

On page 487, after line 24, add the following:

SEC. 2838. LAND CONVEYANCE, WILLIAM LANGER JEWEL BEARING PLANT, ROLLA, NORTH DAKOTA.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.**—The Administrator of General Services may convey, without consideration, to the Job Development Authority of the City of Rolla, North Dakota (in this section referred to as the "Authority"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, with improvements thereon and all associated personal property, consisting of approximately 9.77 acres and comprising the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant in Rolla, North Dakota.

(b) **CONDITION OF CONVEYANCE.**—The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the Authority—

(1) use the real and personal property and improvements conveyed under that subsection for economic development relating to the jewel bearing plant;

(2) enter into an agreement with an appropriate public or private entity or person to lease such property and improvements to that entity or person for such economic development; or

(3) enter into an agreement with an appropriate public or private entity or person to sell such property and improvements to that entity or person for such economic development.

(c) **PREFERENCE FOR DOMESTIC DISPOSAL OF JEWEL BEARINGS.**—(1) In offering to enter into agreements pursuant to any provision of law for the disposal of jewel bearings from the National Defense Stockpile, the President shall give a right of first refusal on all such offers to the Authority or to the appropriate public or private entity or person with which the Authority enters into an agreement under subsection (b).

(2) For the purposes of this section, the term "National Defense Stockpile" means the stockpile provided for in section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98(c)).

(d) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR MAINTENANCE AND CONVEYANCE OF PLANT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available in fiscal year 1995 for the maintenance of the William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant in Public Law 103-335 shall be available for the maintenance of that plant in fiscal year 1996, pending conveyance, and for the conveyance of that plant under this section.

(e) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the property conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Administrator. The cost of such survey shall be borne by the Administrator.

(f) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Administrator may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Administrator determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

NUNN AMENDMENT NO. 2460

Mr. NUNN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1026, *supra*; as follows:

On page 487, below line 24, add the following:

SEC. 2838. LAND EXCHANGE, UNITED STATES ARMY RESERVE CENTER, GAINESVILLE, GEORGIA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Army may convey to the City of Gainesville, Georgia (in this section referred to as the "City"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real prop-

erty (together with any improvements thereon) consisting of approximately 4.2 acres located on Shallowford Road, in the City of Gainesville, Georgia.

(b) **CONSIDERATION.**—As consideration for the conveyance authorized by subsection (a), the City shall—

(1) convey to the United States all right, title, and interest in and to a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 8 acres of land, acceptable to the Secretary, in the Atlas Industrial Park, Gainesville, Georgia;

(2) design and construct on such real property suitable replacement facilities in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary, for the training activities of the United States Army Reserve;

(3) fund and perform any environmental and cultural resource studies, analysis, documentation that may be required in connection with the land exchange and construction considered by this section;

(4) reimburse the Secretary for the costs of relocating the United States Army Reserve units from the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) to the replacement facilities to be constructed by the City under subsection (b)(2). The Secretary shall deposit such funds in the same account used to pay for the relocation;

(5) pay to the United States an amount as may be necessary to ensure that the fair market value of the consideration provided by the City under this subsection is not less than fair market value of the parcel of real property conveyed under subsection (a); and

(6) assume all environmental liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)) for the real property to be conveyed under subsection (b)(1).

(c) **DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.**—(1) The determination of the Secretary regarding the fair market value of the real property to be conveyed pursuant to subsection (a), and of any other consideration provided by the City under subsection (b), shall be final.

(d) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the parcels of real property to be conveyed under subsections (a) and (b) shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the City.

(e) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary may require any additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyances under this section that the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interest of the United States.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

BULLYING TAIWAN

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, recently, the New York Times had an editorial titled, "Bullying Taiwan," which appeared while Congress was not in session.

It comments on what is taking place in China and that country's irresponsible conduct toward Taiwan.

For years before the United States recognized the People's Republic of China, I had favored dual recognition, as we did with East Germany and West Germany.

But for reasons I understand, in part to keep China on an anti-Soviet course, the United States continued to follow a one China policy. It was wrong before, and it is wrong now.

As the editorial points out, Taiwan has been under Beijing's rule only 4 years in the last century.

I ask that the New York Times editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point, and I urge my colleagues to read it, if they have not already.

The editorial follows:

BULLYING TAIWAN

China has embarked on an escalating campaign of military maneuvers meant to intimidate Taiwan and undermine its President, Lee Teng-hui. Washington, as much as it wants to calm troubled relations with Beijing, must firmly signal its opposition to this campaign. Ties with China cannot be built on tolerance for provocative displays of military force and efforts to destabilize Taiwan.

Last week China began its second missile exercise this summer in the waters surrounding Taiwan. More are planned in the weeks ahead, timed to coincide with the campaign to choose Taiwan's first democratically elected President next March.

Mr. Lee, who led Taiwan from dictatorship to democracy after coming to power as the handpicked successor of Chiang Kai-shek and his son, is now the front-runner in that election. But Beijing hopes its military muscle can frighten Taiwan into choosing someone more malleable.

Mr. Lee has drawn China's ire by a series of personal visits abroad, most prominently a May trip to attend his college reunion in the United States. Beijing is upset because these actions challenge its contention that Taiwan is an integral part of China and that any separate political identity for Taiwan diminishes China's sovereignty.

This "one-China policy" had its origins in 1949, when Chiang moved the seat of his defeated Government to Taiwan. From then on, Chiang in Taipei and Mao Zedong in Beijing each insisted his own regime was the legitimate government of China, with authority over both the mainland and Taiwan.

When it recognized Chiang, the United States found the one-China formula convenient. When America switched recognition to the Communists in 1979, Beijing insisted that Washington continue to honor the point. The United States therefore has no formal diplomatic ties with Taiwan.

For Beijing, the one-China concept has been the cornerstone of normalized relations with Washington. Tampering with it would throw the entire relationship into turmoil. Yet continued Chinese military provocations could force the United States to re-evaluate its position.

While diplomatically convenient, the formula has never corresponded very closely to reality. While most of Taiwan's people are descended from Chinese who migrated there several centuries ago, the island, 100 miles off the Chinese coast, has been under Beijing's direct rule for only four years in the last century.

Today Taiwan, with 21 million people, is a prosperous democracy and America's seventh-largest trading partner. Though its businessmen have strong economic ties with the mainland, few of its citizens want to come under the rule of the harsh Communist regime in Beijing. But most Taiwanese also believe it would be a fatal mistake for Taiwan to provoke China by pushing too hard for the diplomatic trappings of independence.

China is trying to intimidate Taiwan into reining in its diplomacy. It is also trying to warn outside powers against

granting visas to Taiwanese political leaders. That China should be pressing these positions is not surprising. That it should do so by military means, and in the process undermine political stability in Taiwan, is disturbing and cannot be ignored.●

THE ACCURACY OF AFDC NUMBERS

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, during the welfare debate on August 8, I displayed a chart on the floor of this Chamber entitled "AFDC Caseload of 10 Largest Cities in the U.S. (1992)." It showed 62 percent of all children in Los Angeles as welfare recipients at some point in 1992, 79 percent in Detroit, on and on. These figures were supplied by the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS].

My office provided the chart to the Washington Times at the request of its editorial writers. The chart appeared in a Times editorial that ran last Friday entitled, "Welfare Shock." The numbers, according to the editorial, "represent a small fraction of the statistical indictment against the failed welfare policies of the liberal welfare state."

Regrettably, the numbers from the Department were wrong. On August 23, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Services Policy Wendell E. Primus wrote me to inform me of the error and provided me with new data. It happens that the numerator used was the number of public assistance recipients in the surrounding metropolitan statistical areas [MSA's], rather than the number of recipients in the cities proper. The denominator, correctly, was the population of each city. I am informed by the Department that data on the number of program beneficiaries is difficult to obtain at the city level. The AFDC Program is operated either at a State or county level. It was a perfectly honest mistake, honorably acknowledged and corrected.

I forwarded the revised numbers to the Washington Times, which graciously ran a follow-up editorial and an explanatory letter from me in this morning's edition. The numbers, as the editorial points out, went down for Los Angeles and Detroit, but inched up for New York and jumped up for Philadelphia. Given the mistake in methodology, I can understand why the ratios went down for some cities. But I am perplexed why they climbed for others, including New York. Apparently, we have more work to do. We'll get them right.

Today's editorial in the Washington Times, "Charting the Welfare State," states that even the lower ratios offer compelling evidence of the complete failure of the current system. I don't disagree. But it would be a huge mistake for the Federal Government to break off its commitment entirely, and we seemed poised to do. If the numbers reveal anything that we can understand, it's this: The problem simply

has become too great for the cities to handle on their own. Mr. Hugh Price of the Nationals Urban League has recently argued that the welfare reform legislation upon which the Senate will take up tomorrow or Thursday could be a reenactment of the deinstitutionalization of mental patients in the 1960's and 1970's which led so directly to the problem of the homeless.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter I received from Deputy Assistant Secretary Primus, the two Washington Times editorials, and my letter to the Times appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, DC, August 23, 1995.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: I very much regret and am deeply embarrassed by the incorrect numbers my office provided to you in response to your request for data on the number of children receiving public assistance in major cities in the United States. I share your passion for data and have published many statistics on welfare during my career. Therefore, I hope you will accept my apologies for this mistake.

Unfortunately, there is no good explanation for the error. As you are well aware, we depend upon the states for administrative data concerning AFDC receipt. In most states these statistics are gathered on a county level and are not routinely compiled for other political subdivisions. Estimates on welfare receipt can be made from Census data, but in many cases these data do not correspond to administrative data. In responding to your request, we did not appropriately map administrative data to population counts obtained from the Census Bureau. Revised estimates are enclosed, including a methodological explanation.

Again, I am very sorry for providing incorrect data and for any embarrassment it has caused you. I am very aware of how widely you quoted those numbers. Please accept my personal and professional apology.

Sincerely,

WENDELL E. PRIMUS,
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Human Services Policy.

NOTES TO TABLES ON RATES OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECEIPT IN MAJOR CITIES

The attached tables present estimates of the number and percentage of persons in major cities who receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI).

The AFDC program is operated at either a State or county level. Accordingly, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (USDHHS) does not collect data on the number of AFDC recipients by city. In addition, the Social Security Administration keeps data on SSI receipt by State and county, but not by city.

Table 1 displays, for the 10 largest cities, the number of AFDC (total and child) and SSI (adult and child) recipients of either the city itself (data permitting) or for the county most closely corresponding to the city. The data are drawn from "Quarterly Public Assistance Statistics: Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993" (a USDHHS publication) and SSI Recipients by State and County (a Social Security Administration publication) and represent the numbers of AFDC and SSI recipients at a point in time.

Data on the number of recipients by program is, as noted above, difficult to obtain at the city level. The decennial Census does contain data by county and city on the number/percentage of households that receive income from any of three public assistance programs (AFDC, SSI or GA) within a year (as opposed to at a point in time). The Census data is not broken down by program; it is not possible to determine from the data how many households received AFDC as opposed to SSI or GA.

Note: the decennial Census may undercount the number of public assistance recipients. While undercounting is a problem for the Census as a whole, it is of particular concern with respect to lower-income persons. The degree of undercounting tends to be especially large in the case of poorer residents. The Bureau of the Census employs weighting techniques in order to correct for undercounting; it is not clear if these techniques are completely successful.

The Census data can be employed, in conjunction with the information available for the counties corresponding to the major cities, to arrive at estimates by city of the number of recipients in each program. These estimates, found in Table 2, are calculated by assuming that for each program (at a point in time) the ratio of recipients in the city to recipients in the county is equal to the ratio of households in the city that received income from any of the three programs to households in the county receiving such income (from the 1990 Census).

For example, while there is no data by program for the City of Los Angeles, there is data for Los Angeles County. According to "Quarterly Public Assistance Statistics," there were 784,000 AFDC recipients in Los Angeles County as of February 1993 (see Table 1, column 5, line 2). The 1990 Census found that there were 130,000 households in Los Angeles (city) with public assistance income in 1989 (Table 2, column 3, line 2), as opposed to 295,000 in Los Angeles County (Table 1, column 3, line 2), for a ratio of .44 (Table 2, column 5, line 2). By applying this ratio to the number of AFDC recipients in Los Angeles County in February 1993, we arrive at an estimate of 350,000 AFDC recipients in Los Angeles (city) as of February 1993 (Table 2, column 6, line 2).

The tables also contain estimates of the number and percentage of children who receive AFDC and AFDC or SSI over the course of a year, as opposed to at a point in time. These estimates are calculated by assuming that the ratio of child recipients over the course of a year to child recipients at a point in time (for each city) is equal to the nationwide ratio (for all AFDC and GA recipients) from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (Dynamics of Economic Well-Being and Program Participation by the Bureau of the Census).

SUMMARY TABLE

[Estimated rates of public assistance receipt: Children in major cities]

City	Percent of child population on—			
	AFDC: Point in time	AFDC: W/ in a year	AFDC or SSI: Point in time	AFDC or SSI: W/in a year
New York	30	39	32	40
Los Angeles	29	38	30	38
Chicago	36	46	38	49
Detroit	50	67	54	67
Philadelphia	44	57	46	59
San Diego	23	30	23	30
Houston	18	22	18	24
Phoenix	15	18	15	18
San Antonio	14	21	18	21