President announced last night, "we're cutting red tape for two more states: for Montana and Missouri -- one state with a Republican governor; one state with a Democratic governor, both committed to require people on welfare to go to work within two years." Since taking office, this Administration has approved a total of 30 welfare demonstrations in 27 states, granting them freedom from federal rules to reward work, make welfare a transitional system, demand parental responsibility, and strengthen child support enforcement. These elements should also be part of any national reform effort.
- o **A realistic deadline.** As the President said last night, Congress can and should act by July 4 - and Rep. Clay Shaw has already called that "a very realistic date." Welfare reform is too important for the typical kind of Washington game where crucial proposals like welfare reform are buried in a larger budget bill. The debate on an issue this important should be open, and should be bipartisan. The President will continue to urge members of both parties to work together on welfare reform in the weeks ahead. He'll continue to highlight areas of agreement, like time limits, work requirements, and child support enforcement. And he'll continue to "end welfare as we know it" for states, by granting waivers to governors of both parties, as he did yesterday. Welfare reform does not have to be a partisan issue.

ENDING WELFARE AS WE KNOW IT

As the President prepares for a prime-time news conference tonight, welfare reform is high on his agenda. Last week, he made it clear that "ending welfare as we know it" should be a bipartisan effort, and that the concerns of religious leaders should be heard. Tonight, his message of change will continue to urge congressional leaders to work together on this urgent national issue.

- o **Our "must" list.** As the President said in Saturday's radio address, welfare reform is first on his "must" list for this Congress. Americans of both parties agree: we must restore the mainstream values of work, responsibility, family and community to the broken welfare system.
- o **Real reform.** To be credible, welfare reform legislation must demand work, set definite time limits, demand responsibility of both parents, include tough child support enforcement measures, and provide more flexibility for the states. To date, however, the proposals in Congress are still too weak on work -- and on helping people move from welfare to work. We need to provide real supports for single mothers - like education and child care - and avoid proposals that simply punish children for their parents' past mistakes.
- o **Working with the states.** Already, we've granted 25 states freedom from federal rules so they can find new ways to move single parents from welfare to work. We're committed to the waiver process that lets states start "ending welfare as we know it" -- even as we continue to press for national welfare reform legislation in Washington. Look for the President to allow even more states to move forward on welfare reform in the days ahead.
- o **Investing in the future.** As President Clinton has said, "If we're going to make people on welfare work, then we have to make it possible for them to work. If we're going to make people on welfare self-reliant, we have to make it possible for them to support themselves. We can be tough, but we've got to be practical." Governors of both parties agree, and are now on record against the more punitive provisions in the bill passed by the House of Representatives. Governor Edgar of Illinois, for example, recently expressed concern that the House bill "...would not allow our current program for teen parents, which stresses the role of education in self-sufficiency." Conservative micromanagement, combined with more than \$66 billion in budget cuts, is not welfare reform.
- o **Bringing people together.** Welfare reform should also build on the consensus for change that has brought Democrats and Republicans, rich and poor, and religious leaders of all faiths to the conclusion that the status quo must go. While the House debate was often divisive, the "silver lining" was the bipartisan agreement on tougher child support enforcement. Such teamwork and consensus is possible on the Senate's broader welfare reform legislation, but only if work is the cornerstone of a real effort that puts long-term gains ahead of short-term politics.

PREVENTING TEEN PREGNANCY

Today, Secretary Shalala will travel to New York, meeting with teenagers and mentors involved in local teen pregnancy prevention efforts. Preventing teen pregnancy and out-of-wedlock births is a critical part of welfare reform, because the link between teen births and poverty is clear. Approximately 80 percent of the children born to teenage parents who dropped out of high school and did not marry are poor. In contrast, just eight percent of children born to married high school graduates aged 20 or older are poor.

But, as the *New York Times* reported this morning, the welfare bill passed by the House would simply deny benefits to teen mothers and their children, without providing the supports necessary to move them towards self-sufficiency. We're hoping that the Senate is smarter -- real welfare reform must strengthen families, not weaken them, and it must move all welfare recipients to work.

- o **Preventing teen pregnancy.** We need to send the strongest possible signal to teens that pregnancy and childbirth should be delayed. To prevent welfare dependency in the first place, teenagers must get the message that staying in school, postponing pregnancy, and preparing to work are the right things to do. As President Clinton has said, "Nobody should get pregnant or father a child who isn't prepared to raise the child, love the child and take responsibility for the child's future."
- o **Smart, not shortsighted, reforms.** Simply denying assistance to a teenage mother, as the House bill proposes, won't do anything to move her toward self-sufficiency, according to experts quoted in today's *New York Times*. The bill's approach is also mean-spirited: it cuts people off because they are poor, young and unmarried -- and small children pay the price for their parents' mistakes. And, as President Clinton has said, "It's bound to lead to more dependency, not less; to more broken families, not fewer; to more burdens on the taxpayers over the long run, not less."
- o **Our solution.** Our approach would require teen mothers to live at home with their parents, identify their child's father, finish high school, and work. But we would also give them the help they need to become good role models and providers for their children. As President Clinton said in a CNN interview last week, we have "to make it clear to people that if they have children they will be able to raise them in dignity. I have tried to improve the lives of women and little children, and support people who do bring children into this world -- to say, if you do have a child, then you ought to give access to education and child care and medical care. And then you ought to get off welfare and go to work."
- o **A step in the right direction.** "Recent proposals by a number of Senators for welfare reform that don't penalize children born to teen age mothers are certainly a step in the right direction," the President said in his weekly radio address to the nation Saturday. "The House of Representatives has adopted all my proposals for tough child support enforcement. I appreciate these efforts. We have to keep on working, however. All the proposals are still too weak on work and helping people move from welfare to work. We can and must work together to pass a welfare reform bill that I can sign into law this year. Delaying reform any further would be a betrayal of what the American people want."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Thursday, April 13, 1995

WORK FIRST

Today, the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* report that some Senators are beginning to take a look at the House welfare bill -- and that even the most conservative Republican governors are urging them to fix some of its more glaring flaws. But the jury's still out on whether the Senate will come up with a bill that is truly about moving people from welfare to work. While discussions in the Senate are still preliminary, here's some guidance on welfare reform today:

- o **No surprises.** It's no surprise that even Republican governors are urging the Senate to drop the more punitive provisions in the House bill -- a bill that originally suggested taking poor children away from their mothers and putting them in orphanages. Even after it was amended, the bill drew criticism from the Catholic Church as being cruel to kids. So they had nowhere to go but up.
- o **Work first.** But as the Senate begins its own deliberations on welfare reform, work should be the centerpiece -- not an afterthought. That means including real incentives to move people from welfare to work, and real resources and performance measures for states to get the job done. And while this newest proposal has dropped many of the provisions that were tough on children, it apparently retains the same unacceptable work provisions in the House bill. For example, the House bill would allow states to count people cut from the rolls as "participating in work" -- whether or not they had found jobs. In our view, cutting people off is not welfare reform.
- o **Small steps.** The preliminary staff discussions reported today suggest some small steps in the right direction. Deleting the ban on aid to teen mothers, maintaining the school lunch program, and allowing states more flexibility to deal with single mothers' real needs are all laudable moves away from extremism. But look at where they started -- orphanages and a lifetime ban on aid to the children of teen mothers.
- o **A long way to go.** However, the jury's still out on whether these discussions will produce real welfare reform legislation. Any serious proposal must put work first. We will continue to work with governors and congressional members from both parties to create real, lasting welfare reform -- and we'll continue to make our requirements for legislation clear. As the President said, "Let's prove to the American people that we can reform welfare, really reform it, without letting this issue divide us. It is time to end welfare as we know it, to put people to work without punishing children."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Wednesday, April 12, 1995

REINVENTING CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

From the start, the Clinton Administration has insisted on stronger child support enforcement in welfare reform, recognizing that unpaid child support is a major reason many people go on welfare in the first place. And we're pleased that the House finally included all the tough measures we've been calling for -- including license revocation -- in its welfare bill.

But while Congress continues to debate, the Clinton Administration is already taking action. This week, Secretary Shalala announced the launch of a new initiative to improve performance and service in our nation's child support enforcement program -- another way in which we're working with the states to create real, lasting reform of the welfare system.

- o **Reinventing government.** HHS is now working with thirty state and local child support programs to find new ways to increase paternity establishment and child support collections from parents who fail to pay. An *Associated Press* article on the program quotes Nancy Ebb of the Children's Defense Fund as saying that this initiative is an "important and appropriate rethinking of what the federal government can do to help states out in this area."
- o **Laboratories of reform.** Many states are already finding new ways to enforce parental responsibility -- to give children the support they need. Missouri, for example, is working with communities to increase paternity establishment by enlisting the support of government agencies, schools, churches and local groups. And Iowa is centralizing its operation to review and adjust the amounts of child support orders. This project will also employ AFDC and JOBS recipients for training and staffing -- another way to help people move from welfare to work.
- o **Another proven tool.** As the *Chicago Tribune* reported this week, the state of Maine has already proven that license revocation programs can significantly increase child support payments -- and "Maine is inspiring imitation nationwide." Nineteen states now have license revocation programs in place -- and they work. In the nine states with collection statistics, the threat of license revocation alone has raised nearly \$35 million.
- o **The strongest possible message.** As the President said in last week's radio address, "The welfare reform plan I sent to Congress last year included the toughest possible child support enforcement. And now the Speaker and his colleagues in the House have taken our child support measures and put them into their bill -- including our plan to ask states to deny drivers' licenses and professional licenses to deadbeat parents." We're committed to working with Congress and the states to send the strongest possible message that parents cannot walk away from the children they bring into this world.

A PARTNERSHIP FOR REFORM

Today, Secretary Shalala approves a welfare reform waiver for California -- the second waiver demonstration approved for the state by the Clinton Administration. California's demonstration is aimed at making overlapping welfare rules more compatible and providing additional financial incentives for work - two goals we've been urging Congress to adopt as part of national welfare reform. Today's action is further evidence of the President's commitment to working with states to create real, lasting welfare reform -- within a partnership that's truly about replacing welfare checks with paychecks.

- o **Real change.** Across the country, states are already ending welfare as we know it - with the Administration's help. California's demonstration project is the 28th welfare waiver approved in the last two years -- further proof of our commitment to give states the flexibility to adopt bold new reforms. In many of these states, early investments in child care, education and training will result in long-term savings -- making states, the federal government, and welfare recipients all winners.
- o **More flexibility, not less.** In contrast, the bill passed by the House of Representatives would reduce federal supports for states by at least \$66 billion -- making it harder, not easier, for them to move people from welfare to work. California alone would lose \$14 billion in funding over five years -- threatening cuts in the very services that are essential to making work requirements real. As President Clinton has said, "We will not achieve real reform or state flexibility, if Congress just gives the states more burdens and less flexibility, and fails to make work and responsibility the law of the land."
- o **Increasing concern.** A *Washington Times* headline announces today: "State legislators see welfare plan hurting budgets." As they read the fine print in the House bill, state legislators and governors are beginning to speak out against provisions that would deny assistance to the children of minor mothers, disabled children, and legal immigrants. States need more flexibility, not less. And they don't need conservative micromanagement -- but that's exactly what the House bill would impose.
- o **Reducing regulations.** Like other states, California is being encouraged to spend more time on recipients and less on bureaucratic rules. The California welfare office can now use new work incentives and simpler eligibility rules to better move recipients from dependency to self-sufficiency. These commonsense measures include a variety of steps already taken in other states: like allowing recipients to deduct a portion of self-employment income, college assistance funds, and a vehicle's value when determining eligibility and benefit levels for AFDC and food stamps.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, April 10, 1995

PRESIDENT CLINTON CALLS FOR REAL REFORM

As President Clinton explained in his Saturday radio address, in order to end welfare as we know it, we'll need to provide the supports people need to find jobs and keep them. "My top priority is to get people off welfare and into jobs," the President said. "If we cut child care, how can we expect mothers to go to work? If we cut job training, how will people learn to work? If we cut job programs and these people can't find jobs in the private sector, how can we require them to work?"

Answering those questions is a big part of the challenge now facing the Senate. Here's part of the answer:

- o **Work first.** As President Clinton said in his radio address, real reform is about moving people from dependence to independence; from welfare to work. "My proposal is a welfare to work plan, not just a welfare plan that cuts welfare," the President said. "So that's the first change I want to make in the Republican welfare proposal. Before I'll sign it into law, it's got to have a stronger work component."
- o **A bipartisan effort.** Members of both parties now have a chance to work together on this important issue. As President Clinton noted, Democrats and Republicans alike want to require work, set time limits, and give states the flexibility to adopt their own welfare-to-work programs. "Let's prove to the American people that we can reform welfare, really reform it, without letting this issue divide us," the President said. "It is time to end welfare as we know it, to put people to work without punishing children."
- o **Real supports.** Sunday's *New York Times* and today's *Los Angeles Times* make it clear that in the real world, child care, education and training are critical investments. As President Clinton said, "My top priority is to get people off welfare and into jobs... To do that, we have to take some of the money we save and plow it into job training, education and child care ... If we're going to make people on welfare work, then we've got to make it possible for them to work. If we're going to make people self-reliant, we have to make it possible for them to support themselves. We can be tough, but we've got to be practical."
- o **Realistic solutions.** As yesterday's *New York Times* reported, welfare-to-work programs such as California's GAIN program have successfully raised earnings for welfare recipients -- by providing child care and other supportive services necessary for people to find and keep jobs. And, over time, they do save money: almost \$3 for every \$1 spent in Riverside. As program evaluator Judith Gueron said, "None of the programs work miracles. But they do make a difference. They move people forward. People who are looking for easy solutions don't understand the complexity of the problem."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Friday, April 7, 1995

AMERICANS WANT REAL REFORM

For months, public opinion surveys have shown that Americans agree on both the problems of the welfare system and the necessary solutions. This week's *New York Times*/CBS News, *Wall Street Journal*/NBC News, and *Washington Post*/ABC News polls reflect what we've been saying all along: Americans believe that the current welfare system is broken and must be changed to emphasize work and responsibility.

Like many previous surveys, they show support for the Administration's approach to welfare reform -- an approach that combines time-limited benefits with education, training, child care, and job placement assistance.

- o **The system must be fixed.** Today's *Wall Street Journal* poll reports that 46 percent of Americans said it would concern them "a great deal" if Congress doesn't complete welfare reform. And, "a remarkable 96 percent believed the welfare system needs fundamental changes," according to this week's *New York Times* survey.
- o **Welfare reform should move people to work.** Today's *Washington Post* poll shows that an overwhelming 94 percent of Americans support requiring job training for welfare recipients. And an April 1994 *Los Angeles Times* survey found nearly three-in-four people agreeing that the main goal of any welfare reform plan should be "to get people in the workforce." Only 6 percent said that the goal should be "to cut costs," and just 17 percent said the goal should be "to cut down on illegitimacy."
- o **Against arbitrarily denying assistance.** Our approach would provide time-limited benefits for teen mothers, but only if they live at home with their parents or a responsible adult, identify their child's father, and stay in school. Arbitrarily denying benefits to teen mothers will only punish poor children -- and make a broken system even worse. Today's *Washington Post* survey shows that the majority of Americans agree -- 57 percent oppose denying benefits to unmarried teen mothers.
- o **Supports for working parents.** A March 1995 survey by a Republican pollster found that 87 percent of Americans believe the government should help pay for child care for mothers on welfare who are required to work. The same poll showed that 54 percent oppose eliminating requirements that federally subsidized child-care centers meet minimum health and safety standards -- but the House bill would do just that.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Wednesday, April 6, 1995

Squeezing the States

While members of Congress talk about reforming the welfare system, the Clinton Administration is already doing it. In two years, we have approved more welfare waivers than all previous Administrations combined -- putting half the country on the road to ending welfare as we know it. Twenty-five states are already moving to implement welfare reform on a local level -- reflecting the Clinton Administration's commitment to give states the flexibility they need to successfully move people from welfare to work.

In contrast, as Mickey Kaus writes today in a *New York Times* op-ed, "the House plan sets the states up for a big squeeze." Democratic and Republican Governors alike are protesting provisions in the House bill that would leave states and children worse off, while making it harder to reform a broken system.

- o **Passing the (reduced) buck.** As President Clinton has said, "We will not achieve real reform or state flexibility, if Congress just gives the states more burdens and less money, and fails to make work and responsibility the law of the land." Republican Governor George Voinovich of Ohio acknowledged this in his letter to Senate Majority Leader Dole last week. He protested that, with the \$66 billion in funding cuts in the House bill, "it becomes even more difficult to make the increased investments in work programs necessary to move individuals off welfare."
- o **Cutting caseloads is not the same as putting people to work.** As Mickey Kaus explains, the House bill "is risky, self-contradictory, and covertly biased against the one reform that both parties say they support: requiring recipients to work ... If a state cut its welfare caseload below 1995 levels, it could pretend all the missing recipients were working, whether they were or not. Governors could probably satisfy the bill's work requirement simply by kicking recipients off welfare after two years" -- or by taking a small penalty.
- o **No conservative mandates.** States need more flexibility -- not less -- in order to implement real, lasting welfare reform. What they don't need is what many Governors recognize in the House bill's more punitive provisions -- conservative micromanagement. Republican Governor Edgar of Illinois wrote to Speaker Gingrich: "The bill ... imposes limits that are inconsistent with welfare reforms that are already in place in Illinois and that we are committed to." Republican Governor Whitman of New Jersey also wrote: "I believe that the denial of benefits to teen parents, as well as to legal aliens, is contradictory to the purpose of block grants. States should have the flexibility to determine who should be eligible for benefits."
- o **States and children must be protected.** Finally, as Governor Voinovich wrote to Senator Dole, "The House bill ... does not include sufficient protections for states in the event of an economic downturn ... States are placed in an extremely vulnerable position should the welfare-eligible population increase dramatically." This is what Kaus calls "the great mystery of the House plan" -- "why the governors didn't rebel against it, given the bind it puts them in."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Wednesday, April 5, 1995

A TAX BREAK FOR THE WORKING POOR

Today, the Senate Government Affairs Committee holds a second day of hearings on the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), a refundable tax credit designed to help the working poor. Real welfare reform must both help people move from welfare to work and prevent welfare dependency in the first place. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Leslie Samuels will testify today that, through a recent expansion of the EITC, the Clinton Administration has already taken an important step to help working families lift themselves out of poverty.

Our approach to welfare reform would combine the EITC with supports such as education, training, and child care, to move people from welfare to work. In contrast, the House plan would cut funding for programs such as child care and child nutrition -- and use the money to give a tax break to the very wealthy.

- o **Working, but poor.** The Census Bureau reported that in 1992, 16 percent of all year-round, full-time workers had earnings too low to lift a family of four out of poverty -- up from 12 percent in 1974. The problem is especially great for women: more than one in five year-round, full-time female workers had earnings below the poverty level.
- o **Making work pay.** The EITC helps ensure that more working people escape poverty -- because it amounts to a pay raise for the working poor. For each dollar earned, low income families get a matching credit of 40 cents. The passage of the EITC expansion in 1993 fulfilled President Clinton's promise to protect families who work hard and play by the rules.
- o **An incentive to leave welfare.** The EITC is fundamental to our goal of rewarding work over welfare. When combined with a higher minimum wage and essential supports such as child care and child support enforcement, it will help ensure that working families who play by the rules are able to support their families. As President Clinton said last month in a speech to the National Association of Counties: "If you work full-time and you have children in the home, you should not be in poverty. And there should never be an incentive to stay on welfare instead of going to work. That's what the Earned Income Tax Credit expansion was all about."
- o **Working families shouldn't get the shaft.** In contrast, the House Majority has consistently failed to support low-income working families -- voting to cut funding for child care and child nutrition to finance tax cuts for the wealthy. If welfare reform is to be real, it must support families moving from welfare to work and families who are already working -- and it must have real requirements and opportunities for people to achieve and maintain self-sufficiency.

"INSIDE THE REVOLUTION"

As the Senate continues to read the fine print in the House legislation, one of the most controversial provisions is sure to be the cuts in school lunches. Vice President Gore summed up the issue this way in a speech to the National Press Club yesterday: "They're cutting school lunches to give the wealthy a free lunch."

Today's *Washington Post* also reports on how politics and budget cutting caused an unprecedented departure from years of bipartisanship on child nutrition. According to the *Post*, here's what happened last month - and what's at stake in the weeks ahead.

- o **An end to bipartisanship.** Representative William Goodling, as Chairman of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, drafted the deep cuts in child nutrition in the House bill, despite his lifelong commitment in the area. "In 1982," the *Post* reports, "he was the chief Republican cosponsor of a resolution opposing a Reagan administration proposal to send nutrition programs back to the state through block grants... Three years later, when conservative Republicans in the House... broached the possibility of cutting back on the national school lunch program, Goodling swiftly killed the idea..."
- o **Cuts in the name of reform.** Under the bill passed by the House, funding for child nutrition programs would be cut by \$6.6 billion over five years. According to the Children's Defense Fund, these cuts would deprive over 2 million school children of free meals.
- o **No national standards.** As today's *Washington Post* also reports, the bill's elimination of national standards could create varying and inadequate levels of child nutrition across states. Lynn Parker, a child nutritionist for the Food Research and Action Center, told the *Post*: "You could find a battle going on in a state legislature over what drinks to serve at school lunch. In a dairy state, it might go one way. If soda interests are strong, it could go another way. Whichever way it goes, it may not be fought out on the grounds of what's best for children."
- o **A short-term view.** In what the *Post* calls a "struggle" to "maintain the populist appeal of antigovernment rhetoric without appearing to acquiesce to special interest," competitive bidding requirements for the Women, Infants and Children feeding program were also deleted in the House bill. "Philosophically it was a no-brainer," Rep. Hoekstra told the *Post*, that even federal mandates that save money should be eliminated.
- o **A glimmer of hope.** Can the Senate save school lunches? Majority Leader Dole, like Rep. Goodling, is on record in support of a national commitment to child nutrition: "The nutrition area is one that does not easily lend itself to state responsibility ... It is appropriate that the federal government retain primary responsibility for nutrition programs in order to guarantee some standardization of benefits ... This Senator believes that child nutrition should remain a national priority," he said at a 1982 hearing. And more recently, Louis Sullivan, President Bush's Secretary of Health and Human Services, recently told the *Post*: "Among my concerns as we reform our welfare system is that we may inadvertently strip programs of the national standards and guidelines that make them work ... Our children's health is not defined by state boundaries. Our nutritional standards should not be either."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, April 3, 1995

CUTTING CHILD WELFARE ISN'T WELFARE REFORM

As the Senate continues to examine the fine print in the bill passed by the House of Representatives, one item is sure to be scrutinized: child welfare. On "This Week with David Brinkley," Sunday, Rep. Gingrich made a rare admission: he spoke too quickly when he proposed "orphanages" as the Republican solution. Foster care and adoption services, the Speaker said, were the proper terms. "Instead of stopping and saying, 'there's foster care, there's adoption, there are private charities, there are classic orphanages,' I just gave ... the word 'orphanages,'" he explained.

Whatever the Speaker wants to call it, the basic point remains the same: the House majority voted not just to deny assistance to millions of poor children, but also to slash funding for the very programs their Speaker says will take up the slack.

- o "Yanking the safety net." As a front page story in the Washington Post pointed out on Saturday, the so-called welfare reform bill passed by the House would eliminate "a longstanding guarantee of federal funds for poor children needing foster care or adoption because of parental abuse or neglect. At the same time, the legislation now before the Senate could well increase the number of children in need of foster care by cutting off cash assistance to teenage mothers, to mothers who have more children while on welfare, and to many disabled children."
- o Increasing need, decreasing resources. According to a Health and Human Services analysis, the House bill would, in fact, cut funding for child protection services by ten percent, or more than \$2.5 billion, over five years. Cuts in this crucial area can't and shouldn't be disguised as "welfare reform." As the President has said, there is a right way and a wrong way to cut the budget. And this is the wrong way.
- o Our commitment. As the Administration has repeatedly stated, the House bill is both weak on work and cruel to kids. Here the latter is especially true: the legislation would not only decimate federal funding, it would virtually eliminate federal oversight of state systems which are already functioning poorly. As a result, abused, neglected and abandoned children will be at increased risk of real harm.
- o Dissension in the ranks. Even Republicans now admit that foster care must be protected. Senator Chafee was quoted last week in the New York Times as saying that "you'll find us in the Senate a little more skeptical of the states' ability to run these programs in such a splendid fashion. Their handling of foster care has not been very good."

LET'S "START ALL OVER AGAIN"

As the House of Representatives' drive to enact the Contract with America falters, Americans are beginning to take a fresh look at what welfare reform really means. In his address to the Florida legislature yesterday, the President put it best: it's time to slow down and look at the fine print.

Editorial writers are beginning to do just that, recognizing that there's a right way and a wrong way to reform the broken welfare system.

Here's a sampling:

- o ***The Washington Post***: "The bill the Republican leadership pushed through the House is not reform," the *Post* editorialized last Sunday. "It is a large budget cut disguised as reform. The bill cuts some \$66 billion over five years from spending on programs for the poor, cuts that will not go to deficit reduction but have been bundled up to pay for a package of unwise tax cuts...There are reports that in approaching welfare reform, the Senate will ignore this House bill and start all over again. It should."
- o ***The Los Angeles Times***: "Do It Right -- Don't Hurt Children" is the cautionary headline on a *Los Angeles Times*' editorial from last week. "The question for Congress and the nation is how to change social policy without hurting children. No child should be left without care because welfare reform makes a parent take a job...No child should suffer because a parent refuses to pay child support...children should not suffer because their parents cannot provide or because they do not fulfill their responsibilities."
- o ***The New York Times***: Dubbing the House bill an "ill-considered legislative lurch," *The New York Times*, in a Wednesday editorial, recognizes that the House Republicans' idea of state flexibility is a cost shift to states that will inevitably hurt children. "As poverty rolls swelled, Federal money would almost surely run out and leave newly unemployed parents in the lurch...The chief victims would be the young. Two-thirds of the welfare population are children...Congress should reform the national welfare system, not fragment and destroy it."
- o **Ellen Goodman**: Writing in the *Baltimore Sun* on Tuesday, Goodman captures the perspective of those who really want to end welfare as we know it. "One morning, Americans looked up at each other over the breakfast table saying, 'Hon, do you remember voting against the school lunch program?' 'No sweetie, was it on the ballot?' School lunch, food stamps, block grants, big cuts. The country began wondering if the Republicans even knew what they were doing."
- o **Even Gov. George Allen in the *Washington Times*?**: Discussing his state's approach to welfare reform in last Friday's *Washington Times*, Governor Allen sounds many of the principles that we have articulated from the beginning. "Requiring all able-bodied welfare recipients to work in exchange for their benefits...A heavy emphasis on personal responsibility -- for fathers and mothers -- with tough paternity requirements...A requirement for children who are having children, to stay in school and live with their parents if they are unmarried." When it comes to real welfare reform, Republicans and Democrats don't have to disagree.

ENDING WELFARE AS WE KNOW IT

Today in Florida, President Clinton will restate his principles for welfare reform and his approach for governing: rewarding work, responsibility and opportunity. In his first speech to a state legislature since taking office, the President will call for welfare reform that is tough on work and responsibility, not tough on children. And he will highlight ways the federal government can be less of a problem - and more of a partner - for states and their citizens.

Look for the President to highlight his unprecedented commitment to helping states put welfare recipients to work, enforce parental responsibility and reduce teenage pregnancy. His remarks will also recognize some of the single mothers who have already benefitted from the record number of welfare demonstrations, like Florida's "Family Transition Program," we've granted in the last two years. In fact, while members of Congress talk about reforming the system, we're already doing it.

- o **A commitment to flexibility.** In two years, the Administration has approved more welfare waivers than all previous Administrations combined, including a dramatic overhaul in Florida. When the demonstrations in 25 states are fully implemented, some 6 million welfare recipients will be effected in an average month.
- o **State innovation.** Florida's welfare demonstration reflects many of the President's goals for national reform. Under the state's reform, recipients are provided time-limited, transitional support for two years -- and then they must go to work. Child care and medical help are provided along the way. Local communities are involved in efforts to find employment opportunities. And welfare recipients who work are allowed to keep more of what they earn.
- o **Faces of change.** During his speech, the President will recognize five Floridians who have begun to make the transition from welfare to work. One of them, Irene Marry, has been on and off welfare for 10 years. But since entering the Family Transition Program, she has attained her GED and enrolled in vocational school where she is learning the skills necessary to get and keep a permanent job. As Irene Marry can tell you, nobody wants "to end welfare as we know it" more than the people who are on it.
- o **Our bottom line.** The President wants to build upon the successes of Irene Marry, Florida's Family Transition Program, and the other welfare demonstrations across the country. He recognizes that, in order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real, fundamental change that helps move people from welfare to work, encourages responsible behavior, and sends a strong message to the next generation that people should not have children until they are ready to care for them.

FUNDAMENTAL CHOICES

Today, the Senate Finance Committee continues its hearings on welfare reform, with testimony from a panel of religious and social leaders. As John Carr of the U.S. Catholic Bishops points out this morning, the Senate and the American people now face "fundamental choices" on the direction of welfare reform.

Echoing President Clinton's challenge in his State of the Union Address, the Catholic Bishops state clearly today that "the goal of welfare reform ought to be to promote decent work and reduce dependency, not simply cut budgets and programs." The Mormon Church and other witnesses agree: welfare reform should be tough on work; not tough on children. Common recommendations of these influential leaders include:

- o **Temporary assistance.** Today's witnesses, including Bishop Merrill Bateman of the Mormon Church, will call for a continued federal commitment to providing temporary assistance to Americans who need it. Like other witnesses, Bishop Bateman outlines a plan similar to the President's: immediate aid, followed by work opportunities and other measures to increase self-reliance.
- o **A social contract.** In order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real, fundamental change that helps move people from welfare to work. The Catholic Bishops, in fact, call today for a "social contract" almost identical to the one President Clinton has advocated for years. "Real reform will offer education, training and transitional help to those who exchange a welfare check for a paycheck," the bishops believe. "The social contract we seek will offer training, education, jobs and other concrete assistance in exchange for persistent commitment and effort in persons trying to leave poverty."
- o **Protections for children.** Calling the bill passed by the House of Representatives "entirely the wrong approach," David Liederman of the Child Welfare League echoes the Administration's challenge to put children first. "The federal government has an important role in enabling the states to do their jobs, by providing guidelines for protection and enforcing the protections when they are ignored," he warns. Without that federal role, "reports of abuse and neglect would continue to go uninvestigated. Children would be left in unsafe homes...Despite a state's best efforts, more children would suffer."
- o **No "conservative mandates."** Both the Catholic Bishops and the Child Welfare League also reiterate the opposition of social welfare experts to the more draconian aspects of the House bill. On both moral and practical grounds, they say, refusing to aid teenage mothers and requiring states to deny help to children born on welfare are wrong. Republican Senators Grassley and Packwood have signaled their opposition too, coming out yesterday against House-passed restrictions that amount to "conservative micromanagement."

STATE SUPPORT FOR CHILD SUPPORT

Today, state child support enforcement officials will testify before the Senate Finance Committee about local efforts at more aggressive child support enforcement. Officials from California, Virginia, and Massachusetts will report on their successful strategies to collect support from the shocking two-thirds of absent parents who don't pay a dime.

Look for these views from the frontline to support the Administration's comprehensive strategy, including license revocation, a provision that was finally included in the House bill after pressure by the President.

The Administration's strategy includes:

- o **License revocation.** This has always been a centerpiece in the Administration's plan. Nineteen states, including California, Virginia, and Massachusetts, have these programs in place -- and they work. Leslie L. Frye, Chief of California's Office of Child Support, tells senators today that license revocation is "a particularly effective method of reaching the self-employed professional or business person who doesn't receive wages that can be readily attached." California denies new and renewal applications for more than 50 categories of business and professional licenses for persons with overdue child support. In the nine states with collection statistics, the threat of license revocation has raised nearly \$35 million.
- o **Paternity establishment.** Establishment of paternity is a proactive way to establish a father's responsibility early in life. In 1990, Virginia became the second state in the nation to offer parents the opportunity to acknowledge paternity in the hospital. In just five years, according to testimony today, state paternity establishments have almost tripled from 11,666 to over 30,000! The Clinton Administration has already made Virginia's success a national strategy by launching a major initiative to support voluntary paternity establishment programs in America's hospitals. And the Administration believes mothers on AFDC should identify the father before receiving benefits.
- o **Interstate child support laws.** Since almost a third of child support cases are interstate, each state's program is only as good as its neighbors' program. Massachusetts, for example, has reached a compliance rate for in-state cases of 80 percent but the rate is less than 40 percent for interstate cases. The Clinton Administration supports a stronger federal role in interstate location and enforcement. So do the states, says Michael R. Henry, director of Virginia's child support program: "We in Virginia are rarely enthusiastic about federal mandates. This is an area, however, where a mandate is absolutely necessary."
- o **New hire reporting.** Currently, only a small percentage of legally due child support is ever paid. Many noncustodial parents who owe support have successfully eluded state officials, leading to a perception among many that the system can be beat. New hire reporting is an enforcement tool that has been tried successfully in a number of states, and even the states are calling for a federal mandate. "Congress should mandate all states to adopt uniform new-hire reporting laws...." Virginia's Henry says.

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Monday, March 27, 1995

"NO MOMENTUM"

After weeks of personal attacks and partisan wrangling, the House of Representatives has finally ended its sham debate on welfare reform. Now more thoughtful action gets underway, as the Senate holds three days of hearings this week in a fresh start at real reform.

And how will the Contract with America fare? Let's turn to Senator Moynihan, who said dismissively yesterday on CNN, "That bill? We're not even going to take that bill up." Added a knowledgeable Senate aide in the *New York Times*: the House bill "has no momentum in the Senate." *USA Today* summed it up this way, "Going gets tough for GOP welfare reform." Here's why:

- o **Divisive rhetoric.** Republican speeches last week were unusually mean-spirited, with shouts and boos instead of real debate. An embarrassed Senator Nickles told the Associated Press that the nasty discussion was "probably counterproductive. We can't afford that in the Senate." In his weekly radio address Saturday, the President asked Congress to "tone down the rhetoric. It got a little rough last week and a little too personal and partisan. After all, all Americans want to change the welfare system; no American wants to continue a system that doesn't promote work and responsible parenting."
- o **Hollow reform.** While the debate was mean, the legislation was weak on work. As the President said on Saturday, "...the bill doesn't really do anything to promote work; indeed, it removes any real responsibility for states to help people gain the training and skills they need to get and keep jobs. It even cuts child care for working people struggling to hold down jobs and stay off welfare." Senator Breaux, noting the problems with the bill, told the *L.A. Times* that "I don't think the concept of just putting all the problems in a box and sending it to the states is likely to survive in the Senate."
- o **A more thoughtful approach.** As Senator Chafee told the *New York Times*, the Senate Finance Committee intends to develop a bipartisan proposal, adding "You'll find us in the Senate a little more skeptical of the states' ability to run these programs in such a splendid fashion." Senator Hatch told *USA Today* that "Nobody in the Senate wants to cut off aid to needy children." The President remains committed to working with Republicans and Democrats in Congress, he said Saturday, "to produce the kind of welfare reform Americans regardless of party affiliation want and expect...Welfare can and must be a bipartisan issue."
- o **One hopeful sign.** Members of the House majority did finally agree to add drivers' license revocation to the other Clinton child support measures in the bill, and even Rep. Shaw acknowledged Democrats on the issue. "I've come along to your way of thinking on this," he said. President Clinton commended the change of heart in his radio address: "The House has now adopted every major child support element in my welfare reform bill. If the Senate will follow suit, we'll mount the toughest crackdown on deadbeat parents ever and will help more children, too."

THIS ISN'T WELFARE REFORM

Today, the House will complete action on a bill still weak on work and tough on children. That's not welfare reform. Yesterday, the House bowed to Democratic pressure and voted to deny drivers' licenses to deadbeat parents. As The New York Times reports today, "the vote was a victory for President Clinton," who praised the bipartisan support for his proposal. The day also saw Democrats unite behind a substitute offered by Rep. Deal, which would have provided real requirements and incentives for welfare recipients to move toward work.

While the underlying bill is expected to pass today, the House majority may have won the battle but lost the war. Today's votes will focus on their proposal's use of budget cuts that hurt children to pay for a "notorious, lousy, stinking tax cut bill." Here's an update:

- o **License revocation.** Members of the majority finally agreed to add drivers' license revocation to the other Clinton child support measures in the bill -- a move we've been calling for from the start. One by one, members who had opposed the provision in committee were forced to announce a change of heart: the final vote was a resounding 425-6. After the bipartisan vote, the President praised members of both parties, explaining that "this tough provision was a central part of the welfare reform plan my Administration introduced last year, and sends a clear signal: No parent in America has a right to walk away from the responsibility to raise their children."
- o **Real, bipartisan reform.** Democrats voted unanimously for the Deal substitute -- legislation providing child care, training, and time-limited benefits to move people off welfare into work and help them stay off. Rep. Morella, who crossed party lines to support it, said: "I just felt it was better for children, and it has a strong work program too." Nevertheless, under intense pressure from their leadership, other Republicans voted no -- continuing to support an approach that would make a broken welfare system even worse.
- o **Defining the debate.** The Washington Post summed up the day's story best: "House Rejects Democrats' Welfare Plan to Promote Work." Yesterday, even though the majority tried to adopt "fig leaves" on child care and child support, Democrats clearly won the public debate. As Rep. Pelosi said, "You can put lipstick on a sow and call it Monique, but it's still a pig."
- o **Deficit reduction -- not tax cuts for the wealthy.** Today, Rep. Mink offers a proposal that, like the Deal substitute, contains real work requirements that are tough and fair. Then Democrats will move on to debate another fundamental flaw in the bill -- the use of more than \$66 billion in cuts that hurt poor children to provide a tax cut rather than deficit reduction. Rep. Stenholm correctly pointed out on Tuesday how "outrageous" that is. Watch for more debate on his simple proposition: "we should not fund tax cuts with welfare reform."

Welfare Reform Daily Talking Points
Thursday, March 23, 1995

DIVIDED THEY FALL

Yesterday, the House began voting on the Republican welfare reform bill, with Republicans barely able to pass the rule needed to debate the measure on the floor. The rule passed by a narrow vote of 217-211 -- a clear sign that Republicans are in disarray, and short on votes for a plan that doesn't even come close to real reform. Today's New York Times reports that "the Republicans were clearly on the defensive." As Representative Barney Frank said, "They are losing this argument."

Today, look for Democrats to unite behind proposals that are truly about ending welfare as we know it, with strong work requirements and supports -- like education and child care -- that people need to move from welfare to work. And don't be surprised if some members of the majority vote with them on key amendments like adding drivers license revocation to the child support section of the bill.

- o **Republicans say it best: their bill's embarrassing.** Even Republicans are protesting provisions in the bill that would make a broken welfare system even worse: "I am deeply concerned that ... we are poised to enact legislation that is likely to increase the number of abortions performed ... while also making children more impoverished," warned Representative Chris Smith. And Representative Jim Bunn said: "I'm embarrassed today to stand here and admit that our party that talks about family values is saying we don't value keeping the family together because in fact there is no incentive ... to stay in the home, stay in your family."
- o **Why? It's not welfare reform.** The focus of real welfare reform is a paycheck, not a welfare check. In contrast to our proposals, the bill being considered by the House today is weak on work and responsibility, and tough on kids. It doesn't reform welfare or reduce the deficit -- instead, it uses welfare reform as a cover to finance tax cuts for the wealthy. Republican members, stung by days of criticism from the Catholic Church and other groups, even had a press conference to announce that they're not "ogres." Said Linda Smith of Washington: "This bill roughs (women) up a little bit, but it helps them along the way."
- o **And whatever happened to deficit reduction?** Opposition to the bill is building today, as the leadership fights off bipartisan opposition to their use of more than \$65 billion in program cuts in the bill to pay for their tax cut for the rich. Rep. Gibbons correctly pointed out yesterday that the bill hurts millions of infants and children to pay for a "notorious, lousy, stinking tax cut bill." He was gavelled down.
- o **Meanwhile, we're for real change.** Democrats will offer two substitutes today -- both substantive proposals that reflect the values of work, responsibility, family, and opportunity. We recognize that, in order to end welfare as we know it, we must have real, fundamental change that helps move people from welfare to work, encourages responsible behavior, and sends a strong message to the next generation that people should not have children until they are ready to care for them. Stay tuned.