

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1996 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1995 amount, the 1996 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1996 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	\$241,553,071,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	236,344,017,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	243,997,500,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	242,683,841,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1996	243,251,297,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	+1,698,226,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	+6,907,280,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	-746,203,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	+567,456,000

BILL YOUNG,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
BOB LIVINGSTON,
JERRY LEWIS,
JOE SKEEN,
DAVID L. HOBSON,
HENRY BONILLA,
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT,
Jr.,
MARK W. NEUMANN (except
to the agreement
regarding U.S.
deployment in Bosnia),
JOHN P. MURTHA,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
CHARLES WILSON,
W.G. (BILL) HEFNER,
MARTIN OLAV SABO,

Managers on the Part of the House.

TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
ARLEN SPECTER,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
PHIL GRAMM,
KIT BOND,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
CONNIE MACK,
RICHARD C. SHELBY,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
DANIEL K. INOUE,
FRITZ HOLLINGS,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
PATRICK J. LEAHY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HIGH ONE

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, fair and equitable treatment of our military personnel and our veterans deserves greater attention in this Congress.

Dedicating one's self to our national security should at least result in some personal security at retirement time.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has approved a plan to refigure the retirement pay that our men and women in the military had figured on as being theirs at retirement time.

They call it High One, but the Texans that I have been hearing from say it is little more than "hi and bye."

We have folks who have served in the military for 10 and 20 years, the whole time thinking that they had a fixed income when they retired. Then along comes this formula refiguring and all of a sudden some folks who calculated a particular retirement find out they have got to do some recalculating. This is all the more unfortunate given the inattention and inaction on some other issues like COLA inequity, Medicare subvention, and forgotten widows.

It is time to give our veterans and those who are in our military the attention they deserve. As the old saying goes, "It's not doing our veterans a favor, it's repaying one."

THE 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF REPUBLICAN CONTRACT AND RELATED EVENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is an appropriate time to focus America's attention on what occurred 1 year ago tomorrow, because we have come to the first anniversary, birthday party No. 1, so to speak, of the so-called Contract on America, announced on the Capitol steps with many smiles about this time last year.

Certainly if one is to assess and evaluate that contract based on hyperbole, based on rhetoric from the floor of this Congress, it has been a great success. It has been something that would give cause for great celebration, if we were to analyze what has been said about it in this Chamber rather than what is actually happening out in the real lives of real people across America.

If one is to evaluate this contract in terms of what legislation has been passed and signed into law in the law books of America that might have some impact on people across America, one gets a more modest evaluation, because in fact thus far we have had a bill passed and signed into law dealing with the question of unfunded mandates; a bill passed and signed into law that was really a Democratic idea that passed the last session of Congress, to require that the House and the Senate and all of our congressional institutions abide by and follow the same laws that we pass and apply to businesses across America and to people across America. A good idea, signed into law, should have been signed into law and would have been, had the will of this House last year been accomplished.

So that is two bills out of many proposed and discussed from this microphone, not exactly revolutionary, that have been placed into law.

There is a third measure that has passed both the House and the Senate, another Democratic idea. It is called

the line-item veto. The line-item veto would be law now and would allow President Clinton to go in and pencil out, redline certain bits of pork barrel either in the Tax Code or in the appropriations bills, but for Republican objection.

Members will recall that last year when this great Contract on America was unfolded here on the steps of the Capitol, with all the smiles and the bright lights and cameras rolling, that it included a line-item veto that apply not only to pork barrel spending but to tax loopholes. But when the bill got here to the floor of the House, a little surgery was performed and the tax loophole part was kept out. They are protected. They are preserved.

The President, under the line-item veto as passed by the House and by the Senate, would be powerless to really get at the tax loopholes that protect the privileged few, that need attention in this country. But there is still some merit to the bill. We passed it in a way that the President would be able to do something about pork-barrel spending, and certainly there is too much of that.

But again, despite the hyperbole and the announcement of the great revolutionaries about all they were accomplishing in this bill, and how they wanted to rush it over to President Clinton so he would have a chance to either put up or shut up in terms of line iteming some of these items, they decided that they really did not want that to happen. So they have dillydallied around and delayed and just never gotten around to adjusting the differences between the House and the Senate.

In fact, we had to wait until just this past month for there even to be conferees appointed to adjust the differences between the House and the Senate, and some Members of the Senate were saying what is obviously true; that is, that the House leadership, which proclaimed itself to be so revolutionary from this and other microphones back in January, did not really want President Clinton to have the power to go in and line item out the pork barrel that they put in this set of appropriations bills, the few that they have gotten past the Congress, and those that will be dumped out in the President's lap within the next week or two.

So the line-item veto, which was one of the centerpieces of this contract that you would expect people to be celebrating today, is not law today, and it is not law today because the self-proclaimed revolutionaries did not want the revolution to occur so early that it might clip a little of their pork barrel out of the appropriations bills.

It is also appropriate, as we look at and evaluate what has happened with reference to this Contract on America, to look at what lies ahead in the next few days. We got an indication of how really extreme its proponents are in comments that were made over the last

couple of days, the incredible declaration of Speaker GINGRICH, the contract's father, that, "I don't care what the price is. I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days. Not this time," in indicating in a speech in front of the Public Securities Association that he is ready to shut down everything if he does not get it exactly his way.

Indeed, after those very inappropriate remarks, the dollar plunged as much as 5 percent in world markets, interest rates went up sharply, and we are already paying for this extremist zeal that says, "I don't care what the price is as long as I get it my way." That is the same kind of approach that is really what is the cause of not passing more items in the contract, some of which are decent principles and could have been shaped in a bipartisan fashion to a point of moderation.

But when you take such an extremist, such a zealous point of view that you are willing to shut down everything if you do not get it your way, then you often do not get it America's way. In fact, at the same time that this remark was being made, Americans were themselves speaking out.

The Wall Street Journal reported on Friday the latest results, that Americans by a vote in one poll of almost 2 to 1 disapprove of the job that this Contract-on-America Congress is doing. I think it is because much of the same sense of extremism that characterizes the Speaker's remarks on Friday, that are reflected in the remarks of one of the Nation's leading Republicans in commenting on his party. Former Governor Kean of New Jersey, saying this was not the year for him to run, declared this month: "I'm moderate. I'm in a party that's becoming radicalized. That creates a problem."

Indeed it is a problem, not just for Governor Kean. It is a problem for America.

You can thumb through the TV Guide where they printed that contract and you can look at it inside out, upside down, backward and forward, and one of the things that you will not find in there is the Republican Medicare plan. That is, the Republican "pay more, get less" Medicare plan.

You will not find, in your TV Guide or anywhere in the Contract on America, the claim that what we need to do is to cut the Medicare Program by \$270 billion, that we need to raise the premiums for our seniors and our disabled people, that we need to raise the deductible and we need to find some way to have the largest cut in Medicare in our Nation's history.

Of course, you just saw a report presented by one of our committees. You will not find anywhere in the contract or in the report of this Congress's work a copy of the piece of legislation to implement that.

That is particularly unfortunate, because it was only a short time after the announcement of the contract that the Speaker was saying in November and

actually reading from parts of the contract what seemed to me to be a very desirable reform.

He said,

We will change the rules of the House to require that all documents and all conference reports and all committee reports be filed electronically as well as in writing, and that they cannot be filed unless they are available to any American citizen who wants to pull them up. Thus information will be available to any citizen in the country at the same moment it is available to the highest paid Washington lobbyist.

Well, the problem that we find ourselves in on this first anniversary of the contract, the Washington lobbyists, some of them have the Medicare cut, \$270 billion. No Democratic Member of Congress has it. No citizen anywhere in this country can go to the Internet, can go to any kind of system and get a copy of this bill, because it is yet to be presented.

In fact, what occurred on Friday was a bit of a charade. It was a hearing of the Committee on Ways and Means, not on a bill the way that Congress would ordinarily operate, but indeed what is truly revolutionary. For the first time the Committee on Ways and Means designates one day of hearings on the future of all of our 37 million seniors, the cut of \$270 billion, and what do they have a hearing on? Not a bill but a press release.

They call in their first witness, a Republican actuary who admits under questioning he has never seen the bill. All he has got is the press release. Yet he is an expert on that press release, and he is at least candid enough to indicate that the Medicare trust fund would be secure for 10 years in the future as long as the Republicans plan to secure it with a change of \$160 billion. That leaves \$110 billion out of this plan, 41 percent of the cuts that do not have anything to do with the Medicare trust fund.

If we Democrats and Republicans would come together and work together, we could resolve any of the issues concerning the Medicare trust fund. There is no crisis here that demands immediate cuts and immediate increases in the out-of-pocket cost to the Nation's seniors. No, as their own first witness commented, though all he had was a press release and not a bill, this does not have to be done.

My concern is about the 50 percent of retirees that I was hearing about. Since there was only 1 day of hearings, some of us organized hearings here on the lawn of the Capitol and listened to real people, seniors, come and tell us about the problems that they would face under this Republican Medicare plan. We heard that over 50 percent of our Nation's retirees received only Social Security; that is their sole means of support, and half of those receive only \$7,000 a year.

When this Republican Medicare plan, pay more, get less, raise your premiums, raise your deductible, raise your out-of-pocket cost in order to cut Medicare by \$270 billion, when that

goes into effect, what will be the impact on that 50 percent of the senior retirees who get Social Security and only get \$7,000 a year? They are going to face some tough choices, tough choices about health care versus food, health care versus heat, health care versus rent. They are choices that we ought not to impose on people that have helped to build this into the greatest country in the entire world.

But that is not all that was omitted from the Contract on America as we look back on it. Indeed, at the same time that the press release was the subject of a hearing in the Committee on Ways and Means, we find that the House Committee on Commerce was attacking America's seniors from another direction. That is what reference to Medicaid, which in my State of Texas provides the funding for 3 out of every 4 people that are in a nursing home. They get their funding through Medicaid.

In addition to terminating the Medicaid Program, last week the House Committee on Commerce, though you cannot find it anywhere in your own TV Guide, they came in and abolished all Federal nursing home standards that set the standards for nursing and nursing care for our Nation's seniors. That is right. They say it cannot happen but it has happened, that every nursing home standard is recommended for total elimination from the Federal level.

Moreover, the committee even went so far as to reject an amendment offered by one of my Democratic colleagues that would prohibit the States from requiring the spouses of nursing home residents to have to sell their home or car to pay for a husband's or wife's care. That means that under the Republican Medicaid plan, that those 3 out of 4 Texas seniors that rely on Medicaid for their nursing home care, a spouse, unless some other action is taken, could be compelled by a State to have to sell their car or their home in order to simply provide their spouse with long-term nursing home care when no other alternative is available. Omissions from the printed Contract on America, but what is happening in real life, not in the speeches, but what is happening in real life on the floors of this Congress.

When it comes to the way that the Congress actually operates, the way it conducts its business, my main concern with my Republican colleagues is not that they have changed things in this House too much but that they have not changed it enough.

In fact, we heard earlier in the year a good bit about the need to reform the operation of the Congress, the Congressional Accountability Act. But when it has come to real reform in the way the lobby influences the Congress, when it has come to real reform in terms of dealing with gifts, with free ski trips, with the golf caucus, with lavish lunches and dinners, nothing has been done in this Congress on the House

side. All that we have heard is equivocal and procrastination.

As recently as August of this year, Speaker GINGRICH has said that the House Calendar is too full with other items to deal with lobby reform and gift reform, and proposed that perhaps they would prepare a paper on the subject. Recently there has been speculation that when they finish with the Medicare plan, maybe we would get to give some attention to these matters. Indeed, we should, because I sense that between the lines of that contract was basically a dissatisfaction with the way that this Congress has operated in the past.

It is time to get down to the real issues, the campaign finance issue on which Speaker GINGRICH shook hands with the President in New Hampshire, long forgotten. Hardly had the smile faded than that was forgotten, and nothing occurred with reference to campaign finance reform.

So on campaign finance reform, on lobby reform, on gift ban, these are issues that this Congress needs to address if we are to have a real revolution instead of a phony one. When we get down to that issue of lobby reform and gift ban reform, two issues that the Senate had failed to deal with are issues that my Democratic colleagues have been urging.

On the issue of lobby reform, the Honorable GEORGE MILLER of California has suggested that one of the most effective lobby reforms would be to simply require that any time an amendment or a bill is offered, you have to indicate any lobbyist who had a hand in writing it. I sat through a hearing where the committee counsel actually would turn around and talk to the lobbyist that helped write the bill on committee computers, in order to give the answers to questions that were being raised about the bill.

Do the American people, in a spirit of openness, not have a right to know who writes the legislation here and if it is one of these special interest lobbyists? Let us honor them and give them the attention that they deserve by actually putting their name down as a part of our rules, as the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has suggested.

When it comes to gift ban, though I am encouraged by the progress that the Senate has made, as I have studied that measure, one of the unfortunate deficiencies in the bill is that, unlike what my Democratic colleagues passed before I reached the Congress during 1994, this gift ban legislation says absolutely nothing about books and book royalties and payments from the likes of Rupert Murdoch or anyone else to a Member of Congress in order to have a book.

I think the American people are concerned about that issue. I see no reason why our gift ban and lobby legislation ought not to address the issue of book royalties and book payments to Members, because that is a way to circumvent these matters. If you have

someone who can come along and offer a \$4.5 million book contract or can offer large royalties on a book, certainly that can influence the legislative process.

It is appropriate that this Congress provide meaningful gift ban and lobby reform, not just partial, by dealing with the gift ban issue, the book issue, and by dealing with the question of which lobbyists are writing which laws. Of course this Congress has additional need to approach these issues and deal with these concerns because of the ethical cloud that has hung over it.

Rather than deal with that, let me go back a few years and turn to the speech of Speaker GINGRICH when he was Congressman GINGRICH, discussing the issue of our ethics process here in the House, which I think is very important to the whole way that we review the Contract on America and the whole way that the Congress is viewed by the American people.

He said from this very place, in the well of the House, on July 27, 1988, and I am quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from Speaker GINGRICH, :

In order to conduct a thorough and credible investigation, the special counsel needs unlimited subpoena power. Both Common Cause and I insist that in order to carry out the responsibilities of an outside counsel effectively, it is necessary for the counsel's authority and independence to be clearly and publicly established. The special counsel must have the authority and independence necessary to conduct the inquiry in an effective and credible manner.

Speaker GINGRICH, then Congressman GINGRICH from Georgia, said:

Clearly this investigation has to meet a higher standard of public accountability and integrity. I think it is vital that every Member reflect on the fact that the integrity of the House is at stake, and that all of us have a responsibility to ensure that the standards being set are those of an extraordinary investigation.

I could not have said it better. I do not know a Member of this House who could have spoken more eloquently on the subject of the authority and the direction of an independent counsel.

Why is it that those good words of Speaker GINGRICH in 1988 have been forgotten? It seems to me that we should, in the course of discussing the general issue of ethics in this House, consider having independent counsel available when there are questions raised about a Member's conduct that has this kind of broad authority. Certainly that is true with reference to an investigation of a Speaker.

Indeed, at the same time Speaker GINGRICH also said:

It seems to me for this investigation to have any legitimacy, it has to be allowed to follow the leads wherever they lead, and it seems to me that it ought to be that the independent counsel has to be truly independent. He cannot be on a short leash held by the Democratic chairman of the committee.

There again is some very insightful comment that it does not pay to have an ethics investigation. If you are going to take your watchdog and you

are going to keep him on such a short leash that they cannot watch anything, they do not have full authority, then what good is it to have a watchdog in the first place?

Fortunately, we know exactly what an independent counsel for the Ethics Committee ought to do because in addition to these comments, Mr. GINGRICH outlined in 1988, along with the outline from Common Cause, exactly what should occur.

He issued a press release insisting that the House Ethics Committee give the special counsel appointed to investigate the Speaker at that time the independence necessary to do a thorough and complete job. He said he was discouraged by several news reports that the special counsel, Richard Phelan, would be restricted in the scope of his investigation, and he proceeded to write the chairman of the Ethics Committee a letter identifying what the authority of the special counsel should be.

He was very proud of the fact that Archibald Cox, the then head of Common Cause, joined in the recommendations for what a special counsel should be permitted to do. He referenced the Common Cause letter that it "commit itself," the Ethics Committee, "to the following measures:"

No. 1, the outside counsel should have full authority to investigate and present evidence and arguments before the Ethics Committee

concerning questions about the Speaker;

No. 2, the outside counsel shall have full authority to organize, select, and hire staff on a full- or part-time basis in such numbers as that counsel reasonably requires, and will be provided with such funds and facilities as the counsel reasonably requires;

No. 3, the outside counsel shall have full authority to review all documentary evidence available from any source and full cooperation of the committee in obtaining such evidence;

No. 4, the committee shall give the outside counsel full cooperation in the issuance of subpoenas;

No. 5, the outside counsel shall be free, after discussion with the committee, to make such public statements and reports as the counsel deems appropriate;

No. 6, the outside counsel shall have full authority to recommend that formal charges be brought before the Ethics Committee, shall be responsible for initiating and conducting proceedings if formal charges have been brought, and shall handle any aspects of the proceedings believed to be necessary for full inquiry.

No. 7, the committee shall not countermand or interfere with the outside counsel's ability to take steps necessary to conduct a full and fair investigation.

No. 8, the outside counsel will not be removed, except for good cause.

□ 1230

Those are the eight guidelines, not from me, but from Speaker GINGRICH, endorsing a position of Common Cause in 1988, concerning the way to structure an independent counsel. It is time that this Congress adopted the same kind of approach.

Indeed, Common Cause has not been silent to this Congress. In a communication this past week, the new head of Common Cause, Ann McBride, has said let us do the same things again. Just because it is 1995, instead of 1988, that is no reason to forget these eight principles, just because we might be dealing with a Republican Speaker instead of a Democratic Speaker. That is no reason to set up a separate standard of conduct.

Our laws are to be applied fairly, certainly our ethical precepts, without regard to whether we are dealing with Democrat, Republican or independent, because it is the people's business we are doing. And an ethical cloud hangs over this House when there is no true independent investigation or when there is any attempt to muzzle the watchdog independent counsel that needs to be appointed to attend to these matters.

So it is that this past week the chairman of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has received a communication from Ann McBride, the president of Common Cause, calling for exactly the same thing to occur. Referring to the 1988 letter concerning the Democratic Speaker at that time, and saying, as I have indicated, that at that time in the investigation of the Speaker it was Mr. GINGRICH himself who stated he agreed with the points made in Common Cause's letter, endorsed the above measures and called for providing the outside counsel with true independence and full leeway in pursuing the investigation.

She says:

Common Cause has long supported an appropriate role for an independent voice in dealing with congressional ethics matters. Appointing an outside person with unquestioned integrity, with a nonpartisan background and experience in dealing with matters of this kind, will be a critical matter in obtaining a publicly credible result.

I could serve to repeat and to underline and to emphasize each of those phrases, because that is what we are looking for in an independent counsel; someone who has the power to get the job done and someone who has the independence, the unquestioned integrity, the nonpartisan background, the experience in dealing with matters of this kind, to achieve a publicly credible result. Not a result that helps Democrats; not a result that whitewashes Republicans; but a result that is fair and independent and thorough.

That is what Common Cause, as of last week, said is needed. The same thing, the same position that they took in 1988, when the shoe was on the other party, on the other foot.

The process—

Common Cause says—

that the Committee uses in looking into this matter involving Speaker GINGRICH, the most powerful Member of the House of Representatives, will directly reflect on the integrity of the institution. We urge the committee to retain an outside counsel and to

clearly and publicly establish the counsel's authority and independence.

The Hartford Current has adopted the same call and with good reason. They say:

An outside counsel should not be hamstrung by a narrow mandate. No questions should be left unanswered. If they are, Mr. GINGRICH would serve under a cloud.

And so, as we do a full and fair evaluation of this contract, we find that one of the biggest questions that remains unanswered is how the great proponent of this contract, the person who said as recently as Friday that he did not care what the price is, he did not care what the consequences were, if it caused interest rates to go up and the dollar to fall, he is willing to shut the Government down, whether we will have a full, fair, and thorough investigation by a nonpartisan person of unquestioned integrity into the charges that have been made.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is essential on this anniversary of the contract, that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which has delayed and delayed and delayed, get about its job, complete this investigation, appoint someone with credibility, and restore the credibility which Americans are increasingly doubting about this institution. Restore that credibility with a full, thorough and fair, nonpartisan investigation of the charges that have been made about Speaker GINGRICH and the book deal, with GOPAC, about all these other ethical charges that raise such serious concerns. Let us finish this Contract on America anniversary party by celebrating with a fair and nonpartisan investigation of Speaker GINGRICH who gave it to us.

DISAGREEMENT WITH THE SENATE VERSION OF WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TATE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me this time to address the House.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I would like to provide some insights and comments about the welfare reform bill which we read passed the Senate last week by a very large vote.

Commentators on the welfare reform legislation have been forecasting, rather uniformly, that because of the Senate action and the very large vote that it received, that quite likely, a welfare reform bill will be enacted which parallels basically what the Senate did.

I rise today to take a great deal of disagreement with the Senate plan. I, of course, objected very strenuously to the House-passed bill, which we did some time in May of this year. I will not take the time to recount all of the various disagreements I had with the House plan, but for this afternoon I

want to concentrate on the points in the Senate bill which I find still lacking. As a consequence, I hope that the President and his administration will look at it more carefully, and I hope that they will come to a decision to veto it.

As you know, when the House bill and the Senate bill are different, what happens is that both Houses designate a conference committee. Conferees of the majority party basically come together and try to iron out the differences. So the best that we could hope to achieve in the conference compromise, so to speak, would be the level of program as authorized by the Senate version.

Mr. Speaker, it is based upon that assumption that the Senate bill cannot be improved upon that I make my statement today in disagreement and in objection to the Senate-passed bill.

Recently, we have heard members of the majority party taking the well, particularly during our 1-minutes, to exclaim over the fact that the Washington Post has now seen fit to support the majority party with reference to its efforts to reform the Medicare plan, and denouncing the Democrats, on the other hand, for failing to come up with a proposal.

Given the sudden recognition and recognition of the Washington Post as the critique of the day, I want to read for the RECORD what the Washington Post on September 20, said about the Senate-passed welfare reform bill.

In an editorial which is tagged "Big Majority, Bad Bill," the Washington Post on September 20, said:

You might think from the overwhelming vote in the Senate in favor of the welfare bill yesterday, 87 votes for, 12 against, that this at long last is the sane, responsible approach to welfare reform. That is not the case.

The fundamental flaw in this legislation is that it abandons the principle that the Federal Government will maintain at least some basic system of support for the Nation's poor, especially the poor children.

Wiping out this core guarantee of the Social Security Act is mischievous and should not have been the solution of first resort on welfare. It is true that the Senate did make the deeply flawed welfare bill passed by the House better. The Senate does at least require States to keep up a certain level of spending on the poor in exchange for Federal dollars.

It does not require the States, as the House bill does, to cut off certain classes of children from welfare; kids born of mothers on welfare and to teen mothers. It includes some money for day care, so that children of mothers required to work will have a modest chance of getting looked after, and at least a bit of the current system's flexibility in responding to economic downturns was preserved by the creation of a special fund for States in economic distress.

But, the original idea of welfare reform—

The Washington Post editorial continues to say—

that the system should be changed to do a better job of moving welfare recipients into work and caring for the children of single mothers, was given second place to the quest for turning welfare into block grants to the States.