

"mother may I" with the Federal Government when it comes to welfare.

Second: Welfare programs should include a real work requirement which in no uncertain terms requires able-bodied welfare recipients to find a job rather than to stay at home or stay in a training program forever. And make no mistake about it; our legislation contains real work requirements.

And third: No program with an unlimited budget will ever be made to work effectively and efficiently. Therefore, we must put a cap on welfare spending.

We will be discussing those principles in greater detail during the debate. I believe the entire Senate, Republicans and Democrats, begins this debate united in many ways. We begin united in the knowledge that our current welfare system is broke, and we begin united in a commitment to fix it.

We have made valiant efforts in the past. And I see my colleague from New York who is the expert on welfare and has been for some 30 years in my memory and who has made a lot of suggestions that had we followed years ago, we would not be in the trouble we are today; they were not followed. I hope that he will enlist in our efforts to make some rather radical changes.

That is not to say we are not going to have disagreements. I hope it is not going to be party line. In my view, the best we can do when it comes to the Work Opportunity Act of 1995, or whatever title other Members may have on their bills, is to work together, iron out some of the problems we have, and have a big vote for change in this Senate Chamber.

There will be a number of close votes during the debate, but by remembering what unites us, I feel confident we will pass a bill with wide bipartisan support. I hope this is a bill we do not have to go through the cloture exercise; that we do not have a filibuster either by amendment or by intent because it seems to me if we have—I know Senator PACKWOOD, the chairman of the Finance Committee, will be leading the debate on this side. He is a very early riser. He will be willing to start at 7, 6, 7:30, 8 o'clock, and so there will be—I do not know how many literally—not hundreds of hours but 40, 50, 60 hours of debate, so hopefully we can move very quickly once we start on Monday.

AMENDMENT NO. 2280

Mr. DOLE. I send to the desk my amendment to the underlying bill, H.R. 4 in the form of a first-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] proposes an amendment numbered 2280.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. DOLE. I know the amendment is probably several hundred pages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOLE. I just say for the information of all Senators, my first-degree amendment will be printed and available for all Members by late Monday morning. We believe we have introduced it in a way that when someone offers an amendment, they can be sure they are going to get a vote on their amendment. Nobody is going to be able to second degree it. If the Senator from New York has an amendment, there will be a vote on that amendment. It might be a tabling motion, but there will be a vote on or in relation to the amendment.

So I think we are ready to go, and I know the Senator from New York has been waiting to make a statement. I appreciate his patience.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. May I first thank the distinguished majority leader, the Republican leader, for the tone and the openness with which he begins once again a welfare debate.

We did this 7 years ago with the Family Support Act of 1988. I had introduced it a year earlier.

It was a bipartisan measure. It passed the Senate 96-1. President Reagan signed it in the company of the Governors who had been so much involved, then chairman of the association, Governor Clinton of Arkansas; the chairman of the committee of the Governors' Association concerned with this matter; then-Governor Castle of Delaware, now Representative Castle.

I regret that the time now has seemingly come when we will be asked to put an end to the Federal commitment to sharing State efforts to provide for the dependent children. They are a massive number. They overwhelm the capacity of our great cities. Would the Senator from Kansas believe, for example, that in the city of Los Angeles, 62 percent of all children are on AFDC, in Chicago 44 percent, in New York 28 percent, and in Detroit 79 percent? This is beyond—this is a social experience which we have had, of which there is no counterpart.

We put in place legislation in 1988, which has been working. States have been innovating. The results are beginning to appear. I will have a bill which is offered in the Finance Committee, the Family Support Act of 1995, bringing it up to date as I believe we should. The distinguished Democratic leader, with Senator MIKULSKI and Senator BREAUX, will have measures. We will have amendments. We will have a good debate. It need not be an endless debate. I hope the outcome will be better than is now forecast. And we will see.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for giving me this time late in the day. I look forward to 10:30 on Monday morning when we will commence.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator from New York.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BEST WISHES TO ELIZABETH MACDONOUGH

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Senate will lose one of its most dedicated floor staffers today. Elizabeth MacDonough will be leaving us to attend law school this fall at the University of Vermont. Liz has worked in the Senate for the past 5 years, first in the Senate Library as a legislative reference assistant, and then as the assistant morning business editor of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In addition to her duties preparing the morning business section of the RECORD, Liz can be found sitting at the corner of the Reporters' table in the well of the Senate, listening intently to our every word, ready to chase us down to retrieve those materials we have asked to have printed in the RECORD. We will miss her dedication and wonderful sense of humor. On behalf of all Senators, I say farewell and wish her good luck in all her future endeavors.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me also associate myself with the remarks of the majority leader with regard to Elizabeth McDonough. We will miss her. She has been a delight to work with. We wish her well as she goes on to school and hope that she comes back frequently. She has been a very, very important member of the floor staff, and we are delighted to have had the opportunity to work with her.

BASE CLOSURE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AND HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the 1994 Base Closure Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance Act Public Law 103-421, signed into law October 25, 1994, applied not only to bases that would thereafter be designated for closure, but also to bases previously designated under the 1990 and 1988 Base Closure Acts, so long as the recognized redevelopment authority for the base elected within 60 days after enactment to proceed under the 1994 Act. The 1994 Act then set out a schedule for preparation, review, and approval of redevelopment plans and the ultimate disposal of property by the Government pursuant to such plans. This process will unavoidably extend beyond the end of the current fiscal year. Indeed, regulations to guide

the implementing agencies and local redevelopment authorities under the 1994 Act will be published on Monday, August 7, 1995.

In order to fulfill the intent and purpose of the 1994 Act, the Department of Defense must retain authority to dispose of bases closed in the 1988 and 1990 Acts, beyond the end of the current fiscal year. Unfortunately, the General Services Administration's original delegation of its authority to dispose of surplus property to the DOD was by its own terms set to expire October 1, 1995. Particularly in light of later amendments to the base closure laws which clarified that DOD's disposal authority was to extend beyond that date, GSA should renew—indeed, it is required—to extend its delegation of authority.

This matter is of great interest to the local redevelopment authority in East Hanover Township, NJ, which is working within the 1994 Act to prepare a redevelopment plan for a small base closed under the 1988 Act. I understand that there are one or more bases around the country similarly situated.

I had intended to offer an amendment to make it absolutely clear that DOD's disposal authority continues beyond the current fiscal year, and mandate the appropriate delegation of authority by GSA. However, I have received assurances from the GSA that it fully intends to extend its delegation of authority. I have also received a copy of a memorandum from DOD's general counsel's office expressing its view that DOD retains its disposal authority. In reliance on these statements, I will withhold my amendment.

However, I would like to seek the commitment from the chairman and ranking member that they will seek an appropriate legislative solution in conference, should it appear before conference is completed that, for some reason, the delegation will not be renewed by the agencies.

Mr. THURMOND. It is certainly the intent of the committee that the DOD shall continue to exercise authority beyond October 1, 1995, to dispose of 1988 bases whose redevelopment authorities elected to proceed under the 1994 Act. The appropriate agencies are apparently on track to make sure that the authority is in place. However, if there is a snag, I assure my colleague from New Jersey that we will be prepared to correct the matter in conference. In the meantime, I appreciate my colleague's withholding his amendment at this time.

Mr. NUNN. I concur with the chairman and join in his commitment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank my distinguished colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of a letter to me from the General Services Administration be placed in the RECORD, along with a memorandum from the general counsel's office of DOD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION,
PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE,
Washington, DC, August 3, 1995.

Hon. FRANK LAUTENBERG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LAUTENBERG: As discussed with Mr. Mitch Warren of your staff and Ms. Marcia Herzog of the General Service Administration (GSA's) Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, I am responding to your concerns with respect to GSA's extension of disposal authority to the Department of Defense (DOD) pursuant to the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526) of October 24, 1988. The delegation, under its own terms, will expire on October 1, 1995.

Last week this Office received from DOD the Fiscal Year 1994 Annual Report, required by the current delegation, detailing DOD's exercise of the Administrator of General Services' disposal authority under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. As discussed with Mr. Warren on July 25, 1995, receipt of this report was requisite to our extension of the delegation.

We are in the process of reviewing DOD's report. Upon completion of our review, we intend to transmit an extension to DOD no later than August 31, 1995.

I hope this information is responsive to your concerns.

Sincerely,

DAVID L. BIBB
(FOR KENNETH R. KIMBROUGH,
Commissioner).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, August 2, 1995.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO
THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR
ECONOMIC SECURITY

Subject: Status of the Delegation of GSA's
Authority Under the Federal Property
and Administrative Services Act of 1949
with respect to Installations Closed or
Realigned Pursuant to the Base Closure
and Realignment Act of 1900

The 1988 BRAC Act directed the Administrator of GSA to delegate him authority under Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with respect to property at installations closed or realigned pursuant to the 1988 BRAC Act to the Secretary of Defense. 1988 BRAC Act at Section 204(b). The Administrator's delegation to the Secretary of Defense pursuant to this provision was issued with an expiration date of September 30, 1995.

Under the 1988 BRAC Act, the authority of the Secretary to carry out any closure or realignment "shall terminate on October 1, 1995," except that the termination of authority "shall not apply to the authority of the Secretary to carry out . . . disposal of property of [1] military installations closed or realigned under this title." BRAC Act at Section 202(c). Because the 1980 BRAC Act as originally enacted did not contain any exemption from the general termination of authority, the limited term delegation of authority by GSA was entirely appropriate. However, as the 1988 BRAC Act is currently written (as the result of amendment over the years), there is no question that the Administrator of GSA is obligated to delegate his authority to the Secretary of Defense with respect to BRAC 1988 installations. This legal conclusion has been agreed to by all parties within the Department of Defense who have examined the issue, including the Department of the Army, and it has been

agreed to by Rich Butterworth, the lawyer for GSA who is responsible for all BRAC-related issues.

The Department of the Army has been acting as DoD's executive agent for purposes of securing an extension to the GSA delegation. It has shared a draft request for an extension with GSA, and the only issue that arose as a result was the fact that DoD had failed to submit a report on the disposition of properties pursuant to the delegated authority to GSA. GSA told the Army that it would not extend the delegation until DoD submitted the required report, but it also told the Army that there were no other impediments, legal or otherwise, that would therefore with the issuance of a new delegation.

In response to inquiries about the tardy report, work on the report was promptly completed, and the report was submitted from DoD to GSA more than two weeks ago. I have been informed by GSA that there are no remaining barriers to the issuance of an extended delegation.

The formal request for a new delegation, however, has not yet been submitted by DoD. The request is being staffed by the Department of the Army, and the Army anticipates that it will clear its review process shortly after the end of this week. I have requested the Army to forward the request to your offices, to the attention of Robert Hertfeld, for prompt proceeding.

ROBERT S. TAYLOR,
Deputy General Counsel,
Environment and Installations.

IS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? CONSIDER THE ARITHMETIC

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the impression will not go away: The \$4.9 trillion Federal debt stands today as a sort of grotesque parallel to television's energizer bunny that appears and appears and appears in precisely the same way that the Federal debt keeps going up and up and up.

Politicians like to talk a good game—and "talk" is the operative word—about reducing the Federal deficit and bringing the Federal debt under control. But watch how they vote.

Control, Mr. President. As of Thursday, August 3, at the close of business, the total Federal debt stood at exactly \$4,956,664,786,501.42 or \$18,815.58 per man, woman, child on a per capita basis. *Res ipsa loquitur*.

Some control, is it not?

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 75

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the