

probably weighed several tons. A strong gust of wind caught the structure like a sail which caused the collapse. Although many of the birds were caught under the wire mesh, at least 33 rare birds were carried away on high winds. The zoo has asked local birders to be on the lookout for these rare arian species.

The aviary was the home to the largest breeding colony in North America of the inca terns, a South American sea bird. Also lost were grey gulls, andean gulls, and a bandtail gull. These birds have a slim chance of survival in the urban wild due to their sheltered upbringing. Zookeepers hope that some of these birds will return to the familiar site of the aviary due to their hunger, but fear that the winds may have carried them too far away.

Mr. Speaker, the Bronx Zoo aviary was an historic landmark which generations of New Yorkers and visitors enjoyed. I commend to my colleagues' attention the New York Times article of this tragedy. The zoo will celebrate its centennial next year and zoo officials hope to rebuild the aviary, despite the cost of such a project at a time of tight budgets.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1995]

BIRDS FLEE WRECKAGE OF BRONX ZOO AVIARY
(By Robert D. McFadden)

The gracefully arched, 19th-century aviary at the Bronx Zoo—home to a colony of 100 South American sea birds and a landmark to generations of New Yorkers and visitors—collapsed in a gust of wind under the weight of a foot of snow during Saturday's storm, and dozens of rare, exotic gulls and terns flew away, zoo officials said yesterday.

No people were in the aviary at the north end of the zoo near Fordham Road when the huge cage of torn, twisted wire mesh crashed down on a coastal habitat of rock outcroppings, murky pools, pebble beaches and island nesting nooks at 10:45 A.M. No birds were killed and only one was known to have been injured.

And many birds were trapped under the tangle of wire and saved, officials said. Ten flightless Magellanic penguins waddled into their rookeries, guanay cormorants and other survivors, including an oystercatcher, took cover in nesting cavities. Zoo keepers quickly rushed in with nets, trying to minimize the loss.

But at least 33 birds—8 Grey gulls, 12 Andean gulls, one Band-Tail gull and 12 Inca terns—escaped and were carried away on high winds from the small artificial realm where they had been hatched, fed and protected into a harsh world where they may have to compete with city sea gulls, crows and other toughs of the air.

"It's a very sad day," Dr. Donald Bruning, the zoo's curator of birds, said in an interview yesterday. "The aviary was beautiful and has been around for almost a century. And the birds would be very difficult to replace. The Inca terns were by far the largest breeding colony in North America, and we've lost almost half of them."

Zoo officials asked bird-watchers and the public to be on the lookout for the escaped birds, whose native habitats are the coasts of Peru and Chile, and issued descriptions and other advice about how to spot, capture and report them. To avoid being swamped by calls from everyone who sees a nonexotic gull or a tern, the zoo issued a list of "bird rehabilitators," licensed experts in aiding wildlife, to serve as intermediaries.

But Dr. Bruning said the chances of recovering the birds seemed slim. He noted that high winds, which gusted up to 50 miles an hour, could have carried them by late yesterday across most of the New York metropolitan area and New Jersey, and that the likeli-

hood of finding and recapturing them appeared to be as dubious as their chances of survival in the urban wild.

"Most of them were hatched and raised in the aviary and have no experience outside," he said. "The cold will not bother them, but it will not be easy for them to find food. They will have to compete with local gulls and other birds, and this is not the best time of the year for trying to find food."

Since the flyaways were accustomed to shelter and regular feedings of fish, Dr. Bruning said the best hope for their recovery was that some had resisted the high winds and taken shelter nearby and would return to the aviary ruins in search of a meal.

"They know food is available and would come back to that," Dr. Bruning said. "We're hoping that when they get hungry and can't find a supply of fish, they may start looking to come back to the cage—that is, if the wind hasn't blown them too far away. If they find themselves in a completely strange area, they won't know how to find their way back."

Pans of smeltlike capelin and other small fish were put out at the aviary wreckage yesterday to lure any nearby fugitives back, but the only taker seen at dusk was a strutting crow.

The structure that collapsed, known as the Harry du Jur Aviary, was built in 1899, three years after the founding of the New York Zoological Society. It was one of the first animal shelters built at the Bronx Zoo, then still in the midst of farms and now a 265-acre tract of hilly parkland bounded by Fordham Road, Southern Boulevard, East 180th Street and the Bronx River Parkway.

The aviary was unique at the time—a huge cage topped with an arch of wire mesh 80 feet high, 150 feet long and 90 feet wide—where birds could live and fly about in a habitat that simulated nature's, and where the people could enter through double wire doors and walk unobtrusively among them.

In the early 1980's, Dr. Bruning said, the aviary was remodeled and a new wire mesh arch was installed, along with a redesigned interior habitat. But the pipelike supports for the arch were not replaced, and after the collapse many of these pipes—96 years old—were found to be rusted where they joined the wire mesh of the arch, about 15 feet above the foundation, Dr. Bruning said.

"You could see the rust once it broke off," he said. "All of the pipes broke at the same joint all the way around the cage."

Saturday's snow was wet and heavy, Dr. Bruning noted, and when it ended at mid-morning the foot of snow that spread over the arch must have weighed many tons. It became even heavier as sleet and rain began falling and were absorbed into the snow. But it was not mere weight that brought the aviary down, he said.

"Apparently there was a strong gust of wind that caught the whole structure like a sail," he said. "The entire cage collapsed on the interior. All the arch members broke apart and separated. There were cables that went across for support and they came down too. It was a mass of twisted and torn mesh, and there were gaps in it—very large holes where some of the birds escaped."

The only immediate casualty of the collapse was a cormorant that sustained a slight cut. Many of the birds were trapped under the mesh. Some took refuge in their nesting areas, others were saved by keepers, who were next door in the Aquatic Bird House and rushed out with nets after hearing the roar. Survivors were taken to other bird shelters at the zoo.

Zoo officials asked bird-watchers and the public for help in finding the escapees, and they provided brief descriptions:

Inca tern adult has a dark blue-gray body, white mustache, red bill and feet and is 14 to 17 inches long, while the juvenile has a black bill and feet and no mustache.

Andean gull has a white head with crescent black earmarks, light gray upper body with white underparts and a 22-inch length.

Grey gull is uniformly slate gray with black bill, faint eye rings and is 19 to 20 inches long.

Band-Tail gull is white with yellow bill and feet, a white body and black wings.

All but the Band-Tail and some of the Andean gulls have leg bands. Zoo officials asked anyone who spots one of these birds to contact the zoo or one of the bird rehabilitators whose names and numbers it made public. They noted that it was unlikely that anyone could catch one of the birds, but if a bird is caught, it should not be taken indoors, but kept in a well ventilated cardboard box. The birds are not dangerous, but can bite if grabbed.

Dr. Bruning said he hoped the aviary would be rebuilt, especially in time for the zoo's centennial next year. He noted that it might cost several hundred thousand dollars and that there was little money for such a project at a time of tight budgets. But he called it an important facet of the zoo.

"It is tragic to lose this beautiful landmark aviary," the curator said.

THE NORTH KOREAN NUCLEAR ACCORD—DOES IT MATTER?

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to turn their attention today to the nuclear accord signed last October with North Korea.

As Members know, this is a complex agreement that will be implemented in stages over a 10-year period. At its simplest, this agreement constitutes a trade. On one side, North Korea will halt and eventually dismantle its nuclear weapons program, accepting extensive international inspections to verify its compliance. In exchange, the international community has agreed to provide the North with alternative energy sources, initially in the form of heavy fuel oil, and later with proliferation-resistant light-water reactor technology.

The agreement also provides for movement toward the normalization of relations between the United States and North Korea, and for resuming a dialog between the two Koreas.

In evaluating this accord, it is instructive to compare what we get from this agreement with what we have agreed to give North Korea. On the positive side of the ledger, the benefits to us and our friends, including South Korea and Japan, are substantial. The agreement calls for:

An immediate freeze on the North Korean nuclear weapons program—a step the North has already taken.

Immediate international and United States inspections of the North's principal nuclear facilities—which are now being carried out on a continuing basis.

The promise of the eventual elimination of the entire North Korean nuclear weapons program.

A commitment by North Korea not only to live up to its obligations under the Nuclear

Nonproliferation Treaty, but to accept restrictions that go well beyond the treaty.

The beginnings of a process that could dampen tensions along the demilitarized zone separating the two Koreas and reduce the chances of the outbreak of a new Korean war.

A North Korean commitment to resume a political dialog with South Korea.

And what does North Korea get in return for these significant concessions?

Interim shipments of heavy oil in quantities equal to the energy it has given up by shutting down its graphite moderated nuclear reactors—roughly 3.5 percent of its electrical generation capacity.

Two light-water reactors, to replace the graphite moderated reactors it has forsworn.

The gradual lifting of United States sanctions against North Korea.

Political dialog and the beginnings of a process that could eventually lead to the normalization of diplomatic relations with the United States.

Certainly this agreement does not address every concern we have about North Korea—its conventional military might, ballistic missile program, or deplorable human rights record. Even in the nuclear sphere, we will have to wait some 5 years before we are permitted to carry out the special inspections that will reveal whether the North has secret stocks of plutonium.

What this agreement does is provide us with an opening—one that did not exist before—to lift the specter of a nuclear arms race from the Korean Peninsula, begin a process of meaningful dialog between the two Koreas, and come to grips with the other problems that continue to concern us.

Mr. Speaker, four decades ago more than 30,000 brave Americans gave their lives in Korea for the cause of freedom. They succeeded in turning back North Korean aggression. But their larger purpose—to lay the groundwork for a Korean Peninsula free from the threat of war—remains unfulfilled.

This agreement represents a giant step toward the achievement of that larger purpose. It does not resolve all outstanding issues between North Korea and the rest of the world. It does not guarantee that future relations with the North will be without tensions and difficulties.

But, if fully implemented, the Geneva accord will advance our national interests and those of our allies, while holding out the promise of a better, more peaceful life to the people of Korea, both South and North.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

HON. BILL ORTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, there are few things that more people agree upon than the fact that our welfare system is a failure. No one likes it. Taxpayers don't like it, politicians don't like it, and most of all—welfare recipients don't like it.

Our welfare system often provides people who choose not to work with a better deal than those who choose to take a job. We need to create a system where work is not pe-

nalized, and where the logical choice for parents is to work to provide for their children.

For this reason, I am pleased to reintroduce the Self-Sufficiency Act, a bill aimed at encouraging the welfare reform efforts that States already have underway. The Self-Sufficiency Act uses a commonsense approach to welfare that provides assistance to participants who are working toward self-sufficiency, promotes work, and gradually eliminates benefits to those who have chosen not to participate in a self-sufficiency plan.

Moreover, the Self-Sufficiency Act may serve as a necessary transition to a welfare system that provides States with even greater control over the welfare system.

Many of the reform plans that are on the table right now are based on controversial assumptions. For example, while block grants sound like a good idea, there are serious concerns about whether most States have the capabilities and resources to take over the reigns of a social welfare system that spans some 350 programs. The Self-Sufficiency Act provides for the coordinated services and State flexibility necessary to shape welfare systems that reflect the unique needs of each State population. This bill provides a middle ground for those States that have reservations about other reform proposals.

This bill is based upon a program, the single parent employment demonstration program, that decreased the Aid to Families with Dependent Children caseload in the Kearns demonstration area 33 percent in just 2 years. The best part is that the decrease in the number of participants is due to success in assisting people in finding jobs that exist in the labor market.

Amazingly, 44 Federal Government waivers had to be approved before Utah could begin using this approach to welfare. Other States seeking to improve upon the current system have encountered similar obstacles. This plan allows States to forgo the redtape and get on with helping people enter the labor market.

Under this act, States may choose an approach to the Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC] program that requires participants to work toward self-sufficiency. This approach requires every participant to negotiate a self-sufficiency plan with a caseworker. Each plan specifies an employment goal.

Under this approach, participants will have 25 percent of benefits reduced for the first month and a gradual complete phase-out of benefits over the course of 2 years if they do not follow their self-sufficiency plan.

Once a State receives approval to use the self-sufficiency approach, it must phase-in 25 percent of the State recipients at the end of 3 years, 50 percent at the end of 5 years, 75 percent at the end of 8 years, and 100 percent at the end of 10 years. In other words, the State must be committed to transforming its welfare system into a self-sufficiency based system.

States that choose this approach are required to coordinate self-sufficiency activities with programs operated under the JTPA and any other relevant programs.

States that choose this approach must provide child care for those participants that require child care assistance. This provision ensures that children will not be neglected due to the activities required of a parent participating in the self-sufficiency program. In order to lessen the financial burden for States that

choose this approach, Federal matching rates for AFDC, transitional, and at-risk child care are increased by 10 percent for these States.

In order to encourage States to continually increase the efficiency and effectiveness of their welfare program, States may receive half of any estimated AFDC grant savings to use to improve their self-sufficiency programs.

In addition, certain AFDC eligibility requirements are altered or eliminated for States using this approach in order to decrease administrative burdens and discourage long-term welfare dependency:

(1) The requirement that families must have received AFDC for a minimum period before becoming eligible for transitional Medicaid and child care benefits is eliminated. This provision served as an incentive for families to stay on welfare for a certain minimum amount of time even if they had to turn down employment opportunities.

(2) Transitional Medicaid benefits and transitional child care benefits are allowed without regard to type of income that would otherwise make the family ineligible for benefits. This is a deletion of a well-meaning regulation that has resulted in administrative time needlessly being spent to determine how the last dollar of income was received by a participant.

(3) The current requirement that minor parents and pregnant minors without children must live with a responsible adult is strengthened.

Finally, the Secretary of HHS and other specified entities are called upon to develop performance standards appropriate to judge the effectiveness of programs developed under this approach. HHS is allowed to modify the AFDC Federal matching rate for participating States to reflect the effectiveness of the State in carrying out the program. State effectiveness will be judged in part on the basis of the number of participants who have become ineligible for AFDC due to earnings.

A State that has been approved to use the self-sufficiency approach may choose any or all of the following options:

(1) Treat two-parent families in the same manner as single parent families—although two-parent families are ineligible for AFDC until 30 days after the loss of employment, and both parents must follow a personal plan or invoke the benefit reduction for the entire family.

(2) Limit family AFDC benefits to the amount for which the family was initially determined eligible—family cap.

(3) Provide a diversion payment of an amount up to 3 months of the benefit for which the family would be eligible if they participated in AFDC. This option can only be used for families that are facing a crisis or need only temporary assistance to prevent them from coming onto AFDC. If the family later decides they must enter the AFDC system, the entire amount is subtracted from payments before they begin receiving assistance. Families that received diversion payments would be eligible for 3 months of transitional child care and Medicaid benefits.

(4) Enhance AFDC payments by not more than \$50 per month for participants with a full-time self-sufficiency schedule.

(5) Increase the earned income disregard rate from the current one-third rate to a rate as and high as one-half, or allow income earned by teens in the JTPA summer program to be discounted.