1ST DOCUMENT of Level 2 printed in FULL format.

Bill Tracking Report

FMLA

Don't understa

so

FMLA

105th Congress
1st Session

U. S. Senate

S 280

1997 Bill Tracking S. 280; 105 Bill Tracking S. 280

TIME FOR SCHOOLS ACT OF 1997

<=1> Retrieve full text version

DATE-INTRO: February 5, 1997

LAST-ACTION-DATE: February 5, 1997

STATUS: Referred to committee

SPONSOR: Senator Patty Murray D-WA

TOTAL-COSPONSORS: 10 Cosponsors: 10 Democrats / 0 Republicans

SYNOPSIS: A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to allow employees to take school involvement leave to participate in the school activities of their children or to participate in literacy training, and for other purposes.

ACTIONS: Committee Referrals:
02/05/97 Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee

Legislative Chronology:

1st Session Activity:

02/05/97	143 Cong Rec S 1017	Referred to the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee
02/05/97	143 Cong Rec S 1027	Remarks by Sen. Murray WA

BILL-DIGEST: (from the CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE)

Short title as introduced :

Time for Schools Act of 1997

Digest :

Time for Schools Act of 1997 - Amends the Family and Medical

Leave Act of 1993 to allow employees covered by such Act to take up to 24 hours, during any 12-month period, of school involvement leave to participate in: (1) an activity of their child's school; or (2) literacy training under a family literacy program.

Amends Federal civil service law to apply the same school involvement leave allowance to Federal employees.

CRS Index Terms:

Labor
Education
Elementary and secondary education
Families
Family leave
Federal employees
Government employees
Government information
Government paperwork
Home schooling
Literacy programs
Parent-teacher relationships

CO-SPONSORS: Original Cosponsors:

Akaka D-HI	Moseley-Braun D-IL	Daschle D-SD
Dodd D-CT	Harkin D-IA	Inouye D-HI
Kennedy D-MA	Kerry D-MA	Lautenberg D-NJ
Wellstone D-MN		

2ND DOCUMENT of Level 2 printed in FULL format.

Bill Tracking Report

105th Congress
1st Session

U. S. Senate

S 756

1997 Bill Tracking S. 756; 105 Bill Tracking S. 756

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1997

<=1> Retrieve full text version

DATE-INTRO: May 15, 1997

LAST-ACTION-DATE: June 9, 1997

STATUS: Referred to committee

SPONSOR: Senator John F. Kerry D-MA

TOTAL-COSPONSORS: 8 Cosponsors: 8 Democrats / 0 Republicans

SYNOPSIS: A bill to provide for the health, education, and welfare of children 6 years of age.

ACTIONS: Committee Referrals:
05/15/97 Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee

Legislative Chronology:

1st Session Activity:

05/15/97	143 Cong Rec S 4588	Referred to the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee
05/15/97	143 Cong Rec S 4606	Remarks by Sen. Kerry MA
06/09/97	143 Cong Rec S 5425	Cosponsor(s) added

BILL-DIGEST: (from the CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE)

Short title as introduced :

Early Childhood Development Act of 1997 Time for Schools Act of 1997

Digest :

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Title I: Assistance for Young Children

Title II: Child Care for Families

Title III: Loan Repayment for Child Care Workers

Title IV: Full Funding for the Women, Infants, and Children

Program

Title V: Amendments to the Head Start Act

Title VI: School Involvement Leave

Early Childhood Development Act of 1997 -

Title I: Assistance for Young Children

- Directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make allotments to eligible States to pay for the Federal share of the cost of enabling them to make competitive grants to local collaboratives for young child assistance activities.

(Sec. 104) Authorizes appropriations.

Title II: Child Care for Families

- Amends the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to establish a Zero-to-Six program of formula payments to States for child care assistance on behalf of children under six years of age.

(Sec. 201) Makes appropriations for such grants.

Title III: Loan Repayment for Child Care Workers

- Amends the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a program of student loan repayment for child care workers. Directs the Secretary of Education to assume the obligation to repay specified types of student loans for any borrower who is: (1) awarded an associate degree, or a baccalaureate or graduate degree, in early childhood development; and (2) employed, for not less than two years, in a child care facility serving low-income children who are primarily age birth through three.

Directs the Secretary to determine the maximum amount of loans that may be repaid under such program.

(Sec. 301) Authorizes appropriations.

Title IV: Full Funding for the Women, Infants, and Children Program

- Amends the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for full funding of the Women, Infants, and Children Program (WIC). Makes appropriations for such purpose.

Title V: Amendments to the Head Start Act

- Amends the Head Start Act to extend the authorization of appropriations and revise requirements for allotment of funds.

Title VI: School Involvement Leave

- Time for Schools Act of 1997 - Amends the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to allow covered employees to take up to 24 hours, during any 12-month period, of school involvement leave to participate in: (1) an activity of their child's school; or (2) literacy training under a family literacy program.

(Sec. 603) Amends Federal civil service law to apply the same school involvement leave allowance to Federal employees.

CRS Index Terms:

Children
Appropriations
Authorization
Budgets
Child care block grants
Child care workers
Child development
Clinics
Community health services
Community organization
Congress
Congressional reporting requirements
Day care
Dental care
Disabled
Disabled children
Drug abuse
Drug abuse treatment
Education
Education of disadvantaged children
Educational planning
Elementary and secondary education

Employee training
Eye care
Families
Family leave
Federal aid to child health services
Federal aid to child welfare
Federal aid to day care centers
Federal aid to disability services
Federal aid to education
Federal aid to higher education
Federal aid to Indians
Federal employees
Food
Government employees
Government information
Government paperwork
Health education
Health policy
Higher education
Housing
Indian children
Infants
Job training
Labor
Literacy programs
Medical care
Medical screening
Medicine
Minorities
Parent and child
Parent-school relationships
Parent-teacher relationships
Poor children
Preschool education
Preventive medicine
Public housing
School health programs
Social services
State and local government
State politics and government
Student loan funds
Teacher education
Urban affairs
Vaccination
Welfare
Women
WIC program

CO-SPONSORS: Original Cosponsors:

Moseley-Braun D-IL	Harkin D-IA	Hollings D-SC
Kennedy D-MA	Murray D-WA	Rockefeller D-WV

Wellstone D-MN

Added 06/09/97:

Moynihan D-NY

```
****------------------------------------------------------------------------****

*       9 PAGES                   217 LINES             JOB  91625   104PK2        *
*   8:37 P.M. STARTED     8:37 P.M. ENDED                 11/17/97                 *
****------------------------------------------------------------------------****
****------------------------------------------------------------------------****
*                          EEEEE      N   N      DDDD                              *
*                          E          N   N      D   D                             *
*                          E          NN  N      D   D                             *
*                          EEE        N N N      D   D                             *
*                          E          N  NN      D   D                             *
*                          E          N   N      D   D                             *
*                          EEEEE      N   N      DDDD                              *

****------------------------------------------------------------------------****

****------------------------------------------------------------------------****
```

SEND TO: FREEDMAN, THOMAS
OPD - DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL
ROOM 308
OLD EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 20502-0308

LAW OFFICES OF
MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK AND STONE, P.L.C.
A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
SEVENTH FLOOR
101 NORTH MAIN
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48104-1400

SIDNEY T. MILLER (1864-1940)
GEORGE L. CANFIELD (1866-1928)
LEWIS H. PADDOCK (1868-1935)
FERRIS D. STONE (1882-1945)

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICHIGAN
DETROIT, MICHIGAN
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN
LANSING, MICHIGAN
MONROE, MICHIGAN

NEW YORK, N.Y.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

AFFILIATED OFFICES:
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA
ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA
GDANSK, POLAND
KATOWICE, POLAND
WARSAW, POLAND

TELEPHONE (313) 663-2445
INTERNET http://www.millercanfield.com
FAX (313) 747-7147

Social Security

FAX COVER SHEET

PLEASE DELIVER TO	FAX TELEPHONE NO.
Tom Friedman	202-456-7431

FROM	Paul R. Dimond	DIRECT DIAL (313) 668-7632	
C/M NO.		DATE	

COMMENTS Tom,

Attached for your eyes only is a copy of my memo to Gene on (1) social security reform, (2) tax shift from payroll taxes to green taxes, and (3) mandatory tax cut support for 2 years of pre-school + child care paid for by cutting unjustified corporate subsidies... All in the cause of building on budget accord to ~~[illegible]~~ a new intergenerational compact for 21st century. Please call to discuss. Thanks
Paul

Total Number of Pages 4 (including this cover sheet)

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL PAGES, PLEASE CALL (313) 663-2445, EXT. 7507, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

Transmitted by: Ruth Langston Time: ________

AA/F8\109481.1-000000-00000

I. Putting our Federal Fiscal House in Order, Budget Achievement III: Complete A New Compact Between the Generations for a New Century?

A. Limit Social Security Benefits for Baby-Boomers. Subject to the real inflation in the cost of living for elderly, (a) preserve the benefits of those born in 1945 or before and (b) provide a floor above poverty after retirement for working members of the Baby Boom Generation born from 1946 through 1960. If you look carefully at Ned Gramlich's proposal, you will see that this can be accomplished without any increase in taxes or any mandatory investment (i.e. just a tax increase by another name) in the stock market. Just don't take on the issues of increasing national savings or raising the "moneysworth" for Baby-Boomers (i.e., the ratio of Baby-Boomer benefits received to social security taxes paid.) Narrow the terms of the Social Security benefit debate to solving only the problem of the extraordinarily large number of Baby Boomers through 2025. For the country as a whole, the demographic reality is that we must focus on the original purpose of Social Security for the Baby-Boom Generation if we are going to preserve the financial integrity of Social Security for future generations: a Social Insurance System that provides a floor for all working Americans to live above the poverty line after they retire from work. For Baby-boomers, additional retirement income and a higher standard of living will depend on (a) pensions earned throughout the individual's working career and (b) returns on personal retirement savings and other investments in a home, bonds, stocks and other assets. This focus on Baby-Boomers will preserve both the financial integrity of the Social Security Trust Fund through 2025 and preserve the ability of succeeding generations to choose for themselves how they want Social Security to work after 2025 in circumstances we cannot predict today.

[Note: Current retirees, and future retirees now between 52 and 65, would continue to pay taxes on Social Security benefits on a progressive basis depending on their overall incomes as required in the 1993 Budget plan. Workers between 52 and 65 would be subject to the already scheduled increase in retirement ages. And, you could add reforms that enable older Americans to continue to work (but to defer receipt of Social Security benefits or to pay taxes on Social Security benefits the same as wages and other income until they retire). But the main point of the proposed reforms in benefits is for the President and the Vice President to take the lead in focussing on limiting benefits for their own generation in order to preserve Social Security for their own and for future generations.]

2. Propose whatever else is appropriate for encouraging firm or association (e.g., TIAA-CREF, FERS, etc.) pensions (including portability), personal retirement savings (IRAs, Keoghs, SEPs, etc.), and personal investment in homes and other stakes in stocks, firms and the growth in the economy over the long haul. (Note: The reduction in Social Security taxes paid on wages by employers, workers, and the self-employed will provide plenty of room for firms and workers to save and invest more for retirement.

3. <u>Reform Social Security Taxes on a revenue neutral basis to reduce taxes on wages and employment and to substitute "Green Taxes" that will operate through the marketplace as an economic incentive to preserve the environment for future generations.</u> First, make all proposed social security reforms <u>subject to no net increase in taxes</u> -- because the total federal tax burden is high enough. Second, propose to cut the payroll taxes on wages (for employers, workers and the self-employed) in half in order to reduce the burden of this regressive tax on wages and employment (while continuing wage taxes enough to make clear that Social Security is earned through work). Third, make up for the loss in revenues from the 50% cut in Social Security wage taxes by imposing "Green Taxes" on emission of gases that increase global warming and on other emissions that pollute the air, water, and ground; and propose that these Social Security "Green Taxes" be collected from firm producers (rather than from consumers) insofar as administratively feasible. **This Social Security tax reform package will make clear that in preserving Social Security for future generations, we are also (a) providing an economic incentive for markets and American ingenuity to go to work reducing Greenhouse gases and other pollutants so that future generations will be able to enjoy a better environment and (b) reducing the tax burden on wages and employment so that today's firms and workers can produce, earn, save and invest more after taxes for their future.**

"Tax Waste not Work" = theme of Jeff Hammond's; Peter Orszag has copy of proposal and analysis (and Peter likes!)

[Note: Imposing the "Green Taxes" on firms also means that we will have a good defense to those -- at home and abroad -- who claim that we should be imposing draconian regulatory restraints that will drag the economy down (or permit bargaining that will direct economic growth away from developed areas to undeveloped areas). Remember that the new economy will increase the returns to mind-power over industrial production and resource exploitation; this change in economic returns will work to help speed the clean-up of pollution and reduce global warming resulting from industrial production. "Green taxes" will buy time for firms, consumers, scientists and government to learn what works and whether further regulatory restraints will be required.]

4. <u>Propose a revenue neutral elimination of uneconomic corporate subsidies and tax breaks in order to finance tax cuts to help working families pay for day-care and pre-school for 3-5 year-olds, after-school learning and recreation for schoolchildren, and education and training for themselves (if they lose a job and can't find a new one).</u> First, propose a total dollar amount of savings from eliminating uneconomic subsidies and tax breaks for firms (e.g., on the order of magnitude of $15-25 billion per year). [I wouldn't specify the particulars; but, if others think you must, it won't be a problem: everyone knows that the initial proposal is designed to begin to set the terms for the debate not to end the discussion]. Second, propose targeted tax credits (plus mandatory individual grants if you can't figure out how to make refundable credits work) to help working families pay for day-care and pre-school for 3 to 5 year-olds and after-school learning and

recreation for schoolchildren. [Caution: in analyzing this, you may want to figure out how this proposal fits with Head Start. I believe that the model of contracting with Head Start providers is much less effective than putting refundable pre-school credits or individual grants directly in the hands of families to make their own choices. But you can leave the Head Start issue off the table in the initial proposal.] Third, propose either a refundable "Skill" credit (or the "future income fix" we explored in November to Pell Grants) to enable workers who lose their jobs and can't find new ones to invest in the education they choose to learn new skills for new and more rewarding jobs in the new economy.

[Caution: Don't make major health care reform a front-burner Issue. Let the market forces driving managed care, HMOs, PPOs and MSAs work. Health care inflation in the private sector -- and in Medicare and Medicaid -- will continue to decline, while health care provision improves over the next ten years. I have never understood those who suggest that such market forces won't restrain costs in Medicare because the illnesses are more chronic for the elderly: baloney, where there is more "health care" (and "social visits" to Doctors) among the elderly such competitive market forces will provide even more savings and efficiency than for children and working-age families who have less "illness" (and don't want to go to the doctor's office at all unless absolutely imperative). Just sit tight on health care: claim substantial victory in the Balanced Budget Agreement; play at the margins if you think you need to propose something to prevent consideration of broader reforms; learn from experience; and sit back to reap the substantial bonus from lower than projected health care costs!]

[Note: This was drafted before Budget Agreement rejected Senate/POTUS proposal to have higher Medicare premiums for wealthy. This is a reform that still makes sense to me]

[Note: The proposals for "tax reform" reduce "flat" taxes on work & self-employment and uneconomic corporate subsidies in exchange for "green taxes" and "pre-school/child care credits" is also crucial to blunt R charge for tax reform through "flat taxes." We can't beat "something" with "nothing" -- so we should propose our own tax reform as integral part of new intergenerational compact!]