

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

SUMMARY TABLE—Continued

(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
Dallas	16	20	16	23

Note: Given that the actual percentage of county recipients living in a city likely varies by program and may diverge substantially from the ratio calculated using the 1990 Census data, the figures in Table 2 and in the summary table above should be regarded as relatively rough estimates.

Correction: An error was made in the calculation of earlier estimates released by the Administration, resulting in inflated figures. The number of public assistance recipients in the metropolitan statistical area (MSA), rather than the number in the city, was used as the numerator, while the population of the city was used as the denominator.

AFDC CASELOAD OF 10 LARGEST CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES (1992)

(Incorrect figures used previously)

City	Number of AFDC children	As a proportion of all children (percent)
1. New York, NY	478,895	28.4
2. Los Angeles, CA	534,528	61.8
3. Chicago, IL	314,706	43.7
4. Houston, TX	110,860	24.6
5. Philadelphia, PA	115,697	31.3
6. San Diego, CA	117,197	44.2
7. Dallas, TX	51,545	20.2
8. Phoenix, AZ	66,770	24.3
9. Detroit, MI	234,910	78.7
10. San Antonio, TX	52,340	18.6

Source: Department of Health and Human Services.

[From the Washington Times, Sept. 1, 1995]

WELFARE SHOCK

Having spent the better part of the past four decades analyzing the statistical fallout of the welfare and illegitimacy crises enveloping our great cities, Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan never has needed hyperbole to describe the dreadful consequences of failed social policies. Perhaps that is because the New York Democrat possesses the uncanny ability to develop or cite pithy statistics that shock even the most jaded welfare analyst, case-worker, senatorial colleague or reporter.

Several weeks ago, Sen. Moynihan, appearing on one of the ubiquitous Sunday morning interview shows, shocked his questioners (and, undoubtedly, his television audience) by revealing that nearly two-thirds of the children residing in Los Angeles, the nation's second largest city, lived in families relying on the basic welfare program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). To illustrate that Los Angeles was not unique, he observed that nearly four of every five (!) Detroit children received AFDC benefits.

The accompanying chart details the extent to which residents in the 10 largest U.S. cities have become dependent on AFDC—and the government. After about three decades of fighting the War on Poverty, during which time more than \$5.4 trillion (in constant 1993 dollars) has been expended, perhaps no single statistic offers more proof of the war's unmitigated failure than the fact that federal and state governments provide the financial support of 38 percent of all children living in the country's 10 largest cities.

AFDC CASELOAD OF 10 LARGEST CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES (1992)

City	Number of AFDC children	As a proportion of all children (percent)
New York, NY	478,895	28.4
Los Angeles, CA	534,528	61.8
Chicago, IL	314,706	43.7
Houston, TX	110,860	24.6
Philadelphia, PA	115,697	31.3
San Diego, CA	117,197	44.2
Dallas, TX	51,545	20.2

AFDC CASELOAD OF 10 LARGEST CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES (1992)—Continued

City	Number of AFDC children	As a proportion of all children (percent)
Phoenix, AZ	66,770	24.3
Detroit, MI	234,910	78.7
San Antonio, TX	52,340	18.6

Source: Department of Health and Human Services.

How does one begin to address such a horrendous problem? For all the talk among Democrats, particularly President Clinton, about the need for increased spending for education to help underwrite welfare reform, it's worth recalling that real (inflation-adjusted) spending for elementary and secondary education has dramatically escalated since the federal government declared war on poverty. Indeed, some of the highest per pupil expenditures occur in the largest cities. Unfortunately, as spending increased, test scores plummeted.

In a more serious tone, Mr. Moynihan approvingly cited the 1966 report on the Equality of Educational Opportunity (the Coleman Report), which "determined that after a point there is precious little association between school resources and school achievement. The resources that matter are those the student brings to the school, including community traditions that value education. Or don't."

Sen. Moynihan has offered his own welfare-reform plan, which, unlike any Republican plan in the House and Senate, would retain AFDC's entitlement status without placing any time restrictions on recipients. Despite the underwhelming success of federal job-training and job-placement programs, his plan places great emphasis on more of the same. Attacking the Republicans' proposals to cancel welfare's entitlement status and enforce time restrictions, Sen. Moynihan frets that "we don't know enough" to design programs that attempt to influence the behavior of poor people.

Take another look at the figures in the chart provided by the senator. They represent a small fraction of the statistical indictment against the failed welfare policies of the liberal welfare state. Tinkering around the edges of such failure without seeking to change the behavior that three decades of the War on Poverty have produced, will surely not solve any of the many social problems that accompany dependency on the scale depicted in the chart. That much we do know.

[From the Washington Times, Sept. 5, 1995]

CHARTING THE STATE OF WELFARE

Even by the appalling standards and results of U.S. welfare policy, the chart that appeared in this space last Friday exaggerated the depths of the situation that prevails in some of this nation's largest cities.

Last month Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, New York Democrat, appeared on the floor of the Senate citing statistics showing that nearly two out of three children in Los Angeles and nearly four out of five children in Detroit lived in households receiving the government's basic welfare grant, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). At the request of The Washington Times' editorial page, Sen. Moynihan's office faxed a copy of a chart listing the 10 largest U.S. cities and the percentage of each city's children relying on AFDC, which was developed by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Regrettably, the information was incorrect.

Nearby is a chart with updated, expanded, and presumably correct, information that HHS subsequently sent to Sen. Moynihan's

office, which then forwarded it the editorial page. The revised chart offers both as snapshot of welfare dependency of children in our largest cities (at a "point in time") and a more expansive statistic incorporating all children whose families relied on AFDC during any portion of an entire year. Clearly, neither classification places Los Angeles or Detroit in nearly as dreadful a position as conveyed by HHS's initial, incorrect tallies. It should also be noted, however that the earlier chart understated the problem of pervasive welfare dependency in other cities: New York and Philadelphia, for example. The revised chart offers no solace to anybody interested in the future of our great cities and the children who live in them.

ESTIMATED RATES OF AFDC CASELOADS

(In major cities (Feb. 1993))

State	Percentage of children on AFDC at a point in time	Percentage of children on AFDC within a year
New York	30	39
Los Angeles	29	38
Chicago	36	46
Detroit	50	67
Philadelphia	44	57
San Diego	23	30
Houston	18	22
Phoenix	15	18
San Antonio	14	21
Dallas	16	20

Source: Department of Health and Human Services.

It's been 30 years since the federal government initiated its so-called War on Poverty. During that time more than \$5 trillion was expended fighting it. What has been accomplished? As the Senate reconsiders the various welfare-reform proposals during the next few weeks, let us keep in mind that anything less than revolutionary in scope is likely to have little long-term impact on these depressing statistics and the numerous pathologies and deviancies that derive from them.

[From the Washington Times, Sept. 5, 1995]

THE AFDC NUMBERS: BAD ENOUGH, BUT NOT THAT BAD

Regarding the Sept. 1 editorial "Welfare shock," The Washington Times is entirely correct in stating that the information of AFDC caseloads I presented in the August welfare debate in the Senate was mistaken. We received the data from the Department of Health and Human Services on Aug. 4. I found the numbers hard to believe—that bad?—and called the deputy assistant secretary responsible to ask if he would check. He did and called back to confirm.

On Aug. 23, however, with the Senate in recess, Mr. Wendell E. Primus, the deputy assistant secretary who provided the data, wrote to say that there had indeed been a miscalculation. It was a perfectly honest mistake, honorably acknowledged and corrected. I will place his letter in the Congressional Record today.

The new numbers are sufficiently horrendous. The proportion of the child population on AFDC or Supplemental Security income in the course of a year in Los Angeles is 38 percent. In New York, 40 percent. In Chicago, 49 percent. In Philadelphia, 59 percent. In Detroit, 67 percent. My contention is that things have gotten so out of hand that cities and states cannot possibly handle the problem on their own. Thirty years ago, certainly. No longer. Mr. Hugh Price of the National Urban League suggests that we will see a reenactment of deinstitutionalization of the mental patients which led so directly to the problem of the homeless. I was in the Oval Office on Oct. 23, 1963 when President

Kennedy signed that bill, his last public bill signing ceremony. He gave me the pen. I have had it framed and keep it on my wall. *Primum non nocere.*

DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senator,
Washington.●

(At the request of Mr. DOLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD).

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as of the close of the last recorded business day, Friday, September 1, the Federal debt stood at \$4,968,255,379,449.49. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,859.58 as his or her share of that debt.●

ON FAMILIES AND VALUES

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the economic leaders in this Nation, with whom I sometimes agree and sometimes disagree, but for whom I have always had great respect is Herbert Stein.

Herb Stein is now a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, and recently had an article in the Brookings Institution publication titled, "On Families and Values."

His comments puncture some of our balloons and bring us back to reality in a very practical, wholesome way.

I ask that his comments be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

ON FAMILIES AND VALUES

(By Herbert Stein)

O, Family Values, what wonders are performed in your name! In your name some political leaders propose to give a tax credit of \$500 per child to every income-tax-paying unit except the very richest. I use the expression "income-tax-paying unit" because no particular family relationship is required. There may be a couple, married or unmarried, or there may be a single tax-payer, male or female, and the children may have a biological relationship to both adults, to one, or to neither. At the same time, also in the name of family values, it is proposed to reduce federal benefits to mother-children units if the mother is young and poor.

We do not have a family problem in America, or, at least, that is not one of our major problems. We have a children problem. Too many of our children are growing up uncivilized. The family deserves attention today mainly because it is the best institution for civilizing children. We shouldn't get too sentimental about that, however. Through most of history the family that reared children was not our idealized Poppy-Mommy-Kiddies group but a much more inclusive relationship. The first family was the scene of a fratricide. The most famous families in literature, the Montagues and Capulets, were obsessed with fighting each other, with fatal consequences for their children. Long before Freud we knew that the family could be a nest of vipers.

Despite its blemishes, perhaps exaggerated in literature because they are exceptional, the family is the best institution we know for rearing children. It is the best because it is most likely to be governed by certain values—love, responsibility, voluntary commitment to the welfare of others, including

those least able to fend for themselves, who are, of course, the children. That is what family values are.

In the rearing of children there is no satisfactory substitute for the well-functioning family. We should try to strengthen such families by private example, public policy, and in any other way we can. But even families that function well need supplementation by other institutions. Some families do not function well, for economic or psychological reasons, and they need even more assistance. In modern societies it is recognized that other institutions have a responsibility and capacity to contribute to the raising of children. These institutions include government, whose wide-ranging functions, from education to preventing child abuse, are generally accepted.

Moreover, there are really no such things as "family values." What we call family values are simply human values that also exist and are desired in relationships outside the family although they are probably less dominant there.

Our need now is to bring what institutions, resources, and values we can to bear on the problem of our children. From that standpoint the current trend of policy seems perverse. The "child credit" has little to do with the welfare of children. Very few of the children in the tax-paying-units that would receive the credit are part of the children problem in America, or if they are it is not because the after-tax incomes in the units are too small. Little of the income that would be provided would go to the benefit of children. Presumably the additional income would be used for purposes that the taxpayer had previously thought were of lowest priority. Any need of a child that a taxpayer with an income of, say, \$60,000 would meet only upon receipt of a tax credit of \$500 could not be a very important need.

Neither is it reasonable to think that reducing government cash and food benefits to poor children who are themselves the children of poor child-mothers will help to civilize our children, although it may reduce somewhat the number of them born in the future. More care, nurturing, counseling, and education will be needed, in the home, in a foster-home, in a school, perhaps even in an orphanage. The drive to cut costs in the name of family values provides none of that.

When I say that "our" children need to be civilized, I do not refer to my biological children and grandchildren, or yours either, dear reader. I refer to America's children. When the bomb exploded in Oklahoma City we all went and prayed for the children. We did not say that they were only their parents' children or Oklahoma's children. They were America's children.

The children growing up in wretched families, in unsafe schools, and in vicious streets are also "our" children. A decent respect for family values calls for more concern with them and more commitment to them than is shown by most of those who now wave the flag of family values.

LARRY DeNARDIS

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Larry DeNardis who on September 22, 1995, will be the recipient of the Distinguished Service Award of the Italian-American Society of Greater New Haven, Inc. The Italian-American Society was founded to celebrate and perpetuate the concept of the Italian heritage in America, and the society strives to acknowledge and commemorate the many contributions made by Italian-Americans.

Lawrence J. DeNardis was born and raised in New Haven, where he currently serves as the president of the University of New Haven [UNH]. Larry is well known in both the academic and public service arenas. His academic experience includes 16 years as associate professor and chairman of political science at Albertus Magnus College and 11 years as an adjunct professor at UNH. He has also been a visiting professor of government at Connecticut College, a guest scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars of the Smithsonian Institution, and a seminar instructor at Yale University.

In the field of government, Larry DeNardis has had the rare and notable distinction of serving as both a Federal and State legislator. After serving five terms in the State Senate from 1971–79, where I was proud to serve with him, Larry was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from Connecticut's Third District in 1980. I should note here that Larry's elevation to Federal office came at my expense—I was on the losing end of that Congressional campaign. But in retrospect, I am grateful for his victory, since it opened the door for me to serve as Connecticut attorney general and in this Chamber. Larry served ably and honorably in Congress and then went on to serve as Assistant Secretary for Legislation at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services during 1985–86.

Larry continues to reside in the New Haven area, where he is currently an active member of many organizations including the Greater New Haven Chamber of Commerce, Shubert Performing Arts Center, Mayor's Task Force on Transportation, Yale Medical School Library, St. Regis Health Center, and the Knights of Malta. He and his high school sweetheart, Mary Lou, have been married for 34 years and have four children: Larry Jr., Mark, Lesley, and Gregory and reside in Hamden, CT. Larry's work and commitment has been an inspiration to those who know him. I am proud to count him as a friend. I salute the Honorable Lawrence J. DeNardis as he accepts the Distinguished Service Award of the Italian-American Society for his decency, intelligence, and steadfast devotion to the community.●

TRANSRACIAL ADOPTIONS IN THE CHILDREN'S BEST INTERESTS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, some weeks ago, the magazine Black Issues in Higher Education, which I read regularly for its scholarly and sensitive insights into higher education, had an article on transracial adoptions written by Dr. Rita J. Simon—no relative, a professor of law at the American University.

I have a special interest in this field because of some family involvement in the area, but what she writes makes so much sense that I thought this area in which there is sometimes more heat