LEVEL 4 - 1 OF 35 STORIES

Austin American-Statesman

July 02, 1995

SECTION: News; Pg. A8

LENGTH: 510 words

HEADLINE: President says welfare reform must address child care

BYLINE: NANCY BENAC

BODY:

MIAMI -- President Clinton accused congressional Republicans on Saturday of engaging in ''pure fantasy'' by aiming to move welfare recipients into jobs while denying them child-care benefits.

''We don't want more welfare mothers staying at home, living on welfare, just because they can't find child care,'' Clinton said in his weekly radio address. ''Cutting child care will make it harder for parents to get off and stay off welfare.''

The president didn't directly mention Republicans in his address, but his complaints against ''many in Congress'' were clearly directed at GOP moves to cut off child care aid.

''It is pure fantasy to believe we can put a welfare mother to work unless we provide child care for her children,'' Clinton said. ''We certainly don't need more neglected children.''

The welfare overhaul approved by the House in March would stop transitional benefits that now cover child care or health insurance for a limited time after a recipient finds work. The Senate is bogged down in internal disagreements among Republicans about the shape of its proposal.

The president, who taped his radio address in Chicago on Friday before flying to Florida, said he was disappointed that Republicans would not meet his July Fourth deadline for delivering a welfare reform package to the White House but that he remained hopeful for a bipartisan solution.

Republicans in both chambers want to turn responsibility for Aid to Families with Dependent Children over to the states as a block grant and set a five-year limit on lifetime benefits.

Delivering the Republican response to Clinton's address, Sen. Bill Frist of Tennessee didn't address the welfare issue but instead sought to reassure Americans that GOP moves to reform the Medicare and Medicaid programs for elderly and low-income people doesn't pose a threat to their health care.

''Our plan will preserve and improve Medicare by eliminating the red tape and regulations that now restrict beneficiaries of the federal system,'' Frist said.

Frist, a heart surgeon before entering politics, said he had treated thousands of Medicare recipients and that nearly one-third of his patients had no health insurance other than Medicaid.

''But without the kinds of improvements Republicans are proposing, Medicare and Medicaid as we know it won't survive,'' he said.

Also Saturday, the White House didn't accept a challenge from House Speaker Newt Gingrich to debate who's the toughest on crime.

Gingrich, R-Ga., on Friday called the administration's recent proclamations that it is being tough on criminals ''nuts'' and said, ''I'll be glad to meet the president and debate crime and debate drugs anywhere in America that he wants to go, any time.''

Clinton didn't specifically reject the Gingrich invitation, but aides said the president's views on crime already were well-known.

''The president is clear where he is on crime,'' said spokeswoman Mary Ellen Glynn, traveling with the president in Florida.

LOAD-DATE: July 03, 1995

LEVEL 4 - 2 OF 35 STORIES

The Fresno Bee

July 2, 1995 Sunday, HOME EDITION

SECTION: TELEGRAPH, Pg. A5

LENGTH: 298 words

HEADLINE: Clinton says welfare reform must keep child-carebenefits

BYLINE: Nancy Benac, Associated Press

DATELINE: MIAMI

BODY:

President Clinton accused congressional Republicans Saturday of engaging in "pure fantasy" by aiming to move welfare recipients into jobs while denying them child-care benefits.

"We don't want more welfare mothers staying at home, living on welfare, just because they can't find child care," Clinton said in his weekly radio address. "Cutting child care will make it harder for parents to get off and stay off welfare."

The president did not directly mention Republicans in his address, but his complaints against "many in Congress" were clearly directed at GOP moves to cut off child care.

"It is pure fantasy to believe we can put a welfare mother to work unless we provide child care for her children," Clinton said. "We don't need more latchkey kids. We certainly don't need more neglected children."

The welfare overhaul approved by the House in March would stop transitional benefits that now cover child care or health insurance for a limited time after a recipient finds work.

The Senate is bogged down in internal disagreements among Republicans about the shape of its proposal.

The president, who taped his radio address in Chicago on Friday before flying to Florida, said he was disappointed that Republicans would not meet his Fourth of July deadline for delivering a welfare reform package to the White House but that he remained hopeful for a bipartisan solution.

Clinton and his wife Hillary made a private visit to Florida to meet their new nephew, Zachary Rodham.

The month-old infant is the son of Mrs. Clinton's brother, Tony Rodham, and his wife, Nicole Boxer Rodham.

The president had no public events on his schedule, but critics turned out nonetheless to protest the administration's decision to send home Cuban refugees picked up at sea.

LOAD-DATE: July 4, 1995

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 3 OF 35 STORIES

Los Angeles Times

July 2, 1995, Sunday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 18; National Desk

LENGTH: 330 words

HEADLINE: CLINTON ASSAILS GOP PLAN TO CUT CHILD CARE BENEFITS

BYLINE: By from Times Wire Services

DATELINE: MIAMI

BODY:

President Clinton accused congressional Republicans on Saturday of engaging in "pure fantasy" by aiming to move welfare recipients into jobs while denying them child care benefits.

"We don't want more welfare mothers staying at home, living on welfare, just because they can't find child care," Clinton said in his weekly radio address. "Cutting child care will make it harder for parents to get off and stay off welfare."

The President did not directly mention Republicans in his address, but his complaints against "many in Congress" were clearly directed at GOP moves to cut off child care.

"It is pure fantasy to believe we can put a welfare mother to work unless we provide child care for her children," Clinton said. "We don't need more latchkey kids. We certainly don't need more neglected children."

The welfare overhaul approved by the House in March would stop transitional benefits that now cover child care or health insurance for a limited time after a recipient finds work. The Senate is bogged down in internal disagreements among Republicans about the shape of its proposal.

The President, who taped his radio address in Chicago on Friday before flying to Florida, said he was disappointed that Republicans would not meet his July 4 deadline for delivering a welfare reform package to the White House but that he remained hopeful for a bipartisan solution.

In the Republican response, Sen. Bill Frist of Tennessee noted this is the Independence Day weekend and said his party is continuing their legislative revolution by working "to restore common sense to government by restraining it, reducing it and returning it to you, the American people."

He said nothing better exemplifies the party's plan than its effort to balance the budget.

Frist, a physician, said the Republican plan would retain and improve the

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Medicare program for the elderly "by eliminating the red tape and regulations that now restrict beneficiaries on the federal system."
LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 3, 1995

LEVEL 4 - 4 OF 35 STORIES

THE ORLANDO SENTINEL

July 2, 1995 Sunday, METRO

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A4

LENGTH: 397 words

HEADLINE: CLINTON SAYS WELFARE SHOULD INCLUDE CHILD-CARE BENEFITS;
REPUBLICAN WELFARE REFORM PLANS WOULD CUT TRANSITIONAL CHILD-CARE BENEFITS TO RECIPIENTS WHO FIND JOBS.;

BYLINE: Compiled From Wire Reports

DATELINE: MIAMI

BODY:

President Clinton accused congressional Republicans on Saturday of engaging in "pure fantasy" by aiming to move welfare recipients into jobs while denying them child-care benefits.

"We don't want more welfare mothers staying at home, living on welfare, just because they can't find child care," Clinton said in his weekly radio address. "Cutting child care will make it harder for parents to get off and stay off welfare."

The president did not directly mention Republicans in his address, but his complaints against "many in Congress" were clearly directed at GOP moves to cut off child care.

"It is pure fantasy to believe we can put a welfare mother to work unless we provide child care for her children," Clinton said. "We don't need more latchkey kids. We certainly don't need more neglected children."

The welfare overhaul approved by the House in March would stop transitional benefits that now cover child care or health insurance for a limited time after a recipient finds work. The Senate is bogged down in internal disagreements among Republicans about the shape of its proposal.

The president, who taped his radio address in Chicago on Friday before flying to Florida, said he was disappointed that Republicans would not meet his July Fourth deadline for delivering a welfare reform package to the White House but that he remained hopeful for a bipartisan solution.

In the Republican response, Sen. Bill Frith of Tennessee noted this was the Independence Day weekend and said his party was continuing the revolution by working "to restore common sense to government by restraining it, reducing it and returning it to you, the American people."

He said nothing better exemplified the party's plan than its effort to balance the budget, which he said contained no plans to endanger Social Security or diminish health care.

Clinton and his wife, Hillary, made a private visit to Florida to meet their new nephew, Zachary Rodham. The month-old infant is the son of Hillary Clinton's brother, Tony Rodham, and his wife, Nicole Boxer Rodham.

The president had no public events on his schedule, but critics turned out nonetheless to protest the administration's decision to send home Cuban refugees picked up at sea.

Later Saturday, the Clintons were flying to New Haven, Conn., to participate in opening ceremonies for the Special Olympics at Yale University.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 2, 1995

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 5 OF 35 STORIES

The Record

July 2, 1995; SUNDAY; ALL EDITIONS

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A17

LENGTH: 310 words

HEADLINE: CLINTON SAYS CHILD CARE VITAL IN WELFARE REFORM

COLUMN: WASHINGTON

SOURCE: Wire services

BYLINE: FROM NEWS SERVICE REPORTS

DATELINE: MIAMI

BODY:

President Clinton accused congressional Republicans on Saturday of engaging in "pure fantasy" by aiming to move welfare recipients into jobs while denying them child-care benefits.

"We don't want more welfare mothers staying at home, living on welfare, just because they can't find child care," Clinton said in his weekly radio address. "Cutting child care will make it harder for parents to get off and stay off welfare."

The president did not directly mention Republicans in his address, but his complaints against "many in Congress" were clearly directed at GOP moves to cut off child care.

"It is pure fantasy to believe we can put a welfare mother to work unless we provide child care for her children," Clinton said. "We don't need more latchkey kids. We certainly don't need more neglected children."

The welfare overhaul approved by the House in March would stop transitional benefits that now cover child care or health insurance for a limited time after a recipient finds work. The Senate is bogged down in internal disagreements among Republicans about the shape of its proposal.

The president, who taped his radio address in Chicago on Friday before flying to Florida, said he was disappointed that Republicans would not meet his July 4 deadline for delivering a welfare-reform package to the White House but that he remained hopeful for a bipartisan solution.

The president and his wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton, made a private visit to Florida to meet their new nephew, Zachary Rodham. The month-old

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

infant is the son of Hillary Clinton's brother, Tony Rodham, and his wife, Nicole Boxer Rodham.

The president had no public events on his schedule, but critics turned out nonetheless to protest the administration's decision to send home Cuban refugees picked up at sea.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: July 6, 1995

LEVEL 4 - 6 OF 35 STORIES

The Sunday Gazette Mail

July 02, 1995, Sunday

SECTION: News; Pg. P3A

LENGTH: 527 words

HEADLINE: CLINTON BLASTS HOUSE PLAN ON CHILD CARE

BODY:

MIAMI (AP) _ President Clinton accused congressional Republicans on Saturday of engaging in "pure fantasy" by aiming to move welfare recipients into jobs while denying them child-care benefits.

"We don't want more welfare mothers staying at home, living on welfare, just because they can't find child care," Clinton said in his weekly radio address. "Cutting child care will make it harder for parents to get off and stay off welfare."

The president did not directly mention Republicans in his address, but his complaints against "many in Congress" were clearly directed at GOP moves to cut off child care.

"It is pure fantasy to believe we can put a welfare mother to work unless we provide child care for her children," Clinton said . "We don't need more latchkey kids. We certainly don't need more neglected children."

The welfare overhaul approved by the House in March would stop transitional benefits that now cover child care or health insurance for a limited time after a recipient finds work. The Senate is bogged down in internal disagreements among Republicans about the shape of its proposal.

The president, who taped his radio address in Chicago on Friday before flying to Florida, said he was disappointed that Republicans would not meet his July Fourth deadline for delivering a welfare reform package to the White House but that he remained hopeful for a bipartisan solution.

Clinton and his wife, Hillary, made a private visit to Florida to meet their new nephew, Zachary Rodham. The month-old infant is the son of Mrs. Clinton's brother, Tony Rodham, and his wife, Nicole Boxer Rodham.

The president had no public events on his schedule, but critics turned out nonetheless to protest the administration's decision to send home Cuban refugees picked up at sea.

The president was out early for a round of golf with Mrs. Clinton's brothers, Tony and Hugh Rodham, and Stewart Boxer, the father of Nicole and husband of Sen. Barbara Boxer, D-Calif. Later Saturday, Clinton was flying to New Haven, Conn., to participate in opening ceremonies for the Special Olympics at Yale University.

Republicans in both chambers want to turn responsibility for Aid to Families with Dependent Children over to the states as a block grant and set a five-year limit on lifetime benefits.

Clinton said he supports setting a time limit on welfare benefits, but that it would be shortsighted to cut off child-care benefits to save money.

Clinton said his administration is trying to give states more flexibility in administering the welfare program by granting waivers to free them from cumbersome federal rules when they have good ideas of their own. Twenty-nine states have received waivers so far, and Clinton announced Saturday that Virginia would be the 30th.

Some 14.2 million Americans received Aid to Families with

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Dependent Children in 1993, up from 11.1 million in 1975. Benefit levels vary from state to state, averaging $ 365 a month. Critics say the program doesn't do enough to help people get the skills they need to find good jobs.

LOAD-DATE: July 05, 1995

LEVEL 4 - 7 OF 35 STORIES

The Washington Post

July 02, 1995, Sunday, Final Edition

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A09

LENGTH: 677 words

HEADLINE: Clinton Announces Approval of Virginia's Welfare Plan, Applauds Goals

BYLINE: Ann Devroy; Peter Baker, Washington Post Staff Writers

BODY:

President Clinton announced yesterday that the federal government has approved Virginia's new welfare legislation and praised it for putting the state on the road to the goal of "ending welfare as we know it."

With negotiations concluded this week between federal and state officials, Virginia becomes the 29th state to obtain a waiver from federal welfare rules to experiment with its own proposals.

The president used his Saturday radio address to make the announcement and the broader case for the need to overhaul the federal welfare system. Republicans in Congress, like Clinton, have pledged such an overhaul, but negotiations have become hung up over how to divide federal funding among states, conservative efforts to limit out-of-wedlock births and funding for child care. In announcing the Virginia waiver, Clinton praised the plan's work requirement, its provision that allows some welfare and food stamp funds to go to employers to subsidize jobs for welfare recipients and its child-care provisions.

Virginia officials exulted over the waiver and the president's praise, calling them a vindication of their approach.

"For centuries, both the ideas and activities of independence and liberty were born here in Virginia," Gov. George Allen (R) said in a statement. "It is fitting that the Virginia Independence Program . . . would become law and be approved at the same time that we commemorate Independence Day."

The Virginia program requires recipients to work after 90 days and sets a two-year limit on benefits. Those provisions will be phased in across the state over four years. Starting across the state yesterday, additional benefits for children born to women on Aid to Families with Dependent Children will be eliminated, and teenage mothers will be required to attend school and live with parents or guardians.

Many, but not all, of the elements have been backed by Clinton, although Republicans are now driving the welfare debate and constructing the legislation.

Senate Majority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.), in a statement before Congress departed for its Independence Day recess, said Republican differences "are not insurmountable" but warned that they will not be easily resolved.

"Our differences are over how to distribute funds and how much flexibility to give states" in designing programs, he said.

Dole said Congress "cannot fail" on the welfare issue because of its importance to the electorate. "We must not break faith with the American people who sent us a clear message last fall," he said, "to end welfare as we know it once and for all, require real work and make it a temporary helping hand, not a lifestyle."

Clinton, in his address, outlined the elements of welfare reform that he and Republicans agree on, including a work requirement, time limits on how long welfare is provided and tougher child-support enforcement.

But he avoided the debate over whether Americans should continue to have a guarantee of welfare benefits if they qualify -- a key difference -- and he concentrated instead on the need to provide more funding for child care, what he called the "the central element" of the effort to put welfare mothers to work.

"It is pure fantasy to believe that we can put a mother to work unless we provide child care for her children," Clinton said.

Clinton, who had called on Congress to send him a welfare plan by Independence Day as a symbolic gesture of fostering independence for welfare families, expressed his disappointment in that failure, but he said he remains hopeful a compromise on a bipartisan bill can be reached. He rejected "extreme measures" that cut off help to unmarried mothers but agreed that out-of-wedlock pregnancies should be discouraged by requiring teenage mothers to live at home, stay in school and go to work. "I don't want filibusters and vetoes and gridlock," Clinton said of disagreements with Republicans, "I want real welfare reform that requires work, that demands responsibility and that provides child care people need."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 02, 1995

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 9 OF 35 STORIES

The New York Times

August 9, 1994, Tuesday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section B; Page 8; Column 1; National Desk

LENGTH: 1639 words

HEADLINE: If Welfare Mothers Must Go to Work In Clinton Plan, Will Children Gain?

BYLINE: By SUSAN CHIRA

BODY:

Dorothy Carmona, a mother and relative newcomer to the world of work, thinks her children are better off now in day care than they were when she was on welfare. "I see many, many women who just get up in the morning and do nothing with their lives," she said. "My kids learn more at the day care center than when I was at home."

Gail Abney, a mother and no stranger to work, nonetheless calls it cruel to ask welfare mothers to work when their children are young. "A child's most important year is the first year," she said. "You build a bond with that child."

The two mothers, both welfare veterans from the Fort Greene section of Brooklyn, reflect a larger divide about a major part of President Clinton's plan to overhaul welfare: for the first time forcing mothers of young children to leave those youngsters for work, school or training. Alternative welfare proposals in Congress make similar demands.

Echoing Broad Debate

The unanswered, and so far unanswerable, question is just how the Clinton plan and other proposals would affect the women's children. Because no previous welfare-to-work program has required mothers of infants to seek work, there is little good research on children that age. But there is plenty of passion on both sides of a discussion that echoes broader debates about working mothers and the state of children.

For the Clinton Administration, the political calculus is clear: if the Family and Medical Leave Act grants just three months no-paid leave to working mothers generally, then welfare mothers can hardly expect more.

To disarm critics, the Administration would exempt welfare mothers until their first child is 1 year old, and give them three months off after the birth of any other children. After that, all welfare mothers who are 18 or older would have to prepare for work through job training or education, or would have to engage actively in a job search. After two years, welfare payments would end; if a woman did not have a job, she would be required to work at subsidized, Government-provided jobs at minimum wage for 15 to 35 hours a week.

"The philosophy is fairness," said Mary Jo Bane, the assistant secretary for children and families in the Department of Health and Human Services. "Our expectations for welfare mothers ought to be similar to the expectations of working people."

Child Care Guidelines

Existing child care research suggests that children's responses to their mothers working depends on both whether their mothers want to work and whether their mothers' jobs are stressful and on the quality of the child care in which the children are placed. But these guidelines can be interpreted differently .

Ms. Bane and several other welfare experts argue, for example, that children might be better off if their mothers work because working could ease the women's social isolation, give them pride and self-confidence and combat the depression that disproportionately afflicts mothers on welfare. And, they maintain, children could be placed in child care that offers them more stimulation than they might receive at home.

"The issue isn't middle-class moms who, if at home, would spend all this time reading to their kids," said Douglas J. Besharov, a welfare expert with the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative research organization. "That's why research on child care often shows that kids benefit, because compared to what they get at home, it is often more enriching."

Indeed, researchers at the Johns Hopkins University, in a recent study of 867 children nationwide, found that when children from the poorest and least intellectually stimulating homes were placed in child care (particularly in child care centers) before they were 1 year old, they performed better on math and reading tests than children who were not in day care.

A national study of 22,000 children conducted last year by the research organizations Westat Inc. and Child Trends Inc. found that welfare mothers -- and other poor mothers -- tended to read less to their children, allowed them to watch more television, showed less physical attention and spanked them more than mothers in the general population. Those children had more behavior problems and achieved less in school than other pupils, the study reported.

But other welfare experts argue that mothers forced into low-wage jobs that are unfulfilling might be resentful, overwhelmed by stress and unable to pay for quality child care. And poor children, they argue, are particularly in need of child care that offers an environment in which they are encouraged to learn.

Two-Generation Approach

The scant evidence available from small-scale welfare-to-work projects suggests that children fare best when programs are designed both for parents and children. The National Center for Children in Poverty, based at Columbia University, recently studied about 200 children of teen-age mothers in Newark who had received further education and job training.

"If you're concerned about kids as well as parents, it's necessary but not sufficient to do welfare to work," said Lawrence Aber, the co-director of the center. "You have to combine employment training with parenting education and child-development activities for kids."

Other small-scale programs to require welfare mothers to seek work support that contention. So do the experiences of women like Ms. Carmona, who found her job as an administrative assistant with a nonprofit company through the help of Project Chance in Fort Greene, which offers counseling, parent education, employment training and free day care. Ms. Carmona said the combination of services helped her be a better mother.

The counseling and training improved her family's finances and her self-confidence. "When I was pregnant, on welfare and watching soap operas at home, one of the family educators said, 'This will make you depressed; you need to go out,' " she said. "I can't see myself at home all day long with them. I tell them, 'I have to work so you can get a better education.' "

The parenting classes improved Ms. Carmona's relationship with her children. "A lot of us come from abusive homes," she said, "and if you get upset with the child, instead of saying, 'Let's take a deep breath,' you say, 'Get the belt.' We learned we can't just take out our frustrations on the children."

The Clinton proposal, already pared because the President pledged not to raise taxes to pay for it, does not require a two-generation approach. But it would let states allow mothers to fulfill part of their required preparation for employment in parent education courses, as long as they spent most of their time looking for a job, Ms. Bane said.

But several child care experts fear that the plan, which was cut back because of costs and politics, did not allocate enough money to pay for quality child care when mothers were undergoing training and, more important, when they had to work. The cost of the proposal was reduced to $9.3 billion over five years from $19.5 billion.

Among other provisions, it does guarantee child care while mothers are on welfare and for one year after they find work. It also offers incentives to raise child care reimbursement rates; nearly doubles the amount of money available to help the working poor pay for child care, and expands the Head Start preschool program to include newborns to age 3. The program now serves 3 and 4 year olds.

Shortcomings Are Seen

But Helen Blank, child care director of the Children's Defense Fund, said states would still be allowed to pay as little as $175 a month to reimburse child care expenses. With waiting lists for subsidized child care for working poor parents reaching 255,000 in California alone, Ms. Bank said the Clinton plan would fall far short of working parents' needs for affordable child care -- and risk pushing working poor parents back into welfare to get the scarce subsidized child care slots.

Jacqueline Bullock, a Fort Greene mother who left welfare to take a job as a transit clerk, said that without the free child care she found through Project Chance she could not afford to keep working. "I was lugging each child to a different place -- one to a center, one in family day care, one to my niece," she said. "If it weren't for the program here, keeping me ahead of the game, giving me free child care, I wouldn't work. With the income limits on day care, the system just throws you out."

Welfare mothers would also have to contend with a time limit if the Clinton proposal were adopted: They would have two years to find jobs, after which welfare benefits would end. Yet virtually every welfare-to-work program has shown that mothers struggling with particularly difficult emotional and family problems may need more time to prepare for work.

Mitzi Hack, for example, is a 30-year-old mother of four in Overland Park, Kan., and has been on welfare for five years, since she left an abusive husband. She says she wants to work but has no skills. She worries that within two years she cannot get training, find a job that pays enough to support four children and save enough money to buy a car, which is essential to commute to work.

Toby Herr, director of Project Match, which works with long-term welfare recipients at the Cabrini-Green housing project in Chicago, proposed that instead of requiring job training for every mother, participation in tenant patrols, Head Start programs, parent-teacher meetings and family support programs could count because these build work skills like reliability and promptness.

"I believe very strongly that everyone's expected to do something," Ms. Herr said. "But the expectations must be meaningful and realistic. If we push the mothers into things they aren't good at, it's bad for kids."

GRAPHIC: Photo: President Clinton's welfare plan would force welfare mothers to work and to put their young children in day care. Some of those women, like Dorothy Carmona of Brooklyn, second from left, believe that their children are now better off in day care than when Mother was home with them but unemployed. (Linda Rosier for The New York Times); The Clinton plan would give welfare mothers two years to find jobs before welfare benefits ended. Mitzi Hack, a welfare mother in Overland Park, Kan., believes that is not enough time to gain the necessary work skills and find a job that can support her and her four children. (Jeff Roberson for The New York Times)

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: August 9, 1994

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Children Today

June 22, 1994

SECTION: Vol. 23 ; No. 1 ; Pg. 9; ISSN: 0361-4336

LENGTH: 971 words

HEADLINE: Meeting the needs of young children; Clinton administration's policies; Transcript

BYLINE: Shalala, Donna E.

BODY:

I'd like to commend you on your groundbreaking report. Starting Points: Meeting the Needs of Our Youngest Children will guide policy and shed light on how to improve the health and well-being of American infants and toddlers. From encouraging responsible parenthood to promoting quality child care choices, and from ensuring good health to mobilizing communities, your report echoes the priorities of the Clinton Administration. You have elevated the 0-3 issue on the national stage. Our job now as policy makers and advocates is to work together to translate your goals into reality.

An ancient Pueblo Indian tale reminds us that our children are both valuable and vulnerable. They rely on caring adults like all of us to protect them from harm. In this Pueblo tale, an evil-hearted giant descends upon a village and demands corn, melons, and deer meat. After the villagers give up all their food, the giant returns for more. And this time he demands their most precious resource -- he demands their children. To save the children, the elders of the tribe summon a good giant from Mother Earth who defeats the evil giant. Then they make sure the evil giant will never threaten their children again -- but they do it in a humane way. They pluck out the thorns and cactus needles from his evil heart. Then, they give him a new, loving heart by replacing the thorns with deep blue turquoise and sparkling pink quartz. The children of the village are saved -- and all because of the intervention of caring adults. American culture is full of stories like this one.

The Clinton Administration recognizes that children and families must take their rightful places at the heart of our domestic policy agenda. That's why one of the first things President Clinton did after he was sworn in was to sign the Family and Medical Leave Act -- to guarantee that parents can give their newborns the time and attention that is so vital to their emotional and physical growth.

At HHS, our Maternal and Child Health Bureau is working to meet the needs of millions of American women, infants, and children -- from pediatric AIDS to emergency medical services and from Healthy Start to health and safety in child care. And, in May, our Administration for Children and Families is holding

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

a National Institute on Infant/Toddler Child Care to build consensus on many of the child care issues we're tackling right now.

The President's 1995 budget proposal made strong, targeted investments in children and families. he increased our investment in child care for working families by 19 percent. He increased funding for drug use treatment and prevention by 13 percent -- part of which will provide treatment to pregnant hard core drug users. And, he increased funding for Head Start by 21 percent. That's a total increase of 45 percent since the President took office. Head Start is prevention in the truest sense -- investing in the hearts and minds of our youngest citizens, to prevent poor health and wasted potential later in life. But our commitment to Head Start doesn't end with our budget. We're also improving the quality of the program -- and demanding accountability for results. And, we're extending Head Start to more eligible children. We recognize -- thanks to your leadership -- that birth to age three are some of the most important years of a child's development. That's why, for the first time, the Head Start bill contains a set-aside for infants and toddlers.

And we're making sure this money is spent wisely by seeking advice from experts in the field, including people working in Head Start programs. At the same time, we're continuing to improve our migrant Head Start programs and our parent and child centers -- both of which already serve families with children under three. We're also working with Secretary Riley to help develop a continuum of services between Head Start and kindergarten.

Another area of bipartisan accomplishment is immunizations. President Clinton has proposed a 28 percent budget increase for infant immunizations. As you know, half of American toddlers are not fully immunized against such preventable diseases as polio and whooping cough. As a nation, we must set our sights higher. Full immunizations for every infant and toddler. Nothing less will do.

At HHS, we're working across programs for young people -- Head Start, child care centers, and Medicaid are all doing their parts. Let me tell you about the four components of our historic initiative to immunize toddlers.

First, we've established the Vaccines for Children program which provides free vaccines for all needy children in both public and private health clinics.

Second, we've tripled funding to cities and states so they can keep clinics open later in the evening and enhance services to rural and urban areas.

Third, we're developing a sophisticated immunization tracking system -- and we're placing a special emphasis on areas where immunization rates are extremely low.

Finally, we've launched a major national outreach program to get the message out to all parents of infants.

We've produced exciting new public service announcements. And we've worked with businesses -- and they are stamping our message about immunization on baby products from bottles to bibs.

I deeply believe that welfare reform is a key children's issue for the 1990s. Because the fact is, we want young people to grow up seeing that work is

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

a valuable and necessary part of adult life. And we want parents to have secure work opportunities...stable jobs, supplemented by the Earned Income Tax Credit, that provide guaranteed private health insurance and quality child care.

Our challenge is to listen to children's voices. To dedicate ourselves to meeting their needs and making their dreams come true.

GRAPHIC: Photograph

IAC-NUMBER: IAC 15855225

IAC-CLASS: Health; Magazine

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: September 18, 1995

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 11 OF 35 STORIES

Los Angeles Times

June 20, 1994, Monday, Home Edition

SECTION: Metro; Part B; Page 7; Column 1; Op-Ed Desk

LENGTH: 796 words

HEADLINE: IT'S NO REFORM IF CHILDREN ARE HARMED;
WELFARE: FULL-TIME WORK FOR AID RECIPIENTS WILL BE BENEFICIAL ONLY IF DECENT CHILD CARE IS AVAILABLE TO ALL.

BYLINE: By BRUCE FULLER and SUSAN D. HOLLOWAY, Bruce Fuller is a professor of comparative policy and Susan Holloway is a professor of human development at Harvard University's Graduate School of Education.

BODY:

The Clinton Administration is eagerly sketching the virtuous New Welfare Mother of the 1990s: She awakes early to drop off her youngster at day care, then zooms to Burger King. Sure, she earns just $4.35 an hour; but she has sworn off the evils of welfare. Through the sanctity of working full-time and despite her ignoble past, she rises as a born-again Calvinist.

What's wrong with this lovely picture?

It depends on the mythical mother's ability to find child-care or a preschool spot for her young child. Almost two-thirds of the 4.5 million single mothers on welfare have preschool-age children. But the current day-care system serves just 4 million youngsters nationwide. And "system" is an optimistic misnomer: Preschooling in America is an archipelago of little organizations in basements and churches, thinly stretched over an escalating number of children.

If President Clinton is serious about strengthening fragile families -- as he signaled in his first year, implementing the Family Leave Act and cash support for working-poor parents struggling to escape welfare -- he must also focus on the most vulnerable members: young children.

Policy-makers rushing to get single mothers off the dole and into jobs could inadvertently push infants and young children into unsafe, low-quality day care. Then we will undoubtedly read more stories of abuse inflicted by care-givers, youngsters left home alone because the baby-sitter didn't show, babies handed off to "friends" of dubious child-care ability in violent neighborhoods.

Thoughtful family policy should aim to reduce welfare dependency and strengthen the quality of young children's lives. This requires that policy-makers and children's advocates tackle three issues as this summer's debate over welfare reform steams up Washington:

* Dumping more young children into already strained child-care organizations will further erode quality. Any parent who has shopped around for preschool services has seen distressing disparities in quality, from unsafe conditions to

unstimulating staff. We pay preschool teachers one-fourth the wages earned by public-school teachers. Low-quality preschools turn over half their staff every year. A recent review of Head Start confirmed what insiders had known for years: Rapid expansion has seriously undercut its quality.

* Poor single mothers have too little access to child care. The child-care market has barely kept pace with rising demand and the supply of quality preschools is distributed unfairly. Working-class sections of Los Angeles have just 11 preschool classes available for every 1,000 preschool-age children, compared with more than 25 classes per 1,000 in affluent suburbs like San Mateo County or Arlington, Va. Some inner-city neighborhoods and towns in Southern states have no child care at all, or the few that exist are of dismal quality.

Welfare agencies like to nudge mothers into home-based day care, since it saves money. Latino families often opt for modest home-care operations run by Spanish-speaking neighbors who are more personal. But a recent study, drawing on observations of these services in Los Angeles and the San Fernando Valley, found that such caregivers often have no training in child development and that preschoolers show little warmth or attachment to the care providers.

Clinton's welfare proposal does include fresh funding for child care, but far less than the leading congressional proposals. Clinton's increase, in fact, is less than the increases proposed by President Bush in his last two years in office.

* Washington's policies, while pro-family, are unfocused.

Clinton's support for families has come in fits and starts, in fragments like the budget increase for Head Start, rather than building broad-based policies and consolidating programs. Entitlements increasingly go to parents who already have abundant resources. More than $1.5 billion in child-care tax credits now go to families earning more than $50,000 a year. Rather than financing welfare reform by cutting benefits for the politically powerless, like the White House plan to slash aid to elderly immigrants, money can better be saved by targeting child-care aid so it goes to poor and working-class families.

Just a year ago, the Family Leave Act -- a touchstone of pro-family sentiment among presidential candidates -- advanced the argument that perhaps we should change work as we know it, allowing more time for parents to be with their young children. But Washington's prescription for impoverished single mothers goes in the opposite direction. Pushing mothers into full-time work may be beneficial to all concerned, but not if we shove their children into hazardous child care or even no care at all.

GRAPHIC: Drawing, "The poor don't want welfare......."; Joel Pett

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: June 21, 1994

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 12 OF 35 STORIES

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

MAY 1, 1994, SUNDAY, TWO STAR EDITION

SECTION: STATE, Pg. C8

LENGTH: 1032 words

HEADLINE: STATE FEARS COSTS OF WELFARE REFORM

BYLINE: FRANK REEVES, POST-GAZETTE HARRISBURG CORRESPONDENT

DATELINE: HARRISBURG

BODY:

State Welfare Department officials warn that President Clinton's proposed welfare reforms -- which seek to get recipients off welfare and into the work force -- could increase the state's welfare budget by more than $ 500 million a year.

Clinton's proposals, still under discussion within the administration, would assist the transition from welfare to the work force by providing help with child care, transportation and other services, and in some cases community-service jobs.

Those costs ''would be astronomical,'' said Yvette Jackson, a DPW deputy secretary.

Clinton is expected to submit a welfare plan to Congress this month.

Spending on welfare already makes up about one-third, or $ 5 billion, of the state's $ 15.1 billion General Fund budget. Changes in federal policy could drive up this figure, at least initially.

Vowing to ''end welfare as we know it,'' Clinton called earlier this year for a two-year limit on welfare benefits. Many of this year's candidates for governor also back the idea. Politicians in both parties sense that the public is fed up with the welfare system and want to put people off the rolls and require them to work.

But limiting cash benefits to two years may not produce the savings the public expects.

According to a draft of the administration's welfare plan, states would be required to provide subsidized private-sector jobs or publicly funded community-service jobs to welfare recipients who haven't been able get a job at the end of two years.

They would also be required to assist people leaving welfare rolls with child care, transportation and other services that would be needed to make their new jobs viable.

In a report released in January, the American Public Welfare association noted that proposed changes in the welfare system could save money over time. But in the short run, they could cost much more.

''There's been lots of discussion about this with the American Public Welfare Association,'' Jackson said.

''The states were pretty unanimous that you can't afford child care'' for all those who might still be on Aid to Families with Dependent Children after two years. ''You've got to target the people you will help.''

Despite the posturing of many of this year's candidates for governor, welfare policy is largely set by the federal government.

Congress would have to approve any changes in AFDC, a federal welfare program the states are required to help pay for. The next governor and Legislature will have the authority only to alter various general assistance programs that are paid for entirely with state taxes.

AFDC provides cash assistance and medical benefits to about 626,000 impoverished adults and children within Pennsylvania. About two-thirds of the AFDC recipients are children.

In Allegheny County, there are about 70,000 adults and children on AFDC; in Westmoreland County, 13,400. An AFDC check for a family of four ranges between $ 454 and $ 514 a month, depending on where the family lives.

The federal government pays 55 percent of the cost of the program; the state pays the rest. During the 1992-93 fiscal year, the last year for which complete figures are available, the program cost $ 2.1 billion, with the state's share being $ 974 million.

The Clinton administration's welfare reform proposals are primarily aimed at prodding adults on AFDC off the welfare rolls.

But what happens at the end of two years if a single mother on AFDC is unable to get a private-sector job?

''I don't think the public wants to see women and children begging on the streets like you see in Mexico and some Asian countries,'' said Gary Burtless, an economist with the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C.

Burtless has studied welfare policy for years.

Welfare Department officials estimate that after two years of job counseling and training, as many as 114,000 adults on AFDC in Pennsylvania, mostly single mothers, will still not have found a job.

As the state Welfare Department envisions it, under the Clinton plan these adults would be required to work in community-service jobs. They would not receive salaries. Instead, they would receive their welfare checks. If they dropped out of the program, their checks would be cut off.

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

To administer a community service job program would require the Welfare Department to hire 1,750 new staff at an annual cost of $ 56 million, officials said.

Child care for parents -- mostly single mothers -- who go back to work would cost about $ 623 million a year. This assumes that it costs about $ 300 a month for each child enrolled in day care.

In contrast, the department last year spent about $ 63.7 million for child care for mothers on AFDC, according to David Florey, the director of DPW's bureau of employment and training programs.

The Welfare Department also estimates that those working at community-service jobs will need money to help pay for their transportation to and from work. In addition, some would need money for equipment and supplies related to their job, such as uniforms and books. Estimated cost of these support services: $ 480 million a year.

This dwarfs the $ 21 million the department spent during the 1992-93 fiscal year on support services for AFDC recipients, Florey said.

In all, the department estimates that the cost of operating a community service job program for welfare recipients unable to find a job after two years would exceed $ 1.1 billion annually. Of this, about half would be picked up the state, the rest by the federal government.

Faced with such staggering costs, Jackson said, welfare department officials around the country were urging the Clinton administration to scale down its ambitious welfare reform proposals. Rather than limiting cash benefits for all AFDC recipients after two years, she said, state officials around the country were urging the administration to target young, single mothers.

These young mothers, Jackson noted, were most likely to benefit from going back to school or enrolling in job training programs. They're also most likely to be caught in the cycle of poverty -- losing any chance to go on to independent, productive lives.

LOAD-DATE: September 15, 1994

LEVEL 4 - 13 OF 35 STORIES

The Charleston Gazette

April 27, 1994, Wednesday

SECTION: News; Pg. P5A

LENGTH: 691 words

HEADLINE: WELFARE REFORM PLAN MAY HAVE DOWNSIDE

BYLINE: Gregory Spears

BODY:
Knight-Ridder

WASHINGTON - The working poor will get less help than expected under President Clinton's welfare-reform plan, raising concerns that low-wage workers will be at risk of slipping backward onto public assistance.

Clinton scaled back plans to provide poor families with up to $ 1 billion a year in child-care subsidies, White House officials said, to avoid raising taxes to pay for welfare reform. He plans to provide about $ 300 million more annually for child care for low-wage workers.

But some analysts say a lack of affordable child care could threaten the central goal of Clinton's welfare plan: moving welfare mothers into the world of work.

States already experimenting with welfare-to-work plans have found that few former welfare recipients can afford the $ 4,000-a-year average cost of providing care for a pre-schooler.

"You can't go to work, pay a baby sitter, pay for medical expenses. It just will not work," said Cheryl Carter, a 33-year-old former welfare recipient. Carter's two children receive subsidized after-school care from the state while she works for $ 7.50 an hour as an aide at a Camden, N.J., hospital.

Clinton's welfare plan, expected to be presented to Congress next month, would provide job training and subsidized child care for welfare recipients. Young recipients would have to take a community service job if they did not land a private-sector job at the end of two years.

The program would cost between $ 9 billion and $ 10 billion over five years and be paid for by cuts in other programs instead of a proposed tax on gambling, according to White House Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers.

"I think after reviewing his options the president decided that this plan could be funded without new taxes and decided to go forward that way," Myers said Tuesday.

While Clinton's plan would double spending on subsidized child care for the working poor, it is far less money than the ambitious assistance level proposed earlier by his 32-member welfare reform working group.

"What this development illustrates is there is a very long distance between the slogan _ end welfare as we know it' _ and the political consensus to provide the support necessary to do it," said James O. Gibson, senior associate with the Urban Institute, an independent research and policy group here.

Up to 60 percent of those who leave welfare for work eventually return to public assistance, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, an independent policy and research group here.

To stem the return to welfare, "If people are going to move into low wage jobs, there has to be support for them," said Sharon Parrott, a research associate at the center.

Long-term support may be required because low-wage workers are less likely to win substantial pay raises now than in the past, according to Rebecca M. Blank, professor of economics at Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill.

"Even after one or two years of steady employment, a woman may still not be able to find a job providing health insurance, not be able to fully cover her child-care expenses," Blank said. "It would be foolish ^e to assume that women who find jobs will make steady economic progress toward higher wages."

Almost 4 million families with children are headed by a worker who doesn't make enough to rise above poverty. The current poverty line for a family of three is $ 11,892.

Existing programs to assist low-wage workers with children care are oversubscribed. For example, in Illinois, a state and federally financed program that subsidizes child care for low-wage workers at risk of going on welfare has a waiting list of 1,000 names.

"People want to go to work, but the kind of jobs they're getting may not get them off ^Fwelfare^G," said Michele Piel, manager of child care and development at the Illinois Department of Public Aid.

"If you're making $ 6 an hour, that's better than minimum wage, but it's going to be difficult if not impossible to pay for child care," Piel said.

LOAD-DATE: January 31, 1995

LEVEL 4 - 14 OF 35 STORIES

The Houston Chronicle

April 27, 1994, Wednesday, 2 STAR Edition

SECTION: A; Pg. 2

LENGTH: 467 words

HEADLINE: Clinton planning to phase in welfare reform plan

BYLINE: Houston Chronicle News Services

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

WASHINGTON -- President Clinton, shunning a tax hike to pay for his ambitious pledge to ""end welfare as we know it,'' said Tuesday he would have to phase in his reform plan because he could not find the funds to get all welfare recipients working soon.

Clinton's welfare plan, expected to be presented to Congress next month, would provide job training and subsidized child care for welfare recipients. Young recipients would have to take a community service job if they did not land a private-sector job at the end of two years.

The White House said Clinton had decided against raising taxes to finance the plan, resulting in a program of $ 9 billion to $ 10 billion over five years -- a smaller amount than Clinton's advisers had sought.

According to White House Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers, it will be paid for by cuts in other programs instead of a proposed federal tax on gambling, which officials said would raise about $ 3 billion over five years.

Clinton said he had known for some time that there wasn't enough money in the budget to accomplish his stated aim of requiring people to get off the dole after two years.

Administration officials said Clinton's plan included $ 2.3 billion for education and training programs, $ 1.3 billion to finance community service jobs and $ 3.5 billion for child care, with the rest divided among smaller programs. But Clinton could still change this mix, as could Congress, officials said.

Clinton scaled back plans to provide poor families with up to $ 1 billion a year in child care subsidies, White House officials said. But some analysts say a lack of affordable child care could threaten the central goal of Clinton's plan: moving welfare mothers into the world of work.

States already experimenting with welfare-to-work plans have found that few former welfare recipients can afford the $ 4,000-a-year average cost of providing care for a pre-schooler.

Long-term support may be required because low-wage workers are less likely to win substantial pay raises now than in the past, according to Rebecca M. Blank, professor of economics at Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill.

Existing programs to assist low-wage workers with child care are oversubscribed. For example, in Illinois, a state and federally financed program that subsidizes child care for low-wage workers at risk of going on welfare has a waiting list of 1,000 names.

""People want to go to work, but the kind of jobs they're getting may not get them off (welfare),'' said Michele Piel, manager of child care and development at the Illinois Department of Public Aid.

""If you're making $ 6 an hour, that's better than minimum wage, but it's going to be difficult if not impossible to pay for child care,'' Piel said.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: April 28, 1994

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 15 OF 35 STORIES

Los Angeles Times

April 26, 1994, Tuesday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 1; Column 4; National Desk

LENGTH: 1092 words

HEADLINE: CLINTON REJECTS CASINO TAX HIKE FOR WELFARE PLAN

BYLINE: By RONALD BROWNSTEIN and ELIZABETH SHOGREN, TIMES STAFF WRITERS

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

President Clinton has ruled out tax increases to pay for his welfare reform plan, and has approved a narrower $9.5-billion program focused on his core campaign promise of requiring work after two years on the rolls, senior Administration officials said Monday.

The decision means that the Administration will disappoint liberals by proposing only modest expansions in child-care programs for the working poor.

But it will allow Clinton to avoid the difficult fight over taxing gambling revenues, which would have been required to pay for the larger plan, which had an estimated cost of $13 billion to $16 billion over four years.

"We are focused entirely on the core of what he promised during the campaign," said one official.

By rejecting the casino tax, Clinton has assured that the plan will be funded only with budget cuts. After earlier criticism that proposed cuts focused too heavily on the poor, the Administration is now also targeting what one official called "welfare for the wealthy," including some farm support payments.

Clinton's decision will not affect the welfare plan's central elements: efforts to increase collection of child support payments and a requirement that welfare recipients work after two years on the rolls, either in private-sector jobs or in public service jobs if no private jobs are available. Under the plan Clinton supports, the work requirement will be phased in, beginning with recipients born after 1971.

But the decision to reject taxes means the Administration will cut back on other elements of the plan, including state demonstrations of some reform experiments and a planned expansion of child-care assistance for the working poor. The plan will still provide child care for welfare recipients undertaking training or work.

There was clearly division in the ranks over the decision. Walter Broadnax, the deputy secretary of health and human services, said: "It is going to be a less robust plan, and we're going to be losing a part that is clearly important if we're going to stablize the working poor and keep them from going on welfare."

Broadnax said he hoped more funding would be found from some other source, saying the measure is "extremely important" to welfare reform.

The Administration is expected to submit its long-delayed welfare reform proposal to Congress some time next month. Only a handful of significant decisions remains, including whether to permit states to deny additional benefits to women who have children while already on the welfare rolls.

Advocates of expanded child care immediately charged that rolling back those provisions could undermine the overall reform effort. "If correct, leaving child care out sets poor women up for a fall," said Rep. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.). "What we heard again and again in our hearings is that women go out into the private sector, begin to make headway, and if child care is not there, they slip back into welfare."

Only a few weeks ago, in a final report prepared for the President, the task force had argued that expanding child-care assistance was a critical element of welfare reform.

"The key missing component for making work pay is affordable, accessible child care," the task force wrote. "In order for families, especially single-parent families, to be able to work or prepare themselves for work, they need dependable care for their children."

On the other hand, some welfare reform advocates have argued recently that the best way to pass the plan is to strip it down to its essentials.

The rejection of the casino tax represents a triumph for those inside the Administration who felt that Congress would resist any taxes to fund welfare reform, particularly one targeted at the powerful gambling industry. But it is bound to disappoint liberals who would have preferred the Administration impose a tax rather than cut other programs for the poor.

"While the casino lobby represents a narrow interest, it is extremely politically powerful in particular states," said Robert Greenstein, executive director of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a liberal think-tank based in Washington. "By contrast, (the poor) don't make campaign contributions and the people who argue on their behalf tend to be church groups and religious organizations that don't have the raw political muscle that well-heeled special-interest groups that make large contributions have."

The Administration hopes to mute such criticism by expanding the targets of the budget cuts to programs that benefit the wealthy. In recent weeks, Administration officials have been combing through a report by Robert J. Shapiro, vice president of the Progressive Policy Institute, a centrist Democratic think-tank, identifying subsidies for the affluent and corporations.

At least two subsidies Shapiro fingered are likely to be included in the final welfare reform funding package, officials said. One is a proposal to cut back on farm subsidy payments to wealthy part-time farmers who receive more than $100,000 annually in non-farm income; another would deny favorable tax treatment to certain kinds of annuities. But officials said the Administration also is committed to pressing ahead with its most controversial budget cut: A plan to extend the period before legal immigrants can become eligible for Supplemental Security Income benefits, which aid the disabled, indigent and the elderly who do not qualify for Social Security.

The Clinton plan will still double child-care spending over the next five years, adding another $1.5 billion in total. But it is a substantial cutback from the broader plan, which would have increased child care for the working poor by $3.5 billion over the next five years.

In addition, the rejection of casino taxes will also compel the Administration to scale back several reform experiments some officials had hoped to include in the final plan. Sources said that the Administration will roll back a planned test of child support assurance -- a program to guarantee a minimum child support payment to all single parents. The program is favored by Health and Human Services Assistant Secretary David T. Ellwood, a co-chairman of the task force.

Also to be reduced are experiments on letting welfare recipients keep more part-time earnings and incentives for recipients to accumulate assets toward a college education or starting a business. And rather than requiring states to expand welfare assistance to two-parent families, the plan now would leave them the option of doing so.

* RELATED STORY: A14

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: April 27, 1994

LEVEL 4 - 16 OF 35 STORIES

The Washington Post

April 26, 1994, Tuesday, Final Edition

SECTION: FIRST SECTION; PAGE A6

LENGTH: 669 words

HEADLINE: Clinton to Support No-Tax Welfare Reform

SERIES: Occasional

BYLINE: Guy Gugliotta, Washington Post Staff Writer

BODY:

President Clinton yesterday ruled out any new taxes to pay for welfare reform and has decided to support a leaner $ 9.5 billion package focused on training, education and public service jobs, senior administration officials said.

Clinton decided against a federal gambling tax that would have raised an estimated $ 3 billion over five years, the officials said. The money would have been used to provide child care for poor workers and additional small projects and experiments to refine the reform process.

"The president has decided against basically all new taxes for welfare reform," one senior official said. Instead, Clinton will attempt to fund the welfare initiative through a "well-balanced financing package" composed of cuts from other federal programs, including subsidies for "wealthy farmers."

The result will be $ 9.5 billion in new money spread over five years, the official said, a considerable reduction from the $ 12.5 billion to $ 15 billion anticipated by Clinton's 32-member welfare reform working group as recently as one month ago.

Senior officials confirmed that the scaled-down plan in part represented Clinton's acknowledgment that any new tax could face a rough reception from Congress, particularly during an election year.

"The president did not want to be in the position of proposing new taxes," one official said. "Now is not the time."

The officials also emphasized that the working group was "still drafting" the final reform proposal. But Monday's action suggested that any new plans would have to be shaped to fit the no-tax constraint. Officials have said they expect the final proposal to be submitted to Congress before the end of May.

Even with the cuts, administration officials insisted that the "core" of Clinton's proposal to "end welfare as we know it" remained intact. The plan has crystallized around the idea of requiring welfare recipients to find work in the private sector within two years or be required to take a community service job.

Under the five-year, $ 9.5 billion proposal currently before the president, the federal government would enhance welfare recipients' private sector job prospects by providing $ 2.3 billion for training and education programs, the officials said.

The package also contains $ 1.3 billion for community service jobs, they said. Under this scheme, and "assuming states will move more quickly to enact these reforms," one official added, the administration assumes there will be 300,000 people working in community service by the year 2000.

Besides training and jobs, the proposal envisions $ 2 billion in new money for child care for welfare recipients and workers in public service jobs, and $ 1.5 million for child care for poor workers who do not receive welfare, the officials said. The rest of the $ 9.5 billion is distributed among several smaller initiatives, they said.

The officials emphasized that the "working poor" child care provision doubled the amount of money available under current law, but it is $ 2 billion less than anticipated in a tax-enhanced welfare reform package.

The other $ 1 billion trimmed from the earlier working proposal comes from a variety of demonstration projects -- experimental programs designed to test the efficiency of new welfare initiatives.

Senior administration officials said the proposal contained strong measures to enhance child support collection, a cornerstone of the Clinton plan.

The plan seeks to wean people from welfare by enhancing poor peoples' job skills and education, instilling a work ethic in welfare recipients and "making work pay" by increasing incentives and benefits for the working poor. One of these, increased child care, is the initiative that suffers most under the no-tax plan.

"The president wanted to make good on the pledges he made in the campaign to require people to work and to strengthen child support enforcement, and he has done that," one senior official said. "He also wanted as much welfare reform as we can afford."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: April 26, 1994

LEVEL 4 - 17 OF 35 STORIES

Los Angeles Times

March 6, 1994, Sunday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 4; Column 1; National Desk

LENGTH: 1477 words

HEADLINE: CHILD CARE A KEY HURDLE TO CLINTON WELFARE PLAN;
REFORM: PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE IS HARD-PRESSED TO DESIGN AFFORDABLE PLAN TO KEEP HIS PLEDGE TO END WELFARE 'AS WE KNOW IT.'

BYLINE: By ELIZABETH SHOGREN, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: BALTIMORE

BODY:

Like thousands of other single mothers who support their families on welfare, Carolyn Bates is trying to do what President Clinton wants her to do -- make it on her own.

The obstacles are no less formidable for their familiarity: only a high school diploma, an all-but-empty resume and a home in a poor, crime-infested part of Baltimore far from any job.

But Bates said that arranging reliable child care for her 6-year-old daughter and 8-year-old son is the biggest hurdle.

Although her on-the-job training program provides money for day care, the only licensed centers in her area that seem safe and comfortable also have long waiting lists. Relatives who agreed to watch the children were not dependable. So for now she leaves her training job early to pick up her children from school.

But she knows this will not be possible when she finds a real job.

"I want a very good job," said Bates, 34. "Something me and my kids can live off. But if I can't find good child care where my kids are comfortable, I'm going to wind up not working."

"But I need to work," she said, her voice filling with anxiety. "I don't want to lay around getting checks. I'm not happy doing that. I am able and I want to work."

Like Bates, many single mothers nationally cannot work because their children have nowhere to go. Her predicament, multiplied millions of times, poses a huge challenge for the policy designers assigned by President Clinton to come up with an affordable plan to keep his campaign pledge to "end welfare as we know it."

With yearly per-child costs running from $3,000 to $5,000, child care is the most expensive part of welfare reform plans that require parents to work instead of staying at home.

Child care is in short supply in many poor urban neighborhoods and rural areas -- especially high-quality care available at the odd hours that are typical of the bottom-of-the-ladder jobs that former welfare recipients often get.

An Administration task force is grappling with this issue as it prepares a welfare reform program for Clinton's consideration. What appears to be its preferred approach -- limiting welfare benefits to two years and then turning recipients out onto the job market -- would send as many as 2 million of the youngest welfare recipients searching for child care.

The Administration's welfare reformers said they have not estimated how many new children would need government-subsidized child care under that approach, but they expressed confidence the supply will be adequate.

"We agree that child care is one of the most important parts of the equation," said Walter D. Broadnax, who as deputy secretary of health and human services is on the welfare reform task force. "The only problem is paying for it."

For starters, the Administration is considering more than doubling the $1.5 billion a year that the government now spends for child care for the working poor. Administration officials are counting on private businesses, nonprofit organizations and even former welfare recipients to respond to the increased demand for child care.

Not everyone is so hopeful.

"What you're talking about is thousands and thousands currently on waiting lists for subsidized child care slots and welfare reform is going to create thousands and thousands more," said Rep. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.). "We're talking about a tidal wave for a system that is already stressed out."

Wyden said the federal government will have to provide substantial new money and to regulate child care more closely.

"You can't do welfare reform unless you do child care reform," he said. "We've got to make sure the welfare reformers understand that this is too important to be short shrifted."

Some conservatives argue that child care costs are so huge that welfare reform should be targeted to put recipients who need the least child care -- those with older children -- into training and jobs first.

The Administration's current favored reform concept takes the opposite approach, targeting recipients under the age of 25. But they are the most likely to have additional children who will need child care for the longest period of time.

Federal and state assistance for child care has mushroomed in the last five years, with the federal contribution growing from $660 million in 1988 to about $1.5 billion this year. But federally subsidized care for people leaving welfare

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

is guaranteed for only a year.
Lucretia Dean, a single mother who stopped getting welfare checks and started working last October, already sees a child care deadline looming.

As a nurse's aide at a Baltimore nursing home, Dean earns $6.25 an hour -- more than many former welfare recipients -- but only on a part-time basis. She said she hopes to get a job at a local hospital before her year of transitional child care is used up. But even then, she would earn only another $1.25 an hour, and paying $85 a week for child care would still be impossible.

"If you're just starting out, they're going to give you minimum wage or a little more, and that doesn't come close to covering rent, utilities, transportation, food and day care," Dean said as she picked up her 4-year-old son from a child care center in a working-class neighborhood. "But they don't think about that when they say: 'Everybody get a job.' Child care really is the biggest issue when you're trying to get off welfare and stay off."

Illinois' welfare policy-makers thought they had a solution. They took another federally funded child care program -- for people at risk of going on welfare because their incomes are less than 75% of the median -- and targeted it at former welfare recipients whose year of transitional day care subsidies had been exhausted.

The hope was that their incomes would increase to the point where they no longer would be eligible for subsidies of any kind. But more than two-thirds of those who received extensions were still using them a year later.

"A lot of these jobs do not have career ladders that will ever enable them to afford child care," said Michelle Piel, the manager of child care and development at the Illinois Department of Public Aid.

Now, because the maximum number of people are using the "at risk" child care program, the state is cutting former welfare recipients off after the year of transitional care. Some of those people already are back on welfare, Piel said.

In a 1990 survey of 7,000 recipients of aid to families with dependent children, a quarter of the respondents said they quit a job or school because of child care, Piel said.

In Texas, acclaimed for setting up a particularly efficient subsidized child care system, the number of children receiving care soared from fewer than 17,000 in 1989 to more than 60,000 in 1994.

Yet many working poor families still cannot get the services for which they are eligible. "There are at least as many children on waiting lists as there are in care," said Charlotte Brandtley, director of child care for the Texas Social Services Department.

For public treasuries, it is clearly cheaper over the short term to let welfare recipients stay home with their children rather than pay for their child care while they receive training and go to work.

Staying at home, a mother of two preschool children in Illinois would receive a $367 welfare check each month. But if she took a minimum-wage job, the

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

government would still pay her $135 a month in welfare benefits plus $600-$800 a month for child care for a year.

Cost notwithstanding, a consensus is forming among policy-makers that it is better for everybody -- welfare recipients, their children and society at large -- if single parents are required to work.

Welfare recipients themselves are not so sure.

"I don't think the government should make it mandatory for a parent to put a small child in day care before the child can talk," said Angela Candy, 33, a mother of three who is trying to make the transition from welfare to work. "What if something bad is happening to the child?"

"I feel the opposite," said Rhonda Clark, 24, who recently started a job and went off welfare after receiving it off and on for seven years. She and her two children live across the street from a public housing project, and she says she sees the terrible influence on the children when their parents collect welfare checks every month.

"As long as a child is in the home, he or she only gets what the parent has to offer," Clark said. "And if that parent is staying home all day watching TV and chatting with friends, that's the only life the child knows. That's why most of them grow up and end up on social services too." She said children as young as 1 or 2 years old are better served by having their mothers working: "They're at a very impressionable age. Things stick in their minds. The more exposure they get to other lifestyles the better."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 1994

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 18 OF 35 STORIES

The Progressive

January, 1994

SECTION: Vol. 58 ; No. 1 ; Pg. 10; ISSN: 0033-0736

LENGTH: 823 words

HEADLINE: Welfare reform again; Editorial

BODY:

Talk about welfare reform has not changed much since 1988, when the Federal Family Support Act went into effect, and President Clinton's latest plan to "overhaul" the welfare system is more of the same.

For years now, there has been widespread agreement that the current welfare system does not work. To a surprising degree, those who have studied the problem concur about what has to change in order to make things better: Jobs, training, health care, child care, and transportation for the working poor would enable people to pull themselves out of the poverty trap.

As it stands, the welfare system penalizes the poor for working by cutting a dollar of benefits for every dollar they earn. Furthermore, welfare recipients lose their Medicaid when they take low-paying, service-sector jobs. Parents have the added problem of finding somewhere safe and affordable to put their children when they go to work - a daunting problem even for the middle class.

The Family Support Act recognized these problems, and proposed to deal with many of them by providing job training, transportation, child care, and a variety of experimental programs administered by state governments, designed to move people off welfare and into work. Now President Clinton, who helped draft the Family Support Act, is promising to "end welfare as we know it" through job training, child care, and a major initiative to move people into jobs.

Why do we keep seeing the same solutions repackaged in new welfare plans? And why haven't the old plans worked to solve widely recognized problems? The devil is in the details - more specifically, in the budget.

The Clinton "overhaul," like the welfare overhauls attempted under the Family Support Act in all fifty states, promises to pay for itself through savings from cuts to social-service programs. Simultaneously, it promises to expand job training, child-care, and other benefits for people on welfare as well as for the working poor.

Members of Congress are understandably skeptical about a major new program that claims to save money and solve major social problems, especially since the Clinton team has not revealed how much money is involved or where the savings will come from.

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

In fact, saving money on social services and fixing the welfare system are incompatible goals. Just look at what happened under the Family Support Act: State governments, strapped for funds, tried to purge their welfare rolls through programs that docked benefits when welfare recipients failed to meet certain conditions.

When money for the promised transportation, child care, etc., was nowhere to be found in state budgets, the emphasis of these programs rapidly shifted away from offering "support" and toward "personal responsibility" - that is, punishing the poor if their children skipped too many days of school, if single mothers had more than one baby, if families didn't pay the rent on time, if welfare applicants refused to be fingerprinted, and other draconian and arbitrary policies, which varied from state to state. Some states reported nominal "cost savings" as they withdrew social services and kicked people off the welfare rolls. But the problems of poverty, unemployment, and related ills continued to grow.

Bill Clinton wants the poor to get jobs, and he says he'll create a work program that will make it possible for the unemployed to move off welfare and start supporting their families within two years. But the details about these jobs - where they will come from, how many will be public and how many private - are quite vague. At this point there is a clause in the program prohibiting states from enforcing the prescribed two-year time limit on welfare if the economy is bad and there are no jobs available. That is just common sense. But then, this sort of common-sense gesture is exactly what went by the wayside under the Family Support Act. At least, one can still hope that the Clinton plan will do no great harm. But what about applying some real solutions to the problems faced by people on welfare?

In its statement of purpose, the Clinton plan includes a line that says it will reinforce "the traditional values of work, family, support, and responsibility." It's alarming to survey the outcomes of previous efforts to put those values into practice.

When money is tight, the easiest thing for the Government to do is to treat poverty as an attitude problem. By ignoring the concrete, practical obstacles poor people face and simply blaming lazy welfare bums for poverty, many politicians have taken the low road to nowhere.

Poverty and unemployment are neither attitude problems nor historical aberrations. Unless we're willing to invest money in the poor, and in creating decent, well-paying jobs with benefits, we're going to be contemplating the same problems again in another few years, wondering why we haven't got a handle on them yet.

IAC-NUMBER: IAC 14695166

IAC-CLASS: Magazine

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: August 25, 1995

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 19 OF 35 STORIES

U.S. News & World Report

December 13, 1993

SECTION: U.S. NEWS; Vol. 115, No. 23; Pg. 30

LENGTH: 3148 words

HEADLINE: Fixing the welfare mess

BYLINE: By David Whitman; Matthew Cooper

HIGHLIGHT:
Clinton has vowed to "end welfare as we know it." Voters approve and want tough standards

BODY:
Joseph Califano, Michael Dukakis and other Democratic luminaries found the problem so intractable that they dubbed it the "Mideast of domestic politics." The "it" is the next major item on President Clinton's domestic agenda: reform of the nation's much-maligned welfare system. During the presidential campaign last year, Clinton pledged so often to "end welfare as we know it" that his vow became a defining mantra almost akin to George Bush's "read my lips" promise. Yet truly ending welfare -- much less resolving the contentious internal debates now swirling among Democrats and Republicans -- may prove tougher than getting Yassir Arafat and Yitzhak Rabin to shake hands on the White House lawn.

Clinton's aim is to transform welfare into a transitional program: His plan would provide recipients with education, training, child care and health coverage during their first two years on the rolls, but then require them to find work in the private sector or in a community-service position. A new poll for U.S. News by Celinda Lake and Ed Goeas finds that the president will face a good-news-bad-news story when he tries to sell his plan to Congress and the public early next year. The good news is that close to 90 percent of Americans fully support Clinton's radical two-years-and-out plan. The bad news is that a majority also back many Republican variants of his ideas that would make time-limited welfare even more restrictive than Clinton might like.

In several ways, the task of remaking welfare is especially daunting now. After remaining relatively steady for more than 15 years, the number of Americans on Aid to Families with Dependent Children has recently mushroomed, from 10.8 million in 1989 to 14.2 million today. A stunning 1 in 7 children is now on AFDC. The welfare explosion is partly due to the recession, but it also stems from a rise in out-of-wedlock births among young, disadvantaged women. And the same contradictory impulses that stifled previous welfare reformers persist. First, legislators want to support those truly in need, especially children; second, they want to discourage dependency and idleness, especially for mothers of those children.

To date, Clinton has taken two long strides toward ending welfare: He has sent legislation to Congress to make health coverage universal and he has signed into law a huge increase in the popular earned income tax credit. Both measures would make it easier for AFDC recipients to switch from welfare to low-wage jobs. In fact, the largely-unsung EITC provisions constitute the biggest antipoverty initiative in more than a decade; they will cost $ 20.8 billion over the next five years and will raise any family with two or more children and a full-time working parent out of poverty.

In the weeks ahead, Clinton -- drawing on the work of an interagency task force -- faces far more controversial decisions about the details of his plan. Senate aide Paul Offner, who studied welfare for the president's transition team, made a crude estimate last year that Clinton's plan might reduce the welfare rolls by 14 percent. The U.S. News poll shows, however, that only 1 in 6 Americans would judge welfare reform a success if it cut the rolls by 25 percent or less by the year 2000. Fully a third of respondents want a bigger cutback, saying they will judge his work a success if the rolls are cut by a virtually impossible-to-achieve reduction of 50 percent or more.

Leading Democrats, such as Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, question whether the administration has the gumption to fund and implement a time-limited welfare system without resorting to other expensive programs to pad the blow to those forced to work. As Harvard Prof. David Ellwood, a co-chair of the Clinton interagency task force, wrote in a candid paper presented at the Urban Institute shortly before he joined the administration: "[The] one thing that becomes abundantly obvious when one looks hard at the details of any time-limited welfare and work program is that there will be many weaknesses." Here are some of the discomfiting questions that Clinton must answer:

Question 1: What happens to the children? Contrary to stereotypes that depict welfare recipients as men who loaf on street corners and women who tool around in Cadillacs, 2 out of 3 AFDC recipients are innocents -- that is, they are children. The American public roundly underestimates that number; only a quarter of respondents to the U.S. News poll guessed that 51 to 75 percent of AFDC recipients were under 18.

Mothers on welfare who are trained and then required to work after two years may well benefit from Clinton's plan. But will their children -- many of whom live in crime-ridden neighborhoods and are under the age of 3 -- necessarily be better off without mom at home? At present, researchers know next to nothing about how a mother's absence might affect her child's performance in school, change the quality of his day care, influence the kind of health care he receives or create stress at home. Marian Wright Edelman of the Children's Defense Fund puts it bluntly: "If it sacrifices poor children," she told the Los Angeles Times, "it's not welfare reform."

Question 2: Is welfare a one-shot deal? If a mother and her children can come back to AFDC each time she has another child, time-limited welfare doesn't seem so time-limited. Yet if she is precluded from returning, then a needy infant may suffer. During the campaign, Clinton said he would try to protect children by penalizing only the parent's portion of the welfare check if the parent failed to work as required. So far, though, he has declined to say whether the two years on AFDC would be a one-shot opportunity. The current House Republican bill would grant a four-month extension to the two-year limit to pregnant mothers who have a child after leaving AFDC, but it requires them to then take a government-sponsored job. The U.S. News poll shows nearly 75 percent

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

of Americans would oppose a bill that precluded a family from ever returning to welfare after two years of benefits ran out. But half the respondents would favor a five-year waiting period during which a family could not go back on welfare.

Question 3: Where do the jobs come from? The best alternative to the dole is private-sector jobs. But most employers are not eager to hire long-term welfare recipients. That means Clinton has to figure out what kind of government support to offer many of the estimated 3 million mothers who could be affected by a two-year time limit. To meet his ambitious goal of moving "millions of idle Americans off the welfare rolls and onto the work rolls," Clinton could pursue one of two options. Either offer community-service or "workfare" slots -- in which people work off their welfare check -- or create public-service jobs outside the welfare system that pay higher wages. Unfortunately, public-service jobs are expensive and have proved unpopular ever since the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act program of the 1970s earned a reputation for bankrolling boondoggles. Today, 2 out of 3 voters polled by U.S. News prefer that the government offer workfare jobs to welfare recipients after two years; only 1 in 4 thinks the government should guarantee jobs to those cut off.

The hitch with workfare is that it generally has failed to reduce welfare rolls significantly or boost earnings and subsequent employment. Only 1 percent of AFDC mothers are in workfare slots, and few states have long-term programs involving large numbers of recipients. Just what kind of work hundreds of thousands of welfare mothers are supposed to do is also something of a mystery. A task force of the Coalition on Human Needs, an umbrella group of liberal organizations, recently issued a statement warning that workfare would "create a permanent underclass of impoverished parents who would not enjoy the basic rights [of] all other American workers."

Question 4: Who is exempt? At present, federal law already exempts roughly half of all AFDC recipients from having to participate in work, education or training programs. Clinton's dilemma: If too many recipients are exempt, time limits are a mockery; if too many are required to participate, overwhelmed state officials are likely to funnel them into make-work programs with phony requirements. On the whole, survey respondents believe the new law should have few loopholes (box, below). For instance, a novel scheme heavily favored in the poll and included in the Republican legislation would require the unemployed fathers of children on welfare to work. The one exception to the eligibility crackdown is that a majority of Americans would favor exempting parents from time limits if they had a significant physical or mental disability.

The unanswered question is whether a segment of chronic AFDC recipients are virtually unemployable because they are too disabled, lack work experience, or are too illiterate or mentally limited. The evidence available suggests that many welfare recipients are not strong candidates for jobs in an upscaled labor market. A recent study by LaDonna Pavetti, who now works in the administration, indicates that 75 percent of long-term AFDC mothers score too low on IQ tests to qualify for the U.S. Armed Forces.

Question 5: How do you pay for reform? The U.S. News poll shows that Americans do anticipate welfare reform could cost more in the short term, even if it might save money in the long run. Nonetheless, many states lack the administrative capacity to mount massive jobs-and-child-care programs. In fiscal '93, states failed to claim $ 186 million in federal funds available for

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

educating and training AFDC recipients. Republicans contend that their welfare plan will actually save billions, primarily by eliminating public assistance for legal aliens who are not citizens. Poll respondents favor that cost-cutting scheme by a 2-to-1 margin. But the Clinton administration is likely to endorse less-sweeping cutbacks on immigrants and seek a revenue-neutral plan.

Question 6: How do you change the culture of welfare? The atmosphere of welfare offices tends to encourage dependency, rather than discourage it. Welfare administrators are chiefly concerned with determining the eligibility of clients and dispensing checks, not getting people into jobs. An intern working for the county in Athens, Ohio, recently tested the system by applying for AFDC and found that by the time she was referred to a jobs program, she had already produced 16 documents for purposes of verification, filled out about 11 forms on her personal and financial circumstances and answered 770 questions. In an interview last summer, Senator Moynihan remarked to U.S. News that the eligibility workers "who hand out the forms are only marginally better off than the people who fill them out -- and they hate each other. It's not the Columbia School of Social Work: 'Come on in and sit down; let's talk about your summer!' " It is hard to imagine that a massive program run by the existing bureaucracy will handily transform the system.

In the months ahead, one of two very different scenarios may well play out on Capitol Hill. In the first, Clinton finesses the questions outlined above enough to win liberal support for his plan. His bill exempts recipients from time limits if they live in states that fail to fund adequate job and child-care slots, provides numerous appeals for sanctioned families, requires only part-time work of single parents and allows families who leave welfare to earn credits toward more time on AFDC if they stay off relief for several years. He could also phase in work requirements so that they only go into effect state-by-state over many years or just apply to new recipients.

In the second scenario, Clinton could inflame liberals by embracing strict time limits and work requirements. Last week, Clinton told U.S. News that there "were a lot of good things in [the Republican] plan ... that I thought were really quite similar to my own thinking" -- and added that the Republicans' bill has made him "reasonably optimistic that we can have a bipartisan welfare-reform package next year." Unfortunately, at least for the president, few of the more liberal members of his own party presently share his optimism or his passion for making welfare temporary.

AMERICANS WHO FAVOR LIMITING THE AMOUNT OF TIME FAMILIES CAN REMAIN ON WELFARE: 69 pct.

AMERICANS WHO OPPOSE A TIME LIMIT: 16 pct.

OF THOSE WHO FAVOR TIME LIMITS, THE PERCENTAGE WHO FAVOR:

Six months:	10 pct.
One year:	21 pct.
Two years:	34 pct.
Five years:	11 pct.
Longer:	5 pct.

Americans' views on welfare reform
The U.S. News poll shows how nuanced voters' views are. A plurality of respondents want the welfare system overhauled, and they support reforms that

are tougher than the existing system. But they also would like more help given to recipients to get them off the dole.

THOSE WHO SAY THE WELFARE SYSTEM (AFDC) SHOULD:

Be left alone	6 pct.
Be subject to experiments in the states	37 pct.
Be reformed at the national level	43 pct.
Eliminate all benefits	8 pct.

THOSE WHO EXPECT WELFARE REFORM TO COST:

More in the short term	56 pct.
Less in the short term	29 pct.
More in the long term	28 pct.
Less in the long term	57 pct.

SHOULD A TIME LIMIT APPLY, OR NOT APPLY, TO THE FOLLOWING GROUPS OF AFDC RECIPIENTS?

	Apply	Not Apply
Single parents with children under 1 year of age	64 pct.	28 pct.
Single parents with children under 3 years of age	64 pct.	27 pct.
Single parents with drug or alcohol problems	64 pct.	24 pct.
Any family the government cannot find a job and provide child care for	55 pct.	36 pct.
Any family where the parent has a significant physical or mental disability	38 pct.	56 pct.
Any family that cannot find a job where jobs are hard to find	57 pct.	32 pct.

IF THE GOVERNMENT IS TO CUT OFF WELFARE BENEFITS TO FAMILIES AFTER A SPECIFIC PERIOD OF TIME AND AFTER IT PROVIDES EDUCATION, TRAINING, HEALTH BENEFITS AND CHILD CARE TO THOSE FAMILIES, IT SHOULD:

Simply end the families' benefits, including Aid for Families with Dependent Children	7 pct.
Make the parent or parents do community service work in exchange for welfare benefits	64 pct.
Guarantee jobs to the parent or parents after they are cut off welfare	24 pct.

DO YOU FAVOR OR OPPOSE THESE IDEAS AS REFORMS FOR THE WELFARE SYSTEM?

	Favor	Oppose
Require job training for those on welfare, and after two years require them to work in government jobs if necessary.	82 pct.	15 pct.
Require job training for those on welfare, and after two years require them to work.	93 pct.	4 pct.
Require unemployed fathers of children on welfare to work.	94 pct.	4 pct.
Replace welfare benefits with tax credits and strengthen child support enforcement.	67 pct.	21 pct.
Have government help pay for child care and transportation for welfare recipients who work or are in job training or education courses.	77 pct.	18 pct.
Deny welfare to legal immigrants until they become citizens.	69 pct.	25 pct.
Deny welfare to legal immigrants.	37 pct.	55 pct.
Do not increase welfare benefits when people on welfare have additional children.	65 pct.	28 pct.
Limit welfare benefits to two years and do not allow people to get back on welfare for at least five years.	50 pct.	38 pct.
Limit welfare benefits to two years and do not allow people to get back on welfare ever.	22 pct.	73 pct.

GOOD POLL NEWS FOR CLINTON

62 pct. of blacks and 60 pct. of moderate/liberal Democrats -- usually welfare supporters -- back time limits on benefits.

59 pct. of Republicans and Perot voters -- usually welfare detractors -- expect reform to cost more in the short term.

Democratic pollster Lake: "Like Clinton, voters want welfare to be a second chance, not a way of life."

BAD POLL NEWS FOR CLINTON

53 pct. of voters want families to work for their benefits even if they live in high-unemployment areas.

46 pct. of voters say they will only consider reform a success if welfare rolls are cut by more than 25 pct..

Republican pollster Goeas: "Voters want a lot more cuts in welfare rolls than Clinton plans to deliver."

U.S.News poll of 1,000 registered voters conducted by Celinda Lake of Mellman-Lazarus-Lake and Ed Goeas of the Tarrance Group Nov. 30-Dec. 1, 1993. Margin of

error: Plus or minus 3.1 percent. Percentages may not add up to 100 because some respondents answered "Don't know."

GRAPHIC: Charts: No caption (U.S. News poll of 1,000 registered voters conducted by Celinda Lake of Mellman-Lazarus -- Lake and Ed Goeas of the Tarrance Group Nov. 30-Dec. 1, 1993.); Drawing, No caption (Illustration: Steve Benson for USN&WR); Charts: Americans' views on welfare reform (U.S. News poll of 1,000 registered voters conducted by Celinda Lake of Mellman-Lazarus -- Lake and Ed Goeas of the Tarrance Group Nov. 30-Dec. 1, 1993.); Picture, Innocents. Vulnerable Americans -- especially children -- have a big stake in reform. (Stephen Shames -- Matrix from the book Outside the Dream); Picture, Job training. There is vast support for more government aid to teach skills to welfare recipients. (John Barr -- Gamma Liaison)

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 20 OF 35 STORIES

The New York Times

December 3, 1993, Friday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section A; Page 1; Column 2; National Desk

LENGTH: 1936 words

HEADLINE: Clinton Welfare Planners Outline Big Goals Financed by Big Saving

BYLINE: By JASON DePARLE, Special to The New York Times

DATELINE: WASHINGTON, Dec. 2

BODY:

President Clinton's task force on welfare reform has translated his pledge to "end welfare as we know it" into a plan to spend significant new sums on child care, work and job training programs. But the plan provides few specifics about the financing and says its ambitious goals can be paid for entirely by cuts or savings in welfare or other programs for the needy.

A draft of the plan was completed 12 days ago and is subject to revisions before it is presented to Mr. Clinton.

A copy of the confidential document suggests that, in its broadest outline, the program seems less the radical departure that Mr. Clinton's oratory has suggested than an expansion of the current law, as embodied in the 1988 Family Support Act.

Training and Then Work

That law provides money for job training and education programs, and requires some welfare particpants to enroll in them. The Clinton plan would expand those training opportunties, and add tougher work requirements at the end.

"We see the Family Support Act as a really core foundation for anything we do," said David T. Ellwood, an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services who is one of three leaders of the task force drafting the bill.

The plan reiterates Mr. Clinton's pledge to impose a two-year limit on welfare benefits, after which recipients would have to enroll in a work program or face financial penalties.

An Unanswered Question

But it holds open the possibility that the work program could be temporary, and it does not resolve the ultimate question: What would then happen to poor families who still could not find private jobs?

One Administration official drafting the plan called that "the $64,000

question" that after nearly a year in office, the Administration has still not answered.
The plan suggests that those who exhaust their temporary jobs could simply recyle back onto the welfare rolls, perhaps with reduced benefits.

The working group member, speaking on the condition of anonymity, characterized the plan as "a first draft" and said it underscored the amount of detailed work still to come before one of the President's primary campaign pledges is converted to legislation.

Like the people who devised the Admininstration's initial ambitious health care proposals, the welfare planners did not say how much the plan would cost or specify which program cuts would finance it. So it is hard to gauge the true extent of its ambition.

But some welfare experts voiced skepticism that a serious welfare plan could be financed simply by cutting current programs.

New Services Required

Mr. Ellwood acknowledged that many decisions remain. "The whole question of how exactly the jobs will work is still very much under discussion," he said.

The financing remains a central political difficulty. Many members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, think the time limit can save money and court favor with the public. But the plan makes the time limits contingent on the Government's providing expensive new services, like job training and child care and the working group members are searching for ways to pay for the services. The Administration wants to phase in the program slowly, to reduce the initial costs.

For now, the White House is in the midst of a vigorous internal debate over the timing of the plan. Some see the need to fulfill political promises quickly, particularly with Congressional Republicans pushing a time-limit plan of their own. Others are warning that fast action on welfare will produce political and financial conflicts for the health care bill, which must travel through the same Congressional committees.

The 29-page plan served as the basis of a Nov. 20 meeting of the working group, which has 32 members. The Administration has recruited some of the nation's leading academic experts on welfare, including Isabel V. Sawhill, a White House budget aide, and Mr. Ellwood and Mary Jo Bane, both assistant secretaries at the Department of Health and Human Services.

But so far they have provided more slogans than specifics about how they plan to tackle the challenge of moving five million poor mothers, mostly with few skills, into an economy with nine million unemployed people.

The document from the Nov. 20 meeting gives the first clues. In addition to calling for expanded child care, training, and work programs, it also endorses a national campaign to reduce teen-age pregnancy. It calls for "dramatic improvements in the child support enforcement system" and acknowledges "there is considerable division" within the group over whether the Government should make the payments itself if it fails to collect them.

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Both Fathers and Mothers

The plan indicates an enthusiasm for expanding training programs so that they include absent fathers, as well as mothers. Such an expansion could help fathers earn more, and therefore pay more in child support payments. But such an expansion would also add large new costs.

The document also acknowledges the considerable political challenges that surround revamping the welfare system and which, in the past, have defeated ambitious plans by Presidents Richard M. Nixon and Jimmy Carter. "Ugly, racist, and mean-spirited images are sometimes loudly proclaimed," the paper said.

Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the main Federal welfare program, costs about $23 billion a year. Food stamps and Medicaid for welfare families costs about $40 billion more. But the volatility of welfare debates is always larger than numbers alone suggest, because the issue touches on race, class and even sexual morality.

Mr. Clinton's plan is similar to Mr. Carter's in one crucial respect: his insistence that any welfare overhaul pay for itself by offsetting cuts or savings in other programs. That is a major reason Mr. Carter's plan failed in Congress.

Bruce Reed, a White House domestic policy aide who is a co-chairman of the task force, expressed confidence that the financing would not similarly stall this plan. "The cost depends how gradually it's phased in," he said.

One way to phase it in, he said, is to start in a limited number of states. Another possibility is to have the new requirements apply only to new welfare applicants, not to those already on the program.

Skepticism on Fiscal Claim

But one Congressional aide who is an expert on welfare expressed skepticism that an ambitious plan could be financed from wringing the fat out of existing programs. "When they tell you it's going to be deficit neutral and they don't know where the money is coming from, I get real skeptical that this is going to be as significant change in policy," he said.

As described in the plan, each welfare recipient would be required to join a social worker in designing a contract that "would detail the obligations of both the recipient and the state."

The state would be required to provide the education, training, or child care a welfare recipient needed to find a job. The welfare recipient would be required to attend the programs.

In general, the work preparation would not exceed two years "for employable persons." But the plan would allow states to grant extensions for people who had not finished high school or needed other kinds of training. The number of extensions each state could issue would be limited.

In the event the state did not have the money to provide the training or child care, the "state would be prohibited from imposing time limits." That is why the extent of Government financing is crucial in determining the extent of the program.

The plan does not specify who would be exempt from the time limits. The Family Support Act already requires welfare recipients to participate in work or training programs.

But it exempts about half of the five million families on the rolls, including, for instance, the mothers of infants. And the current law only requires 15 percent of the rest to be in a program.

Some Would Be Incapable

The Clinton plan envisions "a substantial increase" in the $1.3 billion a year now being spent on the training programs. It would also require less in the way of state matching money.

The Clinton plan acknowledges that not everyone on welfare is physically or mentally capable of holding a job, and argues the system "must be sensitive" to granting them exceptions. Instead of job training, such people might get health or housing assistance or aid, the plan says.

The plan outlines two options for creating the work program that would begin after a welfare recipient reached the two-year limit. Under one option, checks would be distributed by employers; under the other, checks would be distributed by the welfare system, in exchange for work.

The second option is generally considered harder to enforce, because court decision have provided for extensive appeals before a welfare check can be reduced.

In either event, the plan calls for money to finance the jobs from the Federal Government, distributed to states according to a formula. And Federal money would include financial incentives to place people in private jobs, rather than Government jobs.

Such incentives could include payments to the employers who hired welfare recipients, or to personnel concerns that found them jobs. The details would vary by region and be determined by some sort of a public-private council.

Jobs Are Transitional

Mr. Reed, the task force co-chairman, said the jobs are likely to be temporary. "We see these as transitional jobs, not permanent jobs," he said.

That raises the question of what comes next for families that, at the end of the program, could still not find work.

The task force leaders say no decisions have been made. But the plan discusses an option to give states the choice of reducing the benefits "to recipients who had spent at least 18 months in work assignments."

Task force members would not publicly specify how much annual spending they envision when the program is fully in effect. But one member, speaking on the condition of anonymity, noted that the Republicans' plan proposed spending $6 billion a year on child care and training and said "we'd look silly" with a smaller plan.

Where will the officials find the savings? A task force member, also anonymously, said the group was examining welfare, child care, and disability programs for changes to save money. Melissa Skolfield, a spokeswoman for the Department of Health and Human Services, said, "I'm ruling out Medicare and Social Security."

Expanded Care for Children

The plan calls for expansions of child care programs that would cover not only families on welfare but also those of the working poor. Otherwise, it said, "it will be impossible to insure that working people avoid poverty."

It contemplates three ways of doing that: consolidating and expanding current programs, creating a new block grant program or creating a refundable tax credit. It gives no cost estimate.

The plan also calls for a change in the way an important tax credit program is administered. It would give the low-income workers advanced payments on the tax refunds, rather than making them wait until the end of the year.

In an interview this afternoon, Mr. Ellwood argued that the importance of the plan was not in its immediate financial scope but rather in the signals it sends. He said it would change welfare offices from places that mail checks to those that find people jobs.

The document reiterates that vision throughout, arguing the Clinton plan will reinforce "the traditional values of work, family, support, and responsibility."

GRAPHIC: Chart: "Revamping Wlefare, With Questions Remaining"

Here are highlights of a draft plan to end the current welfare system that has been drawn up by a task force appointed by Presdient Clinton. The plan, completed 12 days ago, is subject to revision before it is presented to Mr. Clinton.

Significant expansion of child care, work, and training programs, which would be financed from cuts or savings in existing programs.

After two years, welfare recipients would have to work.

Consideration of a national crusade against teen-age pregnancy, and perhaps new training opportunities for unwed fathers.

The draft plan leaves unresolved several crucial questions:

No decisions have been made about important eatures of the work program like how many jobs will be created and how long they will last.

It does not say how much the program would cost or which other programs would be cut to pay for it. (pg. A26)

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH
LOAD-DATE: December 3, 1993

The New York Times

September 26, 1993, Sunday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section 3; Page 23; Column 3; Financial Desk

LENGTH: 1048 words

HEADLINE: At Work;
Relief for Child-Care Workers

BYLINE: By Barbara Presley Noble

BODY:

AMONG small-business employees, child-care workers may have much to celebrate if President Clinton's health care proposal survives in anything like its current form. Barely a third of them now have health benefits, and though many are young and healthy, the work they do puts them at the mercy of the microbial free-for-all that is the immature immune system. Colds and flus are endemic, as are back problems from hefting and carting young children all day. Under the Clinton plan, workers would get benefits from their employers, who would probably qualify for an expense cap of from 3.5 percent to 7.9 percent of payroll. Self-employed family day-care providers would buy their own insurance but qualify for the 100 percent health insurance tax deduction. Making health care a fact of workers' lives would almost certainly improve quality by reducing turnover.

But child care is a peculiar economic institution. Technically, it is a small business, but one lacking many of the market options of other small businesses. "Over all, the change is going to be a good thing, but we have to pay attention to consequences for child care," said Barbara Reisman, executive director of the Child Care Action Campaign in New York.

Whatever form it takes -- center-based care and family day care dominate -- child care is a labor-intensive business in which salaries may represent as much as 80 percent of a total budget; an additional $8,000 to $10,000, say, to cover health premiums will not go quietly into the balance sheet. Expenses are typically covered by fees, supplemented occasionally by grants or donations. The usual ways of cutting costs or improving productivity -- investing in technology, streamlining inventory, etc. -- don't apply, and the creative ones, like staggering hours and teachers, put children in a topsy-turvy environment.

Passing costs on to consumers is problematic, because many of them are low- and middle-income parents with little financial flexibility. "If parents don't have the money, they can't move the cost forward," said Heidi Hartmann, director of the Institute for Women's Policy Research in Washington. The only other place for extra expenses to come from is the salaries of workers, who make from about $5 to $9 an hour.

The new system may prove especially difficult for in-home day-care providers, who account for nearly a quarter of child-care arrangements for children under

3. As self-employed workers, typically making less than $10,000 a year, they would be eligible to buy care from one of the regional alliances for about $1,800 for individuals and $4,200 for families. Without subsidies and cost-reduction formulas apparently envisioned by the Clinton Administration, the upfront cost would probably put the policies out of reach.

Whatever worries and imponderables there may be, the child-care community is optimistic about the new plan. Its emphasis on preventive care, for example, would probably benefit an occupation that draws from low-income groups whose access to health care is limited. "Prevention is something you don't pay for if you don't have money," said Linda Tarr-Whelan, head of the Center for Policy Alternatives in Washington. "It's incredibly important to that group."

CHILD-care advocates agree with President Clinton's appeal to the public to accept responsibility for part of the cost of their health care, but point out that child-care workers come to the reform table with a pre-existing condition. "We have a child-care delivery system that's breaking at the seams. It's not inefficient. No one's getting rich off it," said Marcy Whitebook, executive director of the Child Care Employee Project in Oakland. Calif. "The child-care work force is already doing more than its part by subsidizing the system of low wages." Ms. Whitebook said she was wowed by the passion for reform President Clinton revealed in his speech to Congress last week. The child-care system, she says, could use the same impassioned approach.

Adventures in Baby Sitting

Among the clear winners this year of various Clinton Administration initiatives, intended and unintended, would seem to be full-time, in-home baby sitters, usually in cities like New York and Washington. First, the infamous $500,000-a-year Attorney General candidate episode force-marched many members of the cultural elite onto the Social Security straight and narrow and presumably benefitted those household workers who were not sacked by potential appointees eager to cover their tracks.

And now comes health care reform, which would treat employers of baby sitters and other domestic workers as small businesses, with the attendant responsibilities. That will entitle baby sitters to health benefits, at a cost to employers of anywhere from a few hundred dollars to well above $1,000 a year over the $200 to $400 weekly salary that many pay now. The plight of families with baby sitters -- about 3 percent of child-care users and often affluent -- generates little sympathy. Asked about the impact on in-home care, one child-care advocate sniffed, "Oh, you mean for the Zoe Bairds of the world?"

VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO CHILDREN

IF it's structured properly, say child-care advocates, President Clinton's new national service program could give the low-wage child-care industry a boost. The $1.5 billion measure creates a domestic version of the Peace Corps, allowing young people to do community service while being paid by the Government for college or job training.

The plan is modeled on volunteer projects already working in several cities. Typically, young people are placed in short-term assignments and circulate through participating organizations. If the assignments were longer term, volunteers could in effect become entry-level child-care workers. That would free up salary money for more experienced workers and widen the gap between entry- and higher-level salaries, a feature of the occupation that discourages long-term commitment. An added benefit, child-care experts say, is the potential to the health of the nation's children: "If you have young people working in a child-care facility who get good training," said Barbara Reisman, of the Child Care Action Campaign, "they learn good parenting skills."

GRAPHIC: Photo: Baby sitters would get health benefits, at a cost to them and their employers, under the President's plan. (Carrie Boretz for The New York Times)

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: September 26, 1993

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 22 OF 35 STORIES

The Ethnic NewsWatch
New Pittsburgh Courier

September 11, 1993

SECTION: Vol. 84; No. 73; Pg. A-1

LENGTH: 654 words

HEADLINE: African-American Workers Union Putting Heat On Day Care Center For Firing Woman

BYLINE: Hamm, Sandy

BODY:
African-American Workers Union Putting Heat On Day Care Center For Firing. Woman

The African-American Workers Union is putting pressure on a day care center located in the Strip District to rehire a Black woman fired after a fight with a co-worker.

The AAWU does not represent employees of the Allegheny Child Academy on Penn Avenue, but took up the cause of Elizabeth Jordan because its mission is to ensure that African-Americans are treated with dignity and respect on the job, said AAWU President Calvin Clinton.

The AAWU on Wednesday staged a small demonstration outside the day care center offices, and said it would notify state licensing officials to investigate the agency's operations.

Jordan was hired as a teacher at the center in June, and terminated the following month after the fight with her co-worker, who was also fired. Clinton said Jordan maintains she was constantly harassed by the white female co-worker, and that the woman struck her without provocation during the July 14 incident that led to their firing.

"Our position is that the management of this facility had enough forewarning of the tension between this white female and Mrs. Jordan," Clinton said. "In the final act, she was yelling at Ms. Jordan, calling her a racial slur, poking her in the face and then slapping her upside the head."

The two then fell to the floor in their scuffle, and were separated by other staffers, Clinton said. But Jordan was sent home without being given a chance to tell her side of the story; the other woman was questioned by management, Clinton said.

Dave Henry, a co-owner of the child care center, said the AAWU's involvement is "a little far-fetched." Jordan's claims are invalid, Henry said.

"This woman's just looking for a free ride. This organization's doing nothing more than attempting to extort her job from us," Henry said. "She got into a fistfight with another employee while they were supposed to be watching the children, and they were both fired.

"I didn't care what happened," he said. "They were both under provisional hiring periods. They both fought, in the room...We have a commitment to our parents to provide the best possible care for the children, and hiring Ms. Jordan back would be breaching that commitment."

The child care center has two offices located in the Strip District and employs more than 60 staff members to oversee about 200 children, Henry said.

"If this is boiling down to a racial issue, I wish someone would just call the URA and check us out," he said. "If this was valid, we'd be in court right now."

Clinton said the AAWU will circulate leaflets in African-American neighborhoods, asking Black parents to avoid patronizing the day care center "while it maintains such a callous disregard for the treatment of its employees and clients."

Clinton said the AAWU conducted its own investigation of the incident, by interviewing co-workers and witnesses to the fight, who corroborated Jordan's version of events. He said the union is primarily upset that she was a victim of harassment and unprovoked assault by a co-worker -- especially in light of escalating violence in the workplace nationwide.

"The African-American female should not have been attacked on the job and should not have been fired on terms of another employee attacking her on the job," Clinton said. "The employer should have provided a safe environment for her to work in."

Clinton said Jordan ultimately wants her job back, because she believes she was unfairly dismissed for defending herself.

"We have to understand the value that a job has to a person's life," Clinton said. "It could mean the difference between poverty and normal subsistance in mainstream society."

But Henry said both women were terminated for using poor judgment and for endangering the welfare of children under his company's care. "Under no circumstances will she be taken back," Henry said.

ETHNIC-GROUP: African-American

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: January 26, 1994

The Washington Post

May 9, 1993, Sunday, Final Edition

SECTION: BOOK WORLD; PAGE X1

LENGTH: 1044 words

HEADLINE: Who Cares for Children?

SERIES: Occasional

BYLINE: Elsa Walsh

BODY:

THE POLITICS OF PARENTHOOD

Child Care, Women's Rights,

And The Myth of The Good Mother

By Mary Frances Berry

Viking. 303 pp. $ 22.50

A RECENT ITEM in personality columns recounted Chelsea Clinton's instructions to a school nurse who needed parental permission before dispensing aspirin. "Call my dad, my mom's too busy," the First Child reportedly told her. No further explanation followed, but the implication seemed clear: Hillary Clinton was neglecting her duty as a mother while Bill Clinton, who should really be busy, was available to be a father. The story probably never would have been noted, much less published, if Chelsea had said to call mom.

In an exhaustively detailed overview of parenting roles in this country, Mary Frances Berry examines the social and political consequences of viewing child care primarily as a woman's responsibility. She argues effectively that this traditional family model needs to be challenged before women record any real improvements in their career and home lives. Drawing on history back to this country's colonial period, Berry shows in The Politics of Parenthood; Child Care, Women's Rights, and The Myth of the Good Mother, not only how the mothering role as we now know it undermines women, but that it was not always so.

Berry's most important contribution in this largely academic book is the presentation of startling evidence that the role of the modern mother, so firmly embedded in our cultural consciousness as to seem eternal, is barely 150 years old. Although Berry's data to support this point are frequently scanty and need more thorough research, her short book provides a starting point for future historians willing to focus more intently on the period. If Berry's arguments hold up, her book could be a significant impetus for corporate executives and political leaders, conservatives and liberals, and mothers and fathers to support parental involvement that is gender-free.

Berry reports that during the 17th and 18th centuries, for example, fathers played the primary role in caring for their children once the early nursing period passed. Early American fathers saw this responsibility as part of patriarchal duty. Citing the childhoods of figures like Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, Berry writes that fathers at that time "not only directed their children's education and religious worship but often decided what they would eat, played with them, and hushed them to sleep when they awakened in the night." Cotton Mather, the New England clergyman and writer, never discusses his mother in his memoirs, Berry says; he writes that when he or his siblings felt ill at night they woke their father, not their mother.

Because Berry only allots a few paragraphs to each of the figures cited during this period, however, the reader yearns for more information to back up her claims. She gives very little sense of what roles the mothers played or how women viewed their relationships with their children. Berry should know that the reader, so accustomed to the traditional view of mothers, cannot help but wonder at times whether these descriptions accurately reflect reality.

Berry tells us that it was not until the Revolutionary War that a gradual shift of these responsibilities to women began to occur. Child-rearing duties as we know them today became firmly entrenched only in the early 19th century, Berry says, attributing the transfer of duty to the advent of the Industrial Revolution and the en masse movement of middle-class men to workplaces outside the home. The "cult of true womanhood," with women at the center of family life, was born and from that point on the "mother-care tradition" has survived despite the ever increasing expansion of women into the work force.

Berry, a member of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and a professor of history and law at the University of Pennsylvania, provides strong evidence that much of the current national policy debate and corporate efforts to be more flexible, however well-intentioned, reinforce the traditional gender roles because women and not men are still the ones who take advantage of flexible working hours, child care benefits and lenient parental leave. "In our society and in the legal world, to take parental leave is wimp-like," Berry quotes one female lawyer in a major law firm. An executive at IBM, one of the country's most accommodating large corporations when it comes to offering child care options, agreed that taking advantage of the options means that "you're really taking yourself out of the running for other things."

What is desperately missing in Berry's treatment of this important subject are more voices like these and longer stories about real women's experiences. In her book, Berry often describes the landscape of women's place in society without giving a sense of the underlying geology of the feelings and emotions that have allowed -- or shaped it. She tries to cover too much historical ground in a volume that barely numbers 200 pages.

Despite these weaknesses, Berry's account poses crucial questions for further debate. For more than a year now I have traveled the country interviewing women about the choices they've made about work and family. Many despair over their efforts to balance children and work. Inadequate day care, unhelpful husbands and inflexible jobs are external restraints holding women back. But sometimes the women's internal expectations, their own assumptions about gender, create the most difficult obstacles. Berry is right in calling for a re-examination of these attitudes.

Just a few weeks ago, President Clinton hosted a town meeting for children in the White House. One child asked the president if he helped Chelsea with her homework. Clinton responded that they worked on math together at night or early in the morning. "It's been a lot of fun for me. I enjoy it a lot," he said. The remark seemed genuine. Clinton may have a real opportunity to be a new kind of role model for men in this country. If the Founding Fathers could handle it, maybe we can welcome this -- and not at the expense of Hillary Clinton.

Elsa Walsh, a reporter for The Washington Post, is writing a book about the choices women make in their lives.

GRAPHIC: ILLUSTRATION, ANTHONY RUSSO FOR TWP

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: October 14, 1993

LEVEL 4 - 24 OF 35 STORIES

Los Angeles Times

April 7, 1993, Wednesday, Home Edition

SECTION: View; Part E; Page 1; Column 2; View Desk

LENGTH: 2496 words

HEADLINE: POWER -- AT LAST;
FAMILY: AFTER YEARS OF ACTIVISM, THE CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND IS CAUTIOUSLY CELEBRATING ITS NEW CLOUT, THANKS TO ITS POLITICAL AND PERSONAL TIES THROUGHOUT THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION.

BYLINE: By LYNN SMITH, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

A blizzard was almost upon the city, but inside the Hilton, it was warm and fuzzy. More than 2,500 children's advocates were anticipating the opening session of the largest ever Children's Defense Fund convention, when unexpectedly, President Bill Clinton took the podium. By the time he finished, some of them were openly weeping grateful tears.

What they heard was not the rhetoric of moral support, but official government policies and proposals for their own heartfelt agenda. What they saw was a President of the United States literally embracing -- with just the briefest nod to the cameras -- CDF's adored, no-nonsense founder Marian Wright Edelman under the organization's logo: "Dear Lord, Be Good to Me, the Sea Is So Wide and My Boat Is So Small."

Susan Van Landingham, a Head Start worker from Martinez, Calif., wiped away tears with unsteady hands. "It was so exciting. I've been in the child-care field for 15 years. This was one of the first times I've ever felt validated," she said.

After 20 years, CDF's ship has come in.

Last fall's election catapulted former CDF board chair Hillary Rodham Clinton into the White House and the powerful chairmanship of its Health Care Task Force; another former board member, Donna Shalala, ascended to secretary of Health and Human Services; a third former board member, New York lawyer Susan Thomases, became a consultant, first in the campaign, then in the West Wing. A former summer intern, Susan Blumenthal, is a consultant to the Health Care Task Force.

Already, President Clinton has enacted programs proposed by the Children's Defense Fund, and promised funds for other CDF interests including immunization, Head Start and family preservation. (See accompanying story.)

As U.S. News & World Report editor David Gergen told the conference participants last month: "People now look to you as a voice of leadership. They want to know what you have to say."

To be sure, there are those who have heard enough already.

Critics see CDF, which is primarily a lobbying and public education organization, as an expensive throwback to unworkable ideas from the '60s. They fear precisely what Shalala and Edelman promised the delegates in March, that immunization is a "driving wedge" to further social initiatives -- and further spending and government involvement.

The undisputed leader in the children's movement, The Children's Defense Fund evolved from the Southern civil-rights movement and anti-poverty programs of the '60s. Edelman, a Yale Law School graduate and civil-rights lawyer, formed the tax-exempt charity in 1973 to ensure enforcement of laws protecting poor children and minorities.

For now, children's advocates, led by the Children's Defense Fund, are celebrating their new clout -- cautiously. Some fear so much support will make their colleagues complacent and overdependent on the federal government. Said Eve Brooks, president of the National Assn. of Child Advocates, "There's a danger to the extent people breathe a sigh of relief and say, 'We don't have to do it. The Clintons are taking care of it. Marian's got it under control.' "

In addition, Brooks observed the job of advocacy can become quite complex with friends in office -- and no one has ever been "quite as close to the center of power as we're seeing with CDF right now."

One of the group's first staff lawyers was Hillary Rodham, who participated in a project to find out why 2 million U.S. children were not in school. The activists knocked on doors in selected census tracts across the country and concluded many public schools were excluding children who either were not Anglos, did not speak English, were too poor to pay for books or needed medical help. The group's subsequent detailed report (now a standard CDF strategy) led to a federal law guaranteeing education for disabled children as well as lawsuits challenging some schools' practices.

But soon after, according to CDF staff counsel James D. Weill, "The courts got so bad on poor people's issues, that we basically gave up litigating." Moreover, he said, it became clear that "airtight arguments and compelling numbers didn't do it."

During the Reagan years, $10 billion was cut from children's programs, just at the time when the problems of single-parent and dual-income families were becoming more apparent. Children's advocates "pulled together, huddling in the cold," Weill said. They regrouped, taught themselves budget analysis, adjusted their strategies, and began to look at the long haul.

Over time, Edelman and Hillary Rodham Clinton formed a deep friendship. "They both paid their dues by taking on the fights in silence, in the dark, that others would not take on," said Paul Smith, a CDF researcher for 19 years. While Edelman lobbied to keep programs funded, Hillary Clinton sat on the Legal Services Board, a quasi-governmental agency, arguing to preserve its programs to train neighborhood lawyers and file class-action suits on behalf of poor people. "What that produced was a real understanding, a bond between the two of them

because, in essence, each fought hard, alone and unheralded against major opposition," Smith said.
Hillary Clinton was chair of the CDF board from 1986 until 1992, when she resigned to campaign, and was replaced by Shalala who had been on the board since 1980.

Now with a staff of 120, CDF focuses on "core issues," -- health care, early education, child-care and family supports. Organized into seven departments, such as policy and programs, communications, and government affairs, CDF has lobbied for a centralized child-care system, orchestrated teen pregnancy media campaigns (using an abstinence message), and organized projects such as Child Watch, which takes community leaders into homeless shelters, decaying housing projects and boarder baby wards. The point, they say, is to "personalize child suffering."

Although it is not a membership organization, CDF sponsors annual conferences, like the one in March, for teachers, health-care and social workers, child-care providers and others. Supported by foundations, corporate grants and individuals, its budget is nearing $11 million.

Children's advocates do not work in complete harmony. "The Children's Defense Fund has become glamorous," said Brooks, whose National Assn. of Child Advocates includes advocacy groups in 35 states. And tensions exist between the state activists and the Washington-based CDF, which also has formed a handful of state chapters, Brooks said.

"Lobbying in a dirty, old Statehouse may not be that impressive, but it may mean the difference of $20 million for more in state subsidies for WIC (the Women, Infants and Children's nutritional program), or move the Medicaid program to cover all children who are poor. Those kinds of pieces just don't happen because of good national leadership."

Moreover, Edelman, who has a reputed magic touch with foundations, "doesn't want to fund-raise for the whole child-advocacy movement," Brooks said. "She wants to have control of what's done under the name of CDF."

To most people, the Children's Defense Fund is synonymous with Marian Wright Edelman, 53, the daughter of a Baptist preacher and the first black woman admitted to practice law in Mississippi.

The author of an inspirational book of homilies, "The Measure of Our Success: A Letter to My Children and Yours," Edelman exudes moral authority. At the conference, she didn't hesitate in her speeches to scold the country's leaders, freely using words like shameful, scandal and immoral to describe how America has neglected its children at the same time amassing unprecedented wealth.

"She just doesn't scare," Smith said. "It is not simply that she doesn't want power herself. She denies you the authority of any power you think you have over her."

In meetings, opponents say Edelman feels no need to compromise. Josephine Velazquez, a board member of Children's Home Society in Miami, argued with Edelman over refundable tax credits to non-working families when they both served on the National Commission on Children. "Marian would say we have to keep (welfare) in place. She didn't want anything taken out. (She said) you need a safety net in case something happens. So instead of being reform, it became an add-on to what we already have."

In a recent article in The New Republic, Edelman was criticized for the CDF's "children's approach to politics."

"Not only are Head Start, WIC and immunization cast as children's issues, so are welfare, day-care, housing and employment," the article by Mickey Kaus stated. "The result is an artificial construction of the universe of relevant interests and values."

Conservative critic Bob Pambianco, an editor with the Capital Research Center in Washington, contends the Children's Defense Fund's solutions are "mired in the '60s Great Society, War on Poverty mind-set. . . . Rather than trying something new, they throw more money at a system that isn't working. Their stated agenda reflects the '60s activism from which they were born."

Members of the CDF staff try to distance themselves from the image of '60s holdovers, but it's sometimes hard to deny. For the advertised 20th anniversary CDF "bash," they partied with soda, ice cream and folk songs. "It's just like being back at the rallies," said the bearded guitar player. While Edelman shushed the audience, he sang an intense Dylan-like composition of his own: "A child is crying, he's hungry and cold, his young face looks old, it's the face of America dying."

For the child-advocacy movement, persuading people that children are in trouble has been relatively easy. Jerry Stermer, 50, an advocate from Illinois said, "I can bring myself to tears." But actually implementing real programs will be a challenge. Still smarting from the Johnson years when money that was poured into social programs didn't necessarily produce high-quality programs, advocates know the public is wary.

Said CDF's Weill: "The challenge is, it damn well better be done right. Whatever's next, we have to make sure it's high quality, effective, run honestly and really works for children."

Advocates know they may not get everything. Said Brooks, "The Administration may not be able to do everything to make up for the neglect of previous years. Children are not the only Americans and monies are going to be a problem. What if suddenly you can't move dollars from defense spending to domestic? If we can't do that, a lot of what Clinton wants (in the area of children) we can't get."

According to Weill, critics have made too much of the close ties with the White House, either magnifying the closeness or the differences. "We're not parting company at this point," he said. The Children's Defense Fund understands that "the vast majority of a loaf is better than none. There are no full loaves coming out of the bakery," he said.

Those who remember how Edelman scolded the Carter Administration for its lackluster support for Head Start or Democratic allies waffling on federalized child-care are sure she would criticize the Clintons if it came to that. But many believe this time it will be done in private.

LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group
LEXIS·NEXIS A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Sitting on a couch in a penthouse suite of the Washington Hilton, with a commanding view of the snow-covered Capitol below her, Edelman spoke guardedly about her changed relationships.

"The point is, people have different roles. After 5 (p.m.) is one thing, you stay friends. Between 9 and 5, our roles are different. "

As far as her friendship with Hillary Rodham Clinton, she said, "There are shared values, shared understanding of things that work, things that need to be improved. We are both quite aware of the difference in our roles.

"People who have been friends as many years as we have will continue to be friends forever."

It's hard for her friends to imagine Edelman ever leaving the Children's Defense Fund, although her name was mentioned for numerous cabinet posts and more recently for Supreme Court justice. In the past, she has said she would decline because "she is doing what the Lord put her on Earth to do, be a voice for children," said CDF spokeswoman Stella Ogata.

If she ever did leave, "It would certainly mean a mini-collapse of the Children's Defense Fund," Weill said.

But according to Smith: "Marian won't settle for power. She wants change."

Since the election, some have noticed a shift in the way Edelman is positioning herself.

"More than simply being an issue advocate working for pointed policy change, she is becoming a moral leader," Brooks said.

Liberals as well as conservatives now are admitting that policy alone isn't going to change behaviors.

Edelman's ultimate goal is to change the culture. "As long as it's about things, as long as it's about violence, as long as people get their sense of power from something external, it's hard to place a value on human life.

"We certainly have the capacity and resources to eliminate child and family poverty in America." Now, she said, "It's a matter of values."

Children's Defense Fund Wish ListWhat Is Needed:

* $6.1 billion for Head Start programs by 1995.

* $3 billion to phase in basic health insurance coverage for every uninsured child and pregnant woman.

* $500 million to provide childhood vaccines to all children.

* $23 billion-$41 billion for a universal, refundable children's tax credit; expansion of the Earned Income Tax Credit for poor families.

* Full authorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

* $370 million for family support programs in every state.

* Open-ended, assured funding for family preservation, to help keep children from unnecessary foster care.
* A national child support assurance system.

* The reform of Aid to Families with Dependent Children by increasing financial incentives for recipients to work, and removing rules that discourage two-parent families from participating.

* The restoration of the minimum wage to at least $4.65 an hour.

* Gun control legislation.

* Family leave legislation.

What President Clinton Has Done:

* Enacted Family Medical and Leave Act.

* Had his Administration announce a $1.1 billion program to provide free vaccinations for all U.S. children.

* Proposed a budget that includes $20 billion to expand the Earned Income Tax Credit for the poor; $9.3 billion for Head Start; $2.6 billion for the Women, Infants and Children nutritional program; $850 million for parenting and family support, $470 million for the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

* Asked the Department of Health and Human Services to draft a child welfare program giving high priority to family preservation.

* Pledged to strengthen child support enforcement and may soon use the IRS to collect seriously delinquent support payments from "deadbeat" parents.

Source: Children's Defense Fund "An Opinion Maker's Guide to Children in Election Year 1992" and other publications.

GRAPHIC: Photo, COLOR, The White House Connection. Hillary Rodham Clinton left one of the CDF's first staff lawyers, is a former chairman of the Children's Defense Fund board and a close friend of CDF founderMarian Wright Edelman, right. Their work together "produced a real understanding, a bondbetween the two," says a CDF official. Reuters; Photo, COLOR, Marian Wright Edelman, right. AL STEPHENSON / For the Times; Photo, COLOR, Donna Shalala, secretary of Health and Human Services, is another former board member. DEBRA GERTLER / For the Times; Photo, COLOR, President Bill Clinton spoke at a Children's Defense Fund convention in a show of support for the organization founded by Marian Wright Edelman. Associated Press

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH