

Most people have made it very, very clear that their concerns are whether they are going to have a job, whether we are going to do something about raising their income, whether kids are going to get to school and whether the schools are going to be safe, and whether they will be safe in their communities. These are the real concerns of the American people. And every single one of us knows that there are going to be some appropriations bills on the floor that are going to be passed in a unison of ideological fervor. Those bills are absolutely preordained to be vetoed. They are absolutely preordained to have the vetoes upheld. And we are absolutely preordained to come here to confront the moment of reality. But that moment of reality is being put off into the future in a way that makes the American people the pawns in the process.

And I guarantee my colleagues—and they know it because I hear them saying it in the back halls—this will not serve America's interests. This will not serve our interests. It will be bad for this institution. And those of us who I think are concerned about trying to find a bipartisan, moderate, common-sense solution would like to suggest that rather than waiting for the train wreck, let us do what sensible people are supposed to do. Let us sit down now. Let us begin the process now of a bipartisan effort to avoid this confrontation and to find out if we can behave like the adults the American people sent us here to behave like. It is not very complicated.

I would ask that the President of the United States engage with the leadership, with those leaders of the key committees now, and that we even invite the American people to participate. Hold a meeting in the East Room. Let C-SPAN be part of the discussion of the priorities of this country. Let them see why there are differences of opinion. Let America share together with us an opportunity to prove that we are not going to conduct business as usual, that we are prepared to truly think differently.

I ask for 1 additional minute, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, rather than go through the process of the inevitable confrontation with a continuing resolution, with a then delayed moment of confrontation with another continuing resolution, it is incumbent on all of us to have a responsible process in the interest of this institution and the American people.

I hope that the President of the United States will reach out to the leadership, and I hope that the majority leader will not be stuck in a position where he suggests that compromise is impossible.

Compromise is the nature of the legislative process. Inevitably, everyone knows there will be some kind of com-

promise. There has to be. The political equation of the veto, the political equation of the executive versus the legislative branch dictates that that will happen. What the American people do not want to see is a repeat of the Washington Monument and other symbolic closings that ultimately wind up with more than symbolic closings. It is not necessary.

So I implore our colleagues, let us not make the American people the pawns in a political charade. Let us get away from business as usual. Let us begin the process of a real dialog now that proves to the American people we are prepared to have an important, open, significant debate about the priorities of this country, and we can conduct our business in a mature and sensible fashion.

I yield the floor, and I thank the distinguished managers.

THE FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 2466

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require for an opening statement.

Mr. President, I rise in an all but empty Chamber to offer an amendment which is in the nature of a substitute for the bill reported from the Committee on Finance and later amended by the distinguished Republican leader.

On May 26, the committee considered the chairman's mark and the bill that I offered, the Family Support Act of 1995. It failed by a vote of 12 to 8 in our committee on party lines, with one exception, and it was not a happy moment, much less a promising moment. It was, indeed, a foreboding one.

Had it not been for the 1994 congressional elections, the wave of what George Will called a cymbal-clash change of the electorate, this measure now before the Senate is pretty much the measure we would have been considering. It brings the Family Support Act of 1988 up to the higher standards, higher expectations that we assumed would come with time and which we also assumed in what might seem the innocence of the last decade would be as bipartisan an effort as was the original.

The Family Support Act passed the Senate on June 16, 1988, by a vote of 93 to 3. We went to conference. The conference committee agreed. It came back, and on September 29 it passed out of this Senate 96 to 1, and then the following day the conference report was agreed to in the House by a vote of 347 to 53, near to an overwhelming vote. And on October 13, it was signed by President Reagan in a ceremony in the Rose Garden. Then Governor Wil-

liam J. Clinton of Arkansas, the Chairman of the Governors' Association was on hand, as was Governor Mike Castle, then Republican Governor of Delaware. The two of them had helped this bipartisan effort in the Governors' Association.

President Reagan said:

I'm pleased to sign into law today a major reform of our Nation's welfare system, the Family Support Act. This bill creates a new emphasis on the importance of work for individuals in the welfare system.

It basically redefined the Aid to Families with Dependent Children legislation, which dates back to 1935. What had been a widow's pension, meant to phase out as survivor's insurance matured in Social Security, had become a wholly different program for a wholly different population, and within a certain measure of delay, when the time came, we redefined the program, redefined its objectives. We did so, Mr. President, with a measure of realism, even of modesty, in the face of extraordinary change in our social structure, our social system, if you will. This change came suddenly and without warning and to this day it can be quantified but scarcely explained. I refer to the subject that has been spoken about with candor and, I think, understanding, with an openness on the floor in this debate already, which is the rise of out-of-wedlock births, from about 6 percent nationwide in 1960 to about 33 percent today.

I have commented several times that this is something we did not know how to talk about, were not sure we ought to talk about, but which Presidents now openly discuss. President Bush was the first President to raise this issue in a State of the Union Message. President Clinton has done the same. President Clinton has suggested projections that we have made in our office which could take us surely to 40 percent, a number without meaning until this moment in history. We could not have imagined it.

We created the JOBS Program, one of those acronyms, Jobs Opportunities and Basic Skills. We set quotas, percentages that States had to meet as they moved along with the funds available, and we began to see results.

We never promised a very great deal. We made very clear that the persons we were concerned about were the persons most in need, and they are not difficult to define, Mr. President.

About 42 percent of persons who enter the welfare system are there for 24 months or less. They typically are women with children whose marriages have dissolved, and it takes them a period to put their life back, their affairs back in order, and they do. A fairly considerable amount of research has indicated they do not need anything but time and a certain amount of income support, which is what the Social Security system is all about.

On the other hand, a very large proportion of our children enter this system and stay in it for more than 5

years, stay in it for much of their childhood. Seventy-six percent of persons on the AFDC rolls at any given time will be on more than 5 years. They are the ones who are most in need. They are the ones who are most difficult to help. Those are the ones, when something succeeds, you have saved a life. We should concentrate on that.

We were off to a slow start. We had a recession. We had a rise in the number of out-of-wedlock births. What is worrisome is that the cohort of women age 15-24, the age group disproportionately responsible for out-of-wedlock births, is expected to rise over the next 10 years. We will have more illegitimacy, and consequently more of a need for welfare assistance. That phrase "demography is destiny"—demography is destiny for the welfare system.

In the face of these massive, disturbing, changes in the structure of the family, we enacted the Family Support Act of 1988. For the first time, we said that the single mothers on the welfare rolls must be in education, training, or work to receive their benefits, to the extent State resources permit. We gave States great flexibility to experiment. And we began to get good news from around the country as these programs took effect. The word came out that you can innovate, you ought to try.

How many Senators have we heard talking about Riverside, CA? We had the director of that jobs program in to testify before us this spring in the Finance Committee, with enthusiasm, full of energy. He had a blue button that says "Life works when you work." That sort of energy in the executive establishment is to be praised. All across the country, we began to hear of this program and that program taking hold. But still, the welfare caseload grew.

As I said yesterday, our assessment in the Congressional Budget Office is that about half the growth was due to the increase in out-of-wedlock births. About a quarter of the decline of the economy is the increase in unemployment. There is a measure in which the economy affects welfare dependency. But primarily, welfare dependency derives from single-parent families. It is affected by the rise in the business cycle—but marginally. We are dealing with something very different, very new, just learning our way. And yet, while we simply do not know how to change the behavior which is driving illegitimacy, we are learning how to get welfare recipients off the rolls and into jobs. What we have learned we have learned under the Family Support Act.

That is why it has come as a source of dismay to many students of the subject, scholars such as Lawrence Mead, of New York University, who certainly wishes himself to be understood as conservative in these matters. He said recently of the legislation before us, what we voted on yesterday and what we will vote on:

The main effect of block grants would be to disestablish the jobs program which has

been the major force pushing States with large caseloads to reform.

Dr. Meade has commented that even New York is beginning to get the message. Well, that is a large event. You cannot break the mindset of a half century instantly. There is a sort of law of retarded response, that large bureaucracies established to provide benefits on a permanent basis to permanently dependent persons, widows react slowly to change, and it will take a generation to get it understood that this is no longer the reality.

I knew Frances Perkins rather well. She was very much in evidence here in Washington in the early sixties. We began to notice this welfare problem, and I would talk with her about it. When it began, she would describe the typical recipient of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children. The typical recipient was a West Virginia miner's widow. There was no expectation that she would go to work in the mines. In time, the survivors insurance would take care of that. In time the survivors insurance did. Only about 71 percent of the persons receiving Social Security benefits are retired persons. The rest are spouses, children of deceased workers, and persons of that order.

We knew we were changing and we knew the change would be difficult, but we built into our legislation very careful evaluation to find what works. We particularly looked to the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation based in New York, which had provided the basic data on which we enacted the legislation, and they have now reported. They are not easily impressed. They quantify, they measure, and they are very realistic. This is what they recently wrote about an assessment of the program Nationwide:

This report represents early evidence that well-implemented, highly mandatory jobs programs that use job search followed by a range of short-term education, training, and other services to promote rapid job entry can produce dramatic reductions in welfare receipt and substantial increases in employment and earnings.

May I say, Mr. President, the MDRC is not in the habit of referring to dramatic reductions. But they have done it. Indeed, we see our caseloads beginning to decline over the last year. They have dropped by a quarter of a million, 240,000 or almost 5 percent. Most of the decline has come in the 44 smaller States that have about half the caseload. Forty-four States have half of the AFDC cases; six have the other half.

I have spoken to you, Mr. President, about the degree to which so many of our cities are effectively overwhelmed by this social disorder, as it now is. In the city of Chicago, in a given year, 46 percent of all children will be on welfare. In Detroit, 67 percent will be. In Philadelphia, 57 percent. In New York, 39 percent. These are numbers that overwhelm a political and a social system. They will stay overwhelmed. It will be a generation before we are out of this.

But if we now abandon efforts which are beginning to show results, we will regret it. We will regret it if we remember having done it. I have, several times, referred to a remark made on the Charlie Rose show by the new director of the National Urban League, Mr. Hugh Price, who said that what we are proposing is something equal to the measures of the deinstitutionalization of mental patients in the 1960's.

I happen to have been much involved in that. The program began in the 1950's in New York State, where the first tranquilizers were developed. I was on hand, Mr. President, when on October 31, 1963, President John F. Kennedy had his last public bill signing ceremony. He signed the Community Mental Health Construction Act of 1963. He gave me a pen, and I have had it framed. We were going to build 2,000 community mental health centers between then and 1980. We were going to empty out our mental institutions and treat people in their communities. Well, we emptied out our mental institutions, but we did not build the centers. We built about 400 and then forgot what we were doing. Then the problem of the homeless appeared, and people said, "Where did these homeless persons come from?"

In my city of New York they said, well, it is obviously the problem of lack of affordable housing. It was not a lack of affordable housing. It is schizophrenia, found in a basic incidence of large populations. We did something terribly wrong and we cannot even recover the memory.

If in 10 years' time we find children sleeping on grates, picked up in the morning frozen, and we ask, why are they scavenging, being awful to themselves, awful to one another? Would anyone remember how it began? It would have begun on the House floor this spring and the Senate Chamber this autumn.

You will have half a million children in New York City with altogether inadequate provision, if any. It will almost be forgotten. Such is the amnesiac quality of so much of our politics, that there was a time when the Federal Government said it had a responsibility.

These children are all our children and we are all responsible for them. If you had more intelligent federalism it would sort so many things out. We have so many things we are doing at the Federal level in which we have no business.

It was remarked yesterday that when the Food Stamp Program began, States were free to set their own levels and they set them at wildly different levels, and many were quite inadequate. President Nixon came along and said, no, children are children, they are all American children. We will have a national standard.

President Nixon proposed a guaranteed income. The distinguished Presiding Officer was presiding the other day when just by coincidence a Brazilian

Senator happened to be in Washington and came to watch us, observe us. I went out to introduce myself and asked him to come and join us on the floor. Senator Eduardo Suplicy, who gave us a copy of a bill that has passed the Brazilian Senate which provided a guaranteed minimum income—all families with children up to age 14.

Brazil is doing it, moving in the direction we were. We are moving away. We are moving away amidst all manner of myth and misinformation.

First of all there is the myth that there is, in fact, an individual entitlement to welfare benefits. There is not, sir. States are entitled to a Federal matching share of any outlays they make on their own State programs.

The Federal share for various States ranges from 50 percent to about 78 percent. A State may have any program it wishes; it may have no program and provide \$1 per year per child or \$1,000 per year per child.

The number of actual Federal requirements are relatively few. The Federal statute says you can have only \$1,000 in assets. All these children are paupers.

The bureaucracy has been too prescriptive in detailing how States may implement their programs, and has often taken much too long to approve various State experiments. But the fact remains that under current law States have a good deal of flexibility, and through the waiver process they can do almost anything they please. There exists now flexibility for innovation, as there exists a Federal commitment to provide a share of provision to impoverished dependent children. If we abandon that, we abandon those children.

The legislation offered in the Finance Committee—I see my distinguished friend from Illinois was there—and now here as an amendment in the nature of the substitute, would build on the Family Support Act of 1988.

We would increase the funding for the Jobs Program from \$1.2 billion in this coming fiscal year to \$2.5 billion. The Federal matching rate for JOBS and child care would go from 60 to 70 percent. The participation rates would increase from 20 percent this year in stages to 50 percent in the year 2001.

These are increases we anticipated would be made as we got the hang of this effort, got to learn more about it. We learned, for example, that immediate job search is the most important thing; that a focus solely on educational training delays the reality of getting a job.

We are even learning to break one of the worst habits we ever acquired on this subject, which is disparaging entry-level jobs. My Lord, how I have spent 30 years listening to “advocates” talk about dead end jobs. Now the cliché is “flipping hamburgers.”

The present chief executive officer of McDonald's, Ed Rensi, began flipping hamburgers. As I recall, he entered his entry wage at 83 cents an hour. Every-

body starts. It is getting started that matters most.

This was our program, Mr. President. We had great hopes for it. It was bipartisan—96 to 1. It has taken hold.

If we look around, a great majority of the States have been coming in, proposing innovative measures of this kind, such as increasing income—disregards, moving people into the work force.

We have a transition from Medicaid provision for a year after leaving the AFDC rolls. We have child care provisions. We thought this out. We have done it. We have done it well. That we should abandon it now would be a great loss to our children. The United States will end up looking to the rest of the world as a place that cannot handle its affairs. We will wonder what we did. We have an opportunity to avoid that. We will vote in a very short while now.

Three years ago we would routinely have upgraded, updated, brought up to the expected higher standards the Family Support Act. If we are unwilling to do so today, at least in 10 years' time, when the horrors we shall have visited upon the children of the United States begin to be unmistakable, there will be those who can remember this day in this Chamber and say, “I saw that coming and I voted to prevent it.”

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I see the distinguished Senator from Iowa is managing and would like to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might consume. But I would like to have the Chair notify me when I have used 20 minutes because if I have colleagues who want to speak, I want to make sure that they have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, we have heard a defense of the 1988 act from the distinguished Senator from New York. I believe, as one who voted for the 1988 act, that it was pursued from beginning to end with the best of intentions. The goals were to move people from welfare to work, from dependence to independence, to strengthen the family and even to save the taxpayers money.

I have to look back on those efforts as work being sincerely done, but as I look at the evolution of that act, the use of it and what it set out to accomplish and has accomplished, I believe I failed when I voted for that bill. I do not want to say that anyone else failed, but I look back at our efforts and see 3.1 million more people on AFDC now than we had then as one measure of failure. I see a lot more tax dollars being spent as another measure of failure.

Now we are being asked by the other side, by the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New York, to build on the 1988 act. Albeit, I am sure, they are suggesting changes in the amendment before us that reflect what they see as failures of that 1988 act. But the difference between the leader-

ship proposal under the distinguished leadership of Senator DOLE and what the loyal opposition offers is the difference between night and day.

We have seen the Federal Government failing in welfare reform, not just since the 1988 act but, we would have to say, over the last several decades. In contrast, we have seen States succeed where we have failed, States like Missouri and Iowa and Wisconsin, Michigan, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and others. That is why we propose to get the Federal Government out of the business of welfare and turn it over to the States with the resources to accomplish the goal of ending welfare as we know it.

The major difference between what my distinguished friend from New York suggests and what Senator DOLE and the Finance Committee on this side suggests is whether or not we are going to maintain what is called the Federal entitlement. We propose to end the Federal entitlement. The Moynihan proposal maintains it.

Republicans propose to save the taxpayers \$70 billion. Under the Moynihan proposal, the savings is only \$2.1 billion. That is \$2.1 billion in savings with the proposal on that side of the aisle; \$70 billion in savings on the program from this side of the aisle.

Now, we do not propose our bill just to save money. We do not propose the ending of the entitlement just to save money. In fact, even if there was not an issue of balancing the budget, the failure of the Federal Government, after decades in the welfare business, is why it should be reformed on its own merits, and that is the way we proceed.

The litmus test of whether or not there is going to be change in Washington, the litmus test of whether it is no longer business as usual, is this issue of the Federal entitlement. Our proposal ends the Federal entitlement. That side would preserve the Federal entitlement.

As I look back at the 1988 legislation, there are things that I see as wrong now that I did not see then. It loosened some of the tough eligibility requirements that were enacted in the 1981 Reagan welfare reforms. It expanded the eligibility to two-parent families. It provided for State waivers that would make it possible to reverse still more of those 1981 reforms.

I know some people would say we made those waivers available, that is why these States today are doing what they are doing. That is true. But, also, in the first instance, States were able to seek waivers of the 1981 reforms that were enacted.

We also permitted waivers to redefine who was unemployed by basing it on income earned rather than hours worked. We allowed the term “strict work requirements” to be undermined by creating an exemption for mothers having another child under 6. We promised a lot of education. We promised a lot of job training. We promised other attractive social services including

child care and medical services to AFDC recipients who leave the welfare rolls. And the sole price for admission to those rolls was having that first baby.

Now, you can say to me, that any one of those things are very, very small. These are precisely the reasons, though, why AFDC has grown by 3.1 million people since 1988. Yes, these results demonstrate, as I look back at the 1988 legislation, that some of those changes were wrong. Though each of the changes might have been slight, they created incentives which, taken together, have caused the dramatic explosion in the AFDC rolls from 1989 to 1995.

Now, I anticipate some will say, "Well, GRASSLEY, you forget that we had a recession in 1991 and 1992. That obviously had something to do with the explosion of people on AFDC."

Before I respond to that, let me give the statistics on the growth of AFDC. There were 3 million in 1960. It rose rapidly through the 1960's and early 1970's. It rose rapidly, yes, even into the 1970's and then leveled off in 1972.

We had a very, very deep recession in 1974 and 1975, and the numbers dropped in the middle of that recession. That recession was deeper than what we had in 1991. The numbers stayed fairly level, though they did rise a little bit during the Carter administration, to 11.1 million in 1981, then they leveled off. They were 10.3 million in 1982, 11 million in 1989, and then we had that dramatic increase of another 3 million people that I believe is blamed on the 1988 law. We were promised that the numbers would go down as a result of the 1988 legislation. We thought that the act would steer AFDC parents to work and off the dole. Obviously, the legislation was praised by Democrats as well as Republicans as a final means of reducing welfare dependency.

We heard earlier that President Reagan praised the 1988 act when he signed it into law. But I still maintain, looking back over the history, that there was a period of time when President Reagan was against what was going on in the Congress. But we had a candidate for President in 1988 by the name of President Bush who, all of a sudden, at the time of the conference committee, came out and supported the legislation. I think that pulling of the rug out from the efforts to modify the legislation nixed what opportunity we had at that late moment to do more. And that legislation passed with only one dissenting vote. It was bipartisan, and I suppose for that reason nobody wants to expose the dramatic failures.

I can only speak for myself. But I do see the six or seven reasons that I gave of changes in the 1981 law, some expansion of eligibility and the redefinition of unemployed, and the redefinition of strict work requirements as opening up the opportunity for the dramatic growth we then saw. I do not see the growth, Mr. President, in any direct

way related to a recession because we did not have that dramatic of an increase in the last recession that we had in 1974 and 1975.

So, we are at the point where we have to consider the new approach to welfare reform, an approach that establishes faith in State governments and local governments because they have done a lot to reduce welfare. Their plans are working. Yet, they had to come to the Federal Government on bended knees, hat in hand, even to get limited waivers to accomplish what they wanted to do. I will bet that in most instances they would have been more dramatic, more dynamic in what they would want to try in the way of reform if they had not had to get those waivers. I know my own State of Iowa had to wait 8 months for waivers.

Iowa has moved 2,000 people off the welfare rolls and reduced the monthly check from \$360 to \$340. My State has the highest percentage of anybody on AFDC at work, 34 percent. That has been a dramatic increase from under 18 percent when our program started, less than 2 years ago.

President Clinton ran for office in 1992. When he was running for office, he promised to end welfare as we know it. After 2 years of inaction, the American people rendered a very dramatic change in Congress, so dramatic that some historians say you have to go back to 1930 to see such a political change at the grassroots in America reflected in the membership of Congress. But for the first time since 1954, Republicans control both Houses of the Congress.

The American people said that they wanted change. The people had not seen the President and a Congress of the President's party so that there would be no gridlock delivered, as was promised in that 1992 election. They wanted change and they did not receive it. So they voted out the old and voted in the new.

I stated how in 1988 we passed welfare reform. Unfortunately, it failed our hopes and expectations. We have more people on welfare today than we did then.

The proposal that is before us from the other side of the aisle is basically a modification and continuation of the 1988 plan. The only positive thing to come out of the 1988 Family Support Act is that some States sought out waivers and came up with changes. As our political laboratories, our State legislatures, they suggested changes which could be made. They began to move people from welfare to work and save the taxpayers' money.

The example of the States then is what moved us on this side of the aisle to our block grant approach as a means of addressing the crisis in the current welfare system. We are ending the entitlement approach, by ending the attitude that the Federal Government knows the answers to all the welfare problems, that we can decide in Washington and we can pay for them as well.

Well, we learned that we do not have all the answers. We have learned that we have not solved all of the problems. And we are finally, after 30 years, facing up to the fact that we cannot afford all of these entitlements.

I am surprised when I hear that if we give authority back to the States, children will be left starving in the streets. That has not been said this morning, but the implication is there when we are told that 10 years from now if we vote for a block grant approach, we are going to look back and see that it is a mistake. That could be. And we have constitutional authority to reevaluate what we have done. But I think I have seen enough change and improvement in the programs at the State level to give me courage to move forward with ending the Federal entitlement and to ignore the warnings that I have received from my good friend.

Somehow I think some in this body have bought into the idea that we at the Federal level know what's best and that we can fix everything. I think it is a fairly arrogant approach to assume that only the Federal leaders as opposed to State leaders have compassion towards the needs of those less fortunate in our society.

In 40 years of Federal control we have seen an increase in dependency. We have seen an increase in the number of people on welfare. We have seen an increase in all of the social pathological problems that come from single-parent families.

We have heard these statistics over and over, but 70 percent of the juveniles in reformatories come from single-parent families, 60 percent of the rapists, 72 percent of the adolescent murderers. Kids that come from broken families are 40 percent more likely to fail a grade, 70 percent more likely to be expelled from school. Girls from broken families are more likely to have out-of-wedlock births and continue the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator he has used 20 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. OK. I am going to take just a few more minutes and then yield the floor to my colleagues.

We have seen well-intended Federal programs destroy the nuclear family. And then we see amendments like we have before us today to continue that form of Federal control.

There is something I believe that we as Republicans and Democrats do agree on, and that is that the current system must be changed and changed dramatically. How dramatically?

Well, not very dramatically from the ideas we are getting from the other side of the aisle. When you want to end a Federal entitlement and let the States make the decisions, that is very dramatic.

We do not all agree that the welfare state is broken, but both Republicans and Democrats agree that the welfare

system within the welfare state is broken, or we would not even have these ideas from the other side of the aisle.

The leadership bill meets the basic goals of welfare reform. That is to provide a system that meets the short-term needs of low-income Americans as they prepare for independence, to provide for much greater State flexibility, to reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock births and strengthen the family, and finally to save the taxpayers some of their hard-earned money.

It is interesting to me that many Members will oppose the leadership bill and support the Moynihan bill because they say our proposal might hurt children. Yet I wish that these same Members would admit that the current system has hurt children.

The system I have described has not been good for our children. If we truly care about these children, we will reform very dramatically the current detrimental system.

Then you have to consider: If you are concerned about children, you also have to be concerned about children who are not on welfare. And if we are not concerned about doing something about this out-of-control Federal spending—though welfare is a small part of it—then we do not show the proper concern for each child born this day who inherits at the first breath \$18,000 of responsibility for the \$4.9 trillion debt we have. If we do not reverse the deficit crisis, our children, all children, will pay 80 percent of their lifetime earnings in taxes. Mr. President, that is wrong. We have to be concerned about the children who are not on welfare as well as children who are on welfare.

It is appropriate for us to be concerned about the children of low-income Americans but, frankly, I think it is about time that we are concerned about all the children of America. That means we have to reduce the deficit while we change the welfare system to free those who are trapped in it. If we take steps to move people from welfare to work, to give more flexibility to the States, to reduce illegitimacy and to strengthen the family, we will in the long run save the taxpayers money. This will be the natural result of positive changes to the current system.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from West Virginia would like to offer an amendment, and to do so with celerity. I yield 30 seconds for such purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank my ranking member.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2491 AND 2492, EN BLOC, TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous consent, I send two amendments, en bloc, to the

desk and ask they be read and the pending amendment be laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] proposes, en bloc, amendments numbered 2491 and 2492 to amendment No. 2280.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2491

(Purpose: To provide States with the option to exempt families residing in areas of high unemployment from the time limit)

On page 36, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

“(4) AREAS OF HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At the State’s option, the State may, on a uniform basis, exempt a family from the application of paragraph (1) if—

“(i) such family resides in an area of high unemployment designated by the State under subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) the State makes available, and requires an individual in the family to participate in, work activities described in subparagraphs (B), (D), or (F) of section 404(c)(3).

“(B) AREAS OF HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT.—The State may designate a sub-State area as an area of high unemployment if such area—

“(i) is a major political subdivision (or is comprised of 2 or more geographically contiguous political subdivisions);

“(ii) has an average annual unemployment rate (as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) of at least 10 percent; and

“(iii) has at least 25,000 residents.

The State may waive the requirement of clause (iii) in the case of a sub-State area that is an Indian reservation.

AMENDMENT NO. 2492

(Purpose: To provide for a State option to exempt certain individuals from the participation rate calculation and the time limit)

On page 35, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

“(6) STATE OPTION FOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENT EXEMPTIONS.—For any fiscal year, a State may opt to not require an individual described in subclause (I) or (II) of section 405(a)(3)(B)(ii) to engage in work activities and may exclude such an individual from the determination of the minimum participation rate specified for such fiscal year in subsection (a).

On page 40, strike lines 6 through 16, and insert the following:

“(B) LIMITATION.—

“(i) 15 PERCENT.—In addition to any families provided with exemptions by the State under clause (ii), the number of families with respect to which an exemption made by a State under subparagraph (A) is in effect for a fiscal year shall not exceed 15 percent of the average monthly number of families to which the State is providing assistance under the program operated under this part.

“(ii) CERTAIN FAMILIES.—At the State’s option, the State may provide an exemption under subparagraph (A) to a family—

“(I) of an individual who is ill, incapacitated, or of advanced age; and

“(II) of an individual who is providing full-time care for a disabled dependent of the individual.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Senator from New York. I ask unanimous consent to lay the amendments aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 2466

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 90 seconds, first to say in response to my friend from Iowa, my long associate on the Committee on Finance, he was this morning talking of the achievements of the State of Iowa in this area, and did so the other day, and he was talking about the achievements under the Family Support Act. There is yet a new proposal that came from Iowa, a request for a new set of disregards, and such like, received in April and approved in August for the Iowa Family Investment Program.

The Senator is right to be proud, but why not associate what Iowa has done with the legislation that encouraged it. I do not ask a response. I do not expect a response. But I would like to put that new Iowa Family Investment Program in the RECORD at this point, Mr. President. It is one page.

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

IOWA FAMILY INVESTMENT PROGRAM
(Request: April 1993. Approved: August, 1993)
STATEWIDE

Disregard 20% of earnings as work expense deduction; in addition, disregard 50% of earned income after all other deductions applied; disregard all earnings in first four months of employment if individual reports employment in timely manner and had less than \$1200 in earnings in 12 months before the employment began.

\$2,000 asset limit for applicants, \$5,000 for recipients; exempt equity value of automobile up to \$3,000, adjusted annually by CPI; income deposited in IDA will not be counted as income and funds in IDA not counted toward asset limit.

Limit exemptions from requirement of Family Investment Agreement to individuals: 1) with a child under 6 months; 2) already employed 30 hours per week or more; or 3) disabled.

Plan specifies that families will be given individualized time limits based on their circumstances. At the end of the specified period, all benefits terminated. Extensions available for good cause.

For noncompliance, family will receive “Limited Benefit Plan,” full benefits for three months of benefits, followed by three months of benefits for children only, followed by full family ineligibility for six months.

TCC for 24 months.

Eliminate 100-hour rule and work history requirements.

Allow stepparents same earned income disregards as available to recipients, as described above. Stepparents also allowed to receive regular child care expense deduction.

Allow grandparents same earned income disregards as available to recipients, as described above.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, again, in response to my friend, it is the fact that in the 1992 campaign, then candidate, now President Clinton proposed to end welfare as we know it.

In an address to Georgetown University opening his campaign in 1991, he proposed a 2-year limit and now we begin to see the consequences. I have nothing more to say than that except to concede, I hope graciously, the Senator is right. We are ending the Federal entitlement to States for the support of dependent children and it is ending what we have known as welfare.

Sir, my able colleague and friend from Louisiana would like to speak to the experience of Louisiana under the Family Support Act. I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. I thank very much the ranking member for giving me some time.

I, too, was a little confused when the Senator from Iowa was talking about the situation in his State. I have heard many, many times in many forums the success of Iowa in being innovative, in creating new programs and ideas of how to solve the problems of welfare reform in their particular State. And those accomplishments really were accomplished under the Family Support Act that was passed in this Congress in 1988.

That bill, which passed this body by a vote of 96 to 1, allowed States to be creative, allowed States to put in new ideas and new programs. Iowa took advantage of that and I think made some great progress. I think they should be proud of it. But it also is a result of actions that this Senate, this body took when we enacted the Family Support Act of 1988, the principal author of which was the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, the senior Senator from the State of New York.

Is it perfect? Of course not. Is anything we do ever perfect? Of course not. But it has allowed for great progress in permitting States to be innovative in creating programs that best fit the needs of their particular State.

In keeping with that, I wanted to share the experience of my State of Louisiana. The headline in the Monroe News Star World of August 14 of this year: "Project Independence Trims Welfare Rolls Across State." This is good news. This was done under the existing program, under the Family Support Act of 1988. There is good news in the land, in many States that have done substantially positive things in getting people off welfare. I read from the article. It says:

"In Louisiana, welfare reform is nothing new. Since October of 1990, the number of Louisiana residents receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children has dropped 20 percent," said Howard Prejeau, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Family Support.

"Since 1990, it has dropped 20 percent." The article further continues:

"That decrease," he said, "is due in large part to Project Independence, a program that helps AFDC recipients find jobs and increase their education." Project Independence was created under the Family Support Act of 1988.

As of June 1995, 11,260 participants received jobs with 8,332 making enough money to get off welfare completely, according to a report released by the Department of Social Services.

A program in my State provides child care and transportation, absolutely essential ingredients if we are going to have real reform for those looking for work. Also it helps build up self-esteem by teaching the value of working and showing them their own self-worth.

Project Independence also has programs to help participants receive their GED's or high school diplomas, receive associate and 4-year degrees or job-skills training and build résumés through community service work.

A report issued by the Public Welfare Association in 1994, Louisiana ranked last in AFDC caseload growth in the country for 1989 through 1993.

Mr. President, it is not a coincidence that this achievement and this accomplishment for my State of Louisiana was produced as a direct product of the Family Support Act of 1988 offered by the distinguished Senator from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN. We should recognize and congratulate success where it has occurred. And under this program there have been outstanding examples of real success. We should not ignore it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I would yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator from Iowa for yielding the time.

Mr. President, I think it is appropriate during this debate to be aware of something that is going on around the Nation today that there are those individuals trying to hold on to the past with white knuckles and using taxpayers' money to do that.

I was shocked to find out yesterday that in my hometown of Tulsa, OK, we had a traveling troupe from Texas. These are the regional directors of the various agencies: Mr. Steve Weatherford from Housing and Urban Development, he is the regional director; Pat Montoya, Health and Human Services; and Jim Cantu, of Labor, all converging upon one city, to scare the people of Tulsa, OK, into thinking that if we go along with the changes that we are advocating in the welfare system, the changes in Government as we know it, the changes that are consistent with the revolution that took place on November 8, 1994, that somehow people are going to be starving.

I am just going to read a couple of the quotes here. And it happens that our mayor in Tulsa is a very strong supporter of President Clinton, so I am sure she joined in. But Steve Weatherford of HUD said, "We are talking about major cuts to our social fabric. * * * We are talking about hundreds of thousands of children and poor people who will be affected in Oklahoma."

We have Pat Montoya with Health and Human Services, "Tulsa would lose more than \$5 billion in Federal funding between 1995 and the year 2002 if the GOP program is adopted."

Jim Cantu of Labor said that GOP budget cuts would "take food out of the mouths of children and punish 15-year-old mothers."

And on and on and on.

You know, I have to join with my fellow Senator from Oklahoma, DON NICKLES, as well as Congressman STEVE LARGENT whose district this city of Tulsa is, when we say that there is no better case that can be made of the bloated Government and the waste that has taken place today than to have these top officials with all their entourage tramping around going from city to city to scare people and into maintaining the status quo.

I think that the stories that we are hearing today in conjunction with the welfare bill are very similar to that.

I think the most profound thing that was said by the Senator from Iowa was that if you are really concerned and really having compassion, look at the children who will be born today, if we do not make these major changes, having to spend 82 percent—I think it has been calculated of their lifetime earnings—on supporting Government. So I hope that we can keep this in mind that there is an army of bureaucrats tramping around the country right now, trying to scare people into thinking that we cannot afford a major change.

Let us keep in mind that in November there was a change, that there is a mandate that came with that, and that is, let us end these age-old programs that have been proven failures and change the role of Government as we have come to know it since the 1960's.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I would like to defer to the Senator from Maine on the same basis we just did a little while ago to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Would my friend mind if we alternate at this point?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will yield the floor to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I am very happy to yield 5 minutes of our remaining time to my strong colleague on the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I want to thank the Senator from New York for his exemplary leadership in this area and for what I consider to be a brilliant statement earlier.

There is so much to say about this subject, one scarcely can say it all in 5 minutes. But I am going to just talk about an observation I had a few minutes ago listening to PAT MOYNIHAN on this subject.

The observation had to do with the whole notion of perspective, of how one perceives an issue often dictates the number of conclusions that one reaches about it, whether the facts support that perception or not.

I was reminded of a fact that PAT MOYNIHAN has been an oracle, if you will, a visionary for a number of years about a number of these issues going to the social fabric in our country. He has found himself over time derided, criticized for his observations. Then, with the passage of time, people come back and say, oh, by the way, that PAT MOYNIHAN was right 20 years ago. He warned us about the increase in illegitimacy. He warned us about this development, or he warned us about another development.

And so, frankly, it has got to be a little frustrating to him to be that kind of prophet in his own time, pointing the way and trying to give people the facts, the basic information that should influence debates like this one, but I daresay unfortunately all too often do not influence debates like this one.

The fact of the matter is, this is more of a political debate than it is anything having to do with reality. The fact of the matter is, this debate is being shaped by hot buttons and wedge issues and frustration and, frankly, campaign dynamics more than anything going to the experience, the history, the reality or anything that can be projected for the future.

I heard a lot of conversation about this as a revolution we are going to go and do things a new way. We are going to get the Federal Government out of the business of providing for poor children and out of setting up the welfare system and the like.

The reality is, Mr. President, that there is an old expression that those who do not learn the lessons of history are doomed to repeat its mistakes. I think that is ancient wisdom that still applies.

The fact of the matter is that the Federal Government was not always in the business of providing for poor children.

Last night, when I made a statement about this issue, I talked about the friendless foundlings and homeless half-orphans, the experience of this country in dealing with the poverty, child poverty particularly, before the Federal Government ingratiated itself and got involved in providing a national safety net, a national base, if you will, below which we expect no American child to fall.

Well, we apparently did not learn that history or have chosen, because of our frustration and our aggravation with our inability to fix this problem, decided to go back to that, to go back to the model that says the Federal Government has no role and, more to the point, as a national community because it is not a Federal Government that sets out there. We are all as Americans in this democracy—really the

Federal Government is an expression of all of us as a national community. And this legislation, as has been admitted and spoken to very candidly on the floor, says that as a national community we have no obligation to poor children in the various locations and locales around this country, that a child's situation and the level and degree of poverty or privation may well depend on an accident of that child's geography, and that that is OK by this body with the pending legislation.

Well, that may be the case. But I submit to you, Mr. President, we have, at a minimum, an obligation to do no harm. As we talk about our political revolution and anger about politicians making statements or whatever, and we go through all of that, it seems to me we have an obligation to do no harm.

In my mind, that means that we do not allow ourselves to construct a response to poverty that will leave the possibility wide open that PAT MOYNIHAN might once again be right, will leave the possibility that we could very well wind up with children being found frozen on the grates on the street corners, that children will no longer have a national safety net, that we will not, as a national community, have a sense of obligation and responsibility to poor children.

There are estimates that given the leadership proposal, should the leadership proposal pass, and this is a preliminary estimate, in my State of Illinois alone, it is projected that the number of children by the 21st century—which is not that far from now—the number of children that will be cut off will be 598,000 children, or 34 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I yield 1 additional minute.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I will be brief. Nationally, the number of children who are likely to be affected and left with no safety net for their welfare whatsoever in this country will be 12 million children—12 million children, a third of the children.

We already know in this country, in America, right now we have the highest child poverty rate in the entire industrialized world. That, in and of itself, ought to make us mindful of our obligation to do better by the response to poverty that we construct in this legislative body than the hot button and the politics that is apparently driving the debate today. If anything, that perspective makes me very sad.

I want to congratulate Senator MOYNIHAN for continuing to raise the issues that these are a phenomenon that transcends anything the Federal Government standing alone can do or any bill standing alone will do. These are the issues that go to the core of fundamental issues having to do with the functioning of our economy, with the existence of poverty and with the breakdown of the family as a unit.

Those kinds of concerns are not being addressed by the leadership bill, and I hope that the Members will support Senator MOYNIHAN's amendment, at least with the prescription that as we move in this very sensitive and important area, we do no harm to the children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from New York he has 2 minutes and 15 seconds. The Senator from Iowa has 17 minutes and 6 seconds. Who yields time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor to the Senator from Maine, on the same basis that we did the Senator from West Virginia earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2493 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280
(Purpose: To clarify provisions relating to the distribution to families of collected child support payments)

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. Snowe], for herself and Mr. BRADLEY, proposes an amendment No. 2493 to amendment No. 2280.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 582, strike line 3 and all that follows through line 2 on page 583, and insert the following:

“(i) DISTRIBUTION TO THE FAMILY TO SATISFY ARREARAGES THAT ACCRUED BEFORE THE FAMILY RECEIVED ASSISTANCE.—From any remainder after the application of clause (1), in order to satisfy arrearages of support obligations that accrued before the family received assistance from the State, the State—

“(I) may distribute to the family the amount so collected with respect to such arrearages accruing (and assigned to the State as a condition of receiving assistance) before the effective date of this subsection; and

“(II) shall distribute to the family the amount so collected with respect to such arrearages accruing after such effective date.

“(iii) RETENTION BY THE STATE OF A PORTION OF ASSIGNED ARREARAGES TO REPAY ASSISTANCE FURNISHED TO THE FAMILY.—From any remainder after the application of clauses (i) and (ii), the State shall retain (with appropriate distribution to the Federal Government) amounts necessary to reimburse the State and Federal Government for assistance furnished to the family.

“(iv) DISTRIBUTION OF THE REMAINDER TO THE FAMILY.—The State shall distribute to the family any remainder after the application of clauses (i), (ii), and (iii).”

On page 585, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

(C) AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE CONCERNING COLLECTION OF CHILD SUPPORT ARREARAGES THROUGH INCOME TAX REFUND OFFSET.—

(1) Section 6402(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the third sentence.

(2) Section 6402(d)(2) of such Code is amended in the first sentence by striking all that follows "subsection (c)" and inserting a period.

On page 585, line 11, strike "(c)" and insert "(d)".

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, this amendment is also being cosponsored by Senator BRADLEY of New Jersey.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2494 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

(Purpose: To clarify that the penalty provisions do not apply to certain single custodial parents in need of child care and to exempt certain single custodial parents in need of child care from the work requirements)

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. Snowe] proposes an amendment No. 2494 to amendment No. 2280.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 36, strike lines 14 through 25, and insert the following:

"(d) PENALTIES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), if an adult in a family receiving assistance under the State program funded under this part refuses to engage in work required under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(2), a State to which a grant is made under section 403 shall—

"(A) reduce the amount of assistance otherwise payable to the family pro rate (or more, at the option of the State) with respect to any period during a month in which the adult so refuses; or

"(B) terminate such assistance, subject to such good cause and other exceptions as the State may establish.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a state may not reduce or terminate assistance under the State program based on a refusal of an adult to work if such adult is a single custodial parent caring for a child age 5 or under and has a demonstrated inability to obtain needed child care, for one or more of the following reasons:

"(A) Unavailability of appropriate child care within a reasonable distance of the individual's home or work site.

"(B) Unavailability or unsuitability of informal child care by a relative or under other arrangements.

"(C) Unavailability of appropriate and affordable formal child care arrangements."

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment.

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

Who yields time?

Mr. PRYOR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 2495 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

(Purpose: To modify the penalty provisions)

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] proposes an amendment numbered 2495 to amendment No. 2280.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 52, lines 4 through 6, strike "so used, plus 5 percent of such grant (determined without regard to this section)." and insert "so used. If the Secretary determines that such unlawful expenditure was made by the State in intentional violation of the requirements of this part, then the Secretary shall impose an additional penalty of up to 5 percent of such grant (determined without regard to this section)."

On page 56, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

"(d) COMPLIANCE PLAN.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the deduction from the grant of aggregate penalties under subsection (a) in excess of 5 percent of a State's grant payable under section 403, a State may develop jointly with the Secretary a plan which outlines how the State will correct any violations for which such penalties would be deducted and how the State will insure continuing compliance with the requirements of this part.

"(2) FAILURE TO CORRECT.—If the Secretary determines that a State has not corrected the violations described in paragraph (1) in a timely manner, the Secretary shall deduct some or all of the penalties described in paragraph (1) from the grant."

On page 56, strike lines 11 through 14, and insert the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The penalties described in paragraphs (2) through (6) of subsection (a) shall apply—

"(A) with respect to periods beginning 6 months after the Secretary issues final rules with respect to such penalties; or

"(B) with respect to fiscal years beginning on or after October 1, 1996; whichever is later."

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment just sent to the desk be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Who yields time?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. The Senator from Arkansas just offered the amendment. So I yield back my few seconds. I thank the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. How much time does Senator MOYNIHAN have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 1 minute remaining. The Senator from Iowa has 15 minutes, 30 seconds remaining.

AMENDMENT NO. 2466

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am going to use the same amount of time Senator MOYNIHAN has left, and then I will yield back my time.

I would like to respond to a couple statements that have been made, I think one by Senator MOYNIHAN, the other one by Senator BREUX. They each made the point that since my State of Iowa has been doing so well in getting waivers, why should we not just continue building upon the 1988 act.

The point here, Mr. President, is first, that it takes such a very, very long time to get a waiver. Second, I believe state legislatures, in changing their welfare laws with the hopes of getting a waiver, are relatively less dynamic and venturesome than they would be if they had the sole authority to make a determination of what they wanted in welfare reform for their State.

Just to show you how complicated it is to get such a waiver approved, a State can sometimes be caught getting waivers from four different Federal Departments: The Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Labor.

All four of these Departments are, in one way or another, responsible for programs that affect low-income families served by our current welfare system. However, there is no coordination among these Departments in granting waivers to the States. In fact, each specific program has its own set of statutes and rules defining the parameters of possible waivers.

I could give you description after description of what my State of Iowa has gone through. In the first days of debate on this legislation, we heard speeches by the Senator from Oregon about the complicated process of waivers that Oregon had to go through, the multitudes of meetings, the multitudes of trips to Washington, DC, the changes that were required, and then they had to go back through the approval process again. We want to end the process by which the coequal States of our Union come to Washington hat in hand on bended knee to get these waivers.

The last point I will make is this. We have had the opportunity again today to hear from the Senator from Illinois about the plight of children. She does this very well.

There is no disputing anything she says, including the facts and figures that she has given of the rapid increase in the number of children in those circumstances.

But let me remind her—let me remind everybody—as we debate welfare

reform, as we consider a change of this system, that all the problems she describes are under a failed system. All those statistics that have increased in number, such as the number of people in poverty—the system that is being defended today, is the cause of those increases.

It is about time that we try something new. I think we have seen the success of the States, and we ought to move to a new approach.

I ask my colleagues to vote against the Moynihan amendment.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. And I yield 1 minute of the 2 minutes, generously provided by the Senator from Iowa, to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending measure be set aside for the purposes of sending amendments to the desk, not being counted against my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2496, 2497, AND 2498, EN BLOC,
TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I send all three amendments to the desk, en bloc, and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] proposes amendments numbered 2496, 2497, and 2498.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2496

(Purpose: To modify the provisions regarding the State plan requirements)

At the end of section 402(a), insert the following:

“(9) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) ELIGIBILITY.—The terms and conditions under which families are deemed needy and eligible for assistance under the program.

“(B) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The terms and conditions described in subparagraph (A) shall include—

“(i) a need standard based on family income and size;

“(ii) a standard for benefits or schedule of benefits for families based on family size and income;

“(iii) explicit rules regarding the treatment of earned and unearned income, resources, and assets; and

“(iv) a description of any variations in the terms and conditions described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) that are applicable in—

“(I) regions or localities within the State; or

“(II) particular circumstances.

“(C) IDENTIFICATION OF FAMILIES CATEGORICALLY INELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE.—Identification of any categories of families, or individuals with such families, that are deemed by the State to be categorically ineligible for assistance under the program, regardless of family income or other terms and conditions developed under subparagraph (A).

“(D) ASSURANCES REGARDING THE PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.—Assurances that all families deemed eligible for assistance under the program under subparagraph (A) shall be provided assistance under the standard for benefits or the benefit schedule described in subparagraph (B)(ii), unless—

“(i) the family or an individual member of the family is categorically ineligible for assistance under subparagraph (C); or

“(ii) the family is subject to sanctions or reductions in benefits under terms of another provision of the State plan, this part, Federal or State law, or an agreement between an individual recipient of assistance in such family and the State that may contain terms and conditions applicable only to the individual recipient.

“(E) PROCEDURES FOR ENSURING THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The procedures under which the State shall ensure that funds will remain available to provide assistance under the program to all eligible families during a fiscal year if the State exhausts the grant provided to the State for such fiscal year under section 403.

“(F) WAITING LISTS.—Assurances that no family otherwise eligible for assistance under the program shall be placed on a waiting list for assistance or instructed to reapply at such time that additional Federal funds may become available.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 2497

(Purpose: To prohibit a State from shifting the costs of aid or assistance provided under the aid to families with dependent children or the JOBS programs to local governments)

At the end of section 405, insert the following:

“(f) NO UNFUNDED LOCAL MANDATES.—A State to which a grant is made under section 403 may not, by mandate or policy, shift the costs of providing aid or assistance that, prior to October 1, 1995 (or March 31, 1996, in the case of a State exercising the option described in section 110(b) of the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995) was provided under the aid to families with dependent children or the JOBS programs (as such programs were in effect on September 30, 1995) to—

“(1) counties;

“(2) localities;

“(3) school boards; or

“(4) other units of local government.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 2498

(Purpose: To provide that existing civil rights laws shall not be preempted by this Act)

At the appropriate place at the end of Title I, add the following:

Nothing in this Act shall be interpreted to preempt the enforcement of existing civil rights laws.

AMENDMENT NO. 2466

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate Senator MOYNIHAN for putting together the only welfare alternative that is really based on what we know about welfare, what the problems are, what we can fix, and what we can't fix.

As a member of the Finance Committee, I was struck by the fact that we held several months of hearings, heard from academic experts, State administrators, Governors, people who work with young mothers in residential programs, and job placement specialists. We heard all their suggestions about what could be improved, and then we proceeded to ignore all their advice. We simply ignored it.

Instead we adopted a solution that serves the political purpose of claiming that we've eliminated welfare, but in reality, does nothing. It turns over the whole thing, with all its problems, to the States, in the hopes that they can figure it out.

Senator MOYNIHAN took the right approach. He looked at his own greatest accomplishment, the Family Support Act of 1988, and was willing to acknowledge that it had fallen short of our expectations in some very distinct ways:

First, the JOBS Program overall was not successful at moving people into work. It put too little emphasis on real work and discouraged real education, leaving people to waste their time in empty job search programs and structured study halls. Some programs actually delayed recipients getting jobs longer than if they hadn't been in the program. But several counties and States found ways to do much better, by striving to place people directly into real jobs and building the training around those jobs. This amendment shifts the focus of the JOBS Program to build on its strengths rather than its shortcomings.

Second, AFDC overall, and the JOBS Program in particular, don't give States enough flexibility to find their own solutions. That's not an argument for handing the States a fixed pot of money and washing our hands of the whole thing. Instead, it's an argument for giving the States flexibility within clear standards, requiring the States to structure the JOBS Program as they see fit but requiring results. This amendment does just that.

Third, we made a mistake in 1988 that we are now on the verge of making all over again, in much greater magnitude: We made big promises and failed to invest. Taking individuals from the middle of the turmoil of America's cities, from the turmoil of their own families and neighborhoods, individuals who are caring for children, and helping them to become economically self-sufficient is an enormous challenge. It means giving each person almost constant attention, helping them find a way to balance work and family, helping them master new skills, compensating for the failures of the elementary and secondary school system. It means sticking with people after they find their first job, helping them keep that job and move on to a better one. It cannot be done with slogans or wishes. It requires an investment.

Since 1988, we have spent only \$1 billion a year on the JOBS Program, and much of that has gone unspent because States have not been willing or able to come up with their share. This amendment is the only alternative that makes realistic promises about getting people to work and puts the investment behind it.

The argument I have heard against this amendment is simply that it retains the entitlement. That's an evil

work, but what does it really mean? It means that States will get an amount of money equal to what they need—when hardship increases because of the economy, States will have the resources they need. It means that individuals who need help will get it, as long as they make an effort to become self-sufficient. Nobody is entitled to anything if they don't follow the rules. And the States can set the rules with greater flexibility under this amendment.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support Senator MOYNIHAN's alternative. It is the only welfare bill we will vote on that is based on reality and not slogans. It builds on the successful piece of legislation in 1988 by repairing its most glaring flaws. It will not end welfare as we know it, but it will reform welfare into a system that strengthens families, that connects parents to work, that brings fathers back into the family, and that promotes innovation.

Those may seem like modest expectations compared to the slogans that we hear on this floor throughout this debate. But if we can accomplish this much, we will have reason to be proud.

This amendment and this alternative deserves the Senate's support.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, we all owe a debt of gratitude to Senator MOYNIHAN for his tireless efforts to educate this body and indeed the American people about the causes of poverty in modern society. Spanning four decades, Senator MOYNIHAN has performed several roles in the effort to end poverty. Throughout his distinguished career, he has been a professor, a planner, an economist, a social scientist, an advocate, and an author, as well as a brilliant legislator and dedicated public servant.

But most of all, he has been right about the causes of poverty amidst the wealthiest nation on earth. He has given us, chapter and verse, the reasons why the number of children receiving AFDC has increased threefold since a small group in the Office of Economic Opportunity mapped out the War on Poverty 30 years ago.

Senator MOYNIHAN predicted the growing tragedy of the American welfare system. He was right because he knew then, as he maintains today that there are consequences to behavior.

But we are here today because knowing why something happens does not necessarily tell us how to modify the predictable results. In fact, we now have 30 years of experience which tells us that despite the best of intentions, the Federal Government cannot replace strong families. The needs of children and families cannot be reduced to mathematical diagrams. The wisdom of Solomon is rarely found in the Federal Register.

Under the present welfare system, we now have over 9 million children receiving AFDC benefits. If we do nothing, the Department of Health and Human Services projects there will be

12 million children on AFDC within 10 years. That is what the present system will bring. This fact alone should embolden us to act in a dramatic way to change the status quo.

Today, we have the choice between two different approaches to changing the welfare system. There are several important, fundamental differences between Senator MOYNIHAN's proposal and the Republican legislation. Perhaps the most important difference is the role of the Federal Government. It is time to release the grasp of Washington which for too long has choked off the initiative and creativity of the States in answering the challenges of the welfare system. If the States remain dependent on Washington, they will not take the bold steps we need and should encourage to the vexing problems of our welfare system. The States do not need another Washington-based approach. They do not need another revision based on a faulty premise. Our block grant approach will free the 50 sovereign States to serve their needy citizens in the most effective manner possible. It is time to leave the past behind and place our confidence in the states to meet the challenges of the future.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield back what time I have remaining.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I yield back such time as we may have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON] would each vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 403 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Akaka	Dorgan	Kennedy
Biden	Exon	Kerrey
Boxer	Feingold	Kerry
Bradley	Feinstein	Lautenberg
Breaux	Ford	Leahy
Bryan	Glenn	Levin
Bumpers	Graham	Lieberman
Byrd	Heflin	Mikulski
Conrad	Hollings	Moseley-Braun
Daschle	Inouye	Moynihan
Dodd	Johnston	Murray

Pell	Robb	Simon
Pryor	Rockefeller	Wellstone
Reid	Sarbanes	

NAYS—56

Abraham	Frist	Mack
Ashcroft	Gorton	McCain
Baucus	Gramm	McConnell
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bingaman	Grassley	Nunn
Bond	Gregg	Packwood
Brown	Harkin	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Campbell	Hatfield	Santorum
Chafee	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hutchison	Simpson
Cohen	Inhofe	Smith
Coverdell	Jeffords	Snower
Craig	Kassebaum	Specter
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Stevens
DeWine	Kohl	Thomas
Dole	Kyl	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Faircloth	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—3

Cochran	Murkowski	Thompson
---------	-----------	----------

So the amendment (No. 2466) was rejected.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri to offer an amendment.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

AMENDMENT NO. 2499 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I will only take a moment. I want to offer an amendment. I will send it to the desk and ask it be set aside so it may be covered—may be discussed and acted upon next week.

Yesterday I told this Chamber about a situation in Sedalia, MO, where we are attempting to get people off of welfare into an employment situation. The program is working well except we found that when welfare recipients, AFDC recipients, went to the employer and tested positively for drugs and were refused a job, the State was prohibited under Federal regulations from cutting them off from their AFDC aid. So we have a situation where, if someone wants to stay on welfare and does not want to have to take a job, they could use drugs, be disqualified from taking a position because of drug tests, and could not be sanctioned by the State.

This measure very simply states that notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State shall not be prohibited by the Federal Government from sanctioning welfare recipients who test positive for use of controlled substances.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] proposes an amendment numbered 2499 to amendment No. 2280.

Mr. BOND. 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:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, States shall not be prohibited by the federal government from sanctioning welfare recipients who test positive for use of controlled substances.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be set aside to be called up pursuant to agreement by the manager and ranking member.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio wishes to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 2500 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

(Purpose: To ensure that training for displaced homemakers is included among workforce employment activities and workforce education activities for which funds may be used under this Act)

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] proposes an amendment numbered 2500 to amendment No. 2280.

Mr. GLENN. 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:

On page 322, strike lines 8 through 14 and insert the following:

(8) DISPLACED HOMEMAKER.—The term “displaced homemaker” means an individual who—

(A) has been dependent—

(i) on assistance under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act and whose youngest child is not younger than 16; or

(ii) on the income of another family member, but is no longer supported by such income; and

(B) is unemployed or underemployed, and is experiencing difficulty in obtaining or upgrading employment.

On page 359, line 13, strike “and”.

On page 359, line 16, strike the period and insert “; and”.

On page 359, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(P) preemployment training for displaced homemakers.

On page 364, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(6) providing programs for single parents, displaced homemakers, and single pregnant women;

On page 364, line 10, strike “(6)” and insert “(7)”.

On page 364, line 12, strike “(7)” and insert “(8)”.

On page 412, line 4, strike “and”.

On page 412, line 5, strike the period and inset “; and”.

On page 412, between 5 and 6, insert the following:

(G) displaced homemakers.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer this amendment because I am extremely concerned that the current provisions in this bill will neglect and ignore a very important segment of our population—displaced homemakers. Nationwide, there are over 17 million displaced homemakers with close to 700,000 in Ohio. The current Perkins Vocational programs for displaced homemakers and single parents has been extremely effective. Approximately 80 percent of women served in these programs are placed in employment and/or post-secondary education. I repeat, 80 percent. Now, if this is not considered a success story, I do not know what is.

This is a good example in which something that we created many years ago, works and works well. Recent statistics show that 85 percent of former program participants across the Nation rated the displaced homemakers programs excellent or very good. Over 75 percent said that these programs were better than other government-funded programs they had participated in.

You know why the success rate is so high? It's because people like Amber McDonald of Akron, OH take their training very seriously and are dead set on getting off welfare.

In a recent letter to me, Amber wrote:

I'd like to state that I am on public assistance at this time in my life and have one child. I don't take pride in the fact I receive welfare. I am grateful to the State of Ohio for their help. It has allowed me to survive and keep my child. It's a long hard road to getting off assistance. One I believe I'm on now. I am attending displaced homemaker classes and these classes have helped me make decisions—good solid decisions. Not the “please-the-system-decisions I've made in the past. The Displaced Homemaker classes educated me about where I could go, what I would need to succeed and how to go about it. We need this program and others like it. A lot of us want off welfare. We are as tired of being on the system as the system is of having us.

Before 1984, when States were not required to fund displaced homemakers' training activities, States unfortunately spent less than 1 percent of their funding on specialized services for displaced homemakers. This is unfortunate because programs for single parents and displaced homemakers have been effective in both preventing families from entering the welfare system and helping families move from the welfare system. And displaced homemakers remain an at-risk population. According to the 1980 census, more than half of the displaced homemakers live in or near poverty.

My amendment will not, I repeat, will not result in a set aside. This amendment will only make it permissible for States to fund for specialized vocational training programs. States will have the flexibility in determining the funding amount and the types of programs to institute. I just want to make sure that States are encouraged

to continue these programs that are working.

I have been hearing from many people from Ohio who have benefited from these services. These women are now gainfully employed; they are off welfare. And they are providing for their families. Are these not the outcomes we want?

For example, Rebecca Richards from Fairfield, OH, wrote how her and her child's life changed since she participated in a displaced homemaker program. She said “As a result of the programs available, I was able to become a productive person in society.” and she concluded by saying “With the program, I found a friend who counseled me, listened to complaints and successes, gave me useful information and training, and helped me meet with other single parents to form a network of friends.” Let us face it, the traditional vocational training programs will not provide this type of training.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which is central to the welfare reform debate. Another Ohioan—Diane Cook—wrote me saying that “Everyone makes mistakes but they all should be allowed a second chance. Give us that second chance.”

The bottom line is to get people off welfare and to keep them off welfare. What better way to accomplish this objective than encouraging the States to tailor training programs which will affect over 17 million women. Mr. President, let us give them that second chance. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be set aside pending consideration of the next amendment.

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

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2501 AND 2502 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment for Senator PRESSLER and an amendment for Senator COHEN.

I ask unanimous consent these amendments be read and filed and laid aside under the usual procedure.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], for Mr. PRESSLER, proposes an amendment numbered 2501 to amendment No. 2280 and, for Mr. COHEN, an amendment numbered 2502 to amendment No. 2280.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2501

(Purpose: To provide a State option to use an income tax intercept to collect overpayments in assistance under the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act)

On page 77, line 21, strike the end quotation marks and the end period.

On page 77, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

“SEC. 418. COLLECTION OF OVERPAYMENTS FROM FEDERAL TAX REFUNDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving notice from the Secretary of Health and Human Services that a State agency administering a plan approved under this part has notified the Secretary that a named individual has been overpaid under the State plan approved under this part, the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine whether any amounts as refunds of Federal taxes paid are payable to such individual, regardless of whether such individual filed a tax return as a married or unmarried individual. If the Secretary of the Treasury finds that any such amount is payable, the Secretary shall withhold from such refunds an amount equal to the overpayment sought to be collected by the State and pay such amount to the State agency.

“(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall issue regulations, after review by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, that provide—

“(1) that a State may only submit under subsection (a) requests for collection of overpayments with respect to individuals—

“(A) who are no longer receiving assistance under the State plan approved under this part.

“(B) with respect to whom the State has already taken appropriate action under State law against the income or resources of the individuals or families involved to collect the past-due legally enforceable debt; and

“(C) to whom the State agency has given notice of its intent to request withholding by the Secretary of the Treasury from the income tax refunds of such individuals;

“(2) that the Secretary of the Treasury will give a timely and appropriate notice to any other person filing a joint return with the individual whose refund is subject to withholding under subsection (a); and

“(3) the procedures that the State and the Secretary of the Treasury will follow in carrying out this section which, to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the specific provisions of this section, will be the same as those issued pursuant to section 464(b) applicable to collection of past-due child support.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COLLECTION OF OVERPAYMENTS.—

(1) Section 6402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to authority to make credits or refunds) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “(c) and (d)” and inserting “(c), (d), and (e)”;

(B) by redesignating subsections (e) through (j) as subsections (f) through (j), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) COLLECTION OF OVERPAYMENTS UNDER TITLE IV—A OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.—The amount of any overpayment to be refunded to the person making the overpayment shall be reduced (after reductions pursuant to subsection (c) and (d), but before a credit against future liability for an internal revenue tax) in accordance with section 418 of the Social Security Act (concerning recovery of overpayments to individuals under State plans approved under part A of title IV of such Act).”.

(2) Paragraph (10) of section 6103(l) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “(c) or (d)” each place it appears and inserting “(c), (d), or (e)”;

(B) by adding at the end of subparagraph (B) the following new sentence: “Any return information disclosed with respect to section 6402(e) shall only be disclosed to officers and employees of the State agency requesting such information.”.

(3) The matter preceding subparagraph (A) of section 6103(p)(4) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “(5), (10)” and inserting “(5)”;

(B) by striking “(9), or (12)” and inserting “(9), (10), or (12)”.

(4) Section 552a(a)(8)(B)(iv)(III) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 464 or 1137 of the Social Security Act” and inserting “section 418, 464, or 1137 of the Social Security Act.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2502

(Purpose: To ensure that programs are implemented consistent with the first amendment)

On page 78, line 18, insert after “subsection (a)(2)” the following: “so long as the programs are implemented consistent with the Establishment Clause of the United States Constitution”.

On page 80, line 13, add “;” after “governance” and delete lines 14–16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendments will be laid aside.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I defer to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENTS NUMBERED 2503, 2504, 2505, AND 2506 EN BLOC TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send amendments en bloc to the desk and ask for their consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], proposes amendments numbered 2503, 2504, 2505, and 2506 en bloc to amendment No. 2280.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2503

(Purpose: to prevent an increase in the number of hungry children in states that elect to participate in a food assistance block grant program)

On page 229, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

“(4) SUNSET OF ELECTION UPON INCREASE IN NUMBER OF HUNGRY CHILDREN.—

“(A) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

“(i) on March 29, 1995 the Senate adopted a resolution stating that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry;

“(ii) it is not the intent of this bill to cause more children to be hungry;”

“(iii) the Food Stamp Program serves to prevent child hunger;

“(iv) a State's election to participate in the optional state food assistance block grant program should not serve to increase the number of hungry children in that State; and

“(v) one indicator of hunger among children is the child poverty rate.

“(B) SUNSET.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services makes two successive findings that the poverty rate among children in a State is significantly higher in a State that has elected to participate in a program established under subsection (a)

than it would have been had there been no such election, 180 days after the second such finding such election shall be permanently and irreversibly revoked and the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not be applicable to that State.

“(C) PROCEDURE FOR FINDING BY SECRETARY.—In making the finding described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall adhere to the following procedure:

“(i) Every three years, the Secretary shall develop data and report to Congress with respect to each State that has elected to participate in a program established under subsection (a) whether the child poverty rate in such State is significantly higher than it would have been had the State not made such election.

“(ii) The Secretary shall provide the report required under clause (i) to all States that have elected to participate in a program established under subsection (a), and the Secretary shall provide each State for which the Secretary determined that the child poverty rate is significantly higher than it would have been had the State not made such election with an opportunity to respond to such determination.

“(iii) If the response by a State under clause (ii) does not result in the Secretary reversing the determination that the child poverty rate in that State is significantly higher than it would have been had the State not made such election, then the Secretary shall publish a finding as described in subparagraph (B).

AMENDMENT NO. 2504

(Purpose: To prevent an increase in the number of hungry and homeless children in states that receive block grants for temporary assistance for needy families)

On page 124, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

“SEC. 113. SUNSET UPON OF INCREASE IN NUMBER OF HUNGRY OR HOMELESS CHILDREN.

“(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

“(1) on March 29, 1995 the Senate adopted a resolution stating that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless;

“(2) it is not the intent of this bill to cause more children to be hungry or homeless;

“(3) the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, which is repealed by this title, has helped prevent hunger and homelessness among children;

“(4) the operation of block grants for temporary assistance for needy families under this title should not serve to increase significantly the number of hungry or homeless children in any State; and

“(5) one indicator of hunger and homelessness among children is the child poverty rate.

“(b) SUNSET.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services makes two successive findings that the poverty rate among children in a State is significantly higher in the State than it would have been had this title not been implemented, then all of the provisions of this title shall cease to be effective with regard to the State 180 days after the second such finding, making effective any provisions of law repealed by this title.

“(c) PROCEDURE FOR FINDING BY SECRETARY.—In making the finding described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall adhere to the following procedure:

“(1) Every three years, the Secretary shall develop data and report to Congress with respect to each State whether the child poverty rate in that State is significantly higher than it would have been had this title not been implemented.

“(2) The Secretary shall provide the report required under paragraph (1) to all States,

and the Secretary shall provide each State for which the Secretary determined that the child poverty rate is significantly higher than it would have been had this title not been implemented with an opportunity to respond to such determination.

“(3) If the response by a State under paragraph (2) does not result in the Secretary reversing the determination that the child poverty rate in that State is significantly higher than it would have been had this title not been implemented, then the Secretary shall publish a finding as described in subsection (b), and the State must implement a plan to decrease the child poverty rate.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2508

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding continuing medicaid coverage for individuals who lose eligibility for welfare benefits because of more earnings or hours of employment)

On page 86, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 104A. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CONTINUING MEDICAID COVERAGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the potential loss of medicaid coverage represents a large disincentive for recipients of welfare benefits to accept jobs that offer no health insurance;

(2) thousands of the Nation’s employers continue to find the cost of health insurance out of reach;

(3) the percentage of working people who receive health insurance from their employer has dipped to its lowest point since the early 1980s; and

(4) children have accounted for the largest proportion of the increase in the number of uninsured in recent years.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that any medicaid reform enacted by the Senate this year should require that States continue to provide medicaid for 12 months to families who lose eligibility for welfare benefits because of more earnings or hours of employment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2506

(Purpose: To provide for an extension of transitional medicaid benefits)

On page 86, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 104A. EXTENSION OF TRANSITIONAL MEDICAID BENEFITS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the potential loss of medicaid coverage represents a large disincentive for recipients of welfare benefits to accept jobs that offer no health insurance;

(2) thousands of the Nation’s employers continue to find the cost of health insurance out of reach;

(3) the percentage of working people who receive health insurance from their employer has dipped to its lowest point since the early 1980s; and

(4) children have accounted for the largest proportion of the increase in the number of uninsured in recent years.

(b) EXTENSION OF MEDICAID ENROLLMENT FOR FORMER TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS FOR 1 ADDITIONAL YEAR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1925(b)(1) (42 U.S.C. 1396r-6(b)(1)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, and shall provide that the State shall offer to each such family the option of extending coverage under this subsection for an additional 2 succeeding 6-month periods in the same manner and under the same conditions as the option of extending coverage under this subsection for the first succeeding 6-month period.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1925 (42 U.S.C. 1396r-6) is amended—

(i) in subsection (b)—

(I) in the heading, by striking “EXTENSION” and inserting “EXTENSIONS”;

(II) in the heading of paragraph (1), by striking “REQUIREMENT” and inserting “IN GENERAL”;

(III) in paragraph (2)(B)(ii)—

(aa) in the heading, by striking “PERIOD” and inserting “PERIODS”;

(bb) by striking “in the period” and inserting “in each of the 6-month periods”;

(IV) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “the 6-month period” and inserting “any 6-month period”;

(V) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “the extension period” and inserting “any extension period”;

(VI) in paragraph (5)(D)(i), by striking “is a 3-month period” and all that follows and inserting the following: “is, with respect to a particular 6-month additional extension period provided under this subsection, a 3-month period beginning with the first or fourth month of such extension period.”; and

(ii) by striking subsection (f).

(B) FAMILY SUPPORT ACT.—Section 303(f)(2) of the Family Support Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 602 note) is amended—

(i) by striking “(A)”;

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to medical assistance furnished for calendar quarters beginning on or after October 1, 1995.

AMENDMENT NO. 2507 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

(Purpose: To exclude energy assistance payments for one-time costs of weatherization or repair or replacement of unsafe or inoperative heating devices from income under the food stamp program)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD, proposes an amendment numbered 2507 to amendment No. 2280.

Mr. WELLSTONE. 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:

Beginning on page 161, strike line 7 and all that follows through page 163, line 1, and insert the following:

SEC. 308. ENERGY ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(d)(11) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014(d)(11)) is amended by striking “any payments or allowances” and inserting the following: “a one-time payment or allowance for the costs of weatherization or emergency repair or replacement of an unsafe or inoperative furnace or other heating or cooling device.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 5(k)(1)(A) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(k)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “plan for aid to families with dependent children approved” and inserting “program funded”.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be laid aside and be considered next week.

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

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I defer to the Senator from Colorado for the purposes of offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 2508 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

(Purpose: To impose a cap on the amount of funds that can be used for administrative purposes)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. BROWN) proposes an amendment numbered 2508 to amendment No. 2280.

On page 25, strike line 4 and insert the following: “1, 1995;

except that not more than 15 percent of the grant may be used for administrative purposes.”

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be laid over until next week for consideration.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I will not interfere with people offering their amendments. But I wonder if I might be permitted to modify my amendment at a later time this afternoon.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I defer to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2509 AND 2510 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk and ask for their consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. SIMON) proposes amendments numbered 2509 and 2510 to amendment No. 2280.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2509

(Purpose: To eliminate retroactive deeming requirements for those legal immigrants already in the United States)

On page 289, lines 2 through 5, strike “, or for a period of 5 years beginning on the day such individual was first lawfully in the United States after the execution of such affidavit or agreement, whichever period is longer”.

(The text of the amendment No. 2510 is printed in today’s RECORD under “Amendments Submitted.”)

Mr. SIMON. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be set aside.

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

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I defer to the Senator from Michigan for the purposes of offering an amendment.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2511 AND 2512 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk and ask for their consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) proposes amendments numbered 2511 and 2512 to amendment No. 2280.

Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2511

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

“SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ENTERPRISE ZONES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Many of the Nation's urban centers are places with high levels of poverty, high rates of welfare dependency, high crime rates, poor schools, and joblessness;

(2) Federal tax incentives and regulatory reforms can encourage economic growth, job creation and small business formation in many urban centers;

(3) Encouraging private sector investment in America's economically distressed urban and rural areas is essential to breaking the cycle of poverty and the related ills of crime, drug abuse, illiteracy, welfare dependency, and unemployment;

(4) The empowerment zones enacted in 1993 should be enhanced by providing incentives to increase entrepreneurial growth, capital formation, job creation, educational opportunities and homeownership in the designated communities and zones;

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—Therefore, it is the Sense of the Senate that the Congress should adopt enterprise zone legislation in the 104th Congress, and that such enterprise zone legislation provide the following incentives and provisions:

(1) Federal tax incentives that expand access to capital, increase the formation and expansion of small businesses, and promote commercial revitalization;

(2) Regulatory reforms that allow localities to petition Federal agencies, subject to the relevant agencies' approval, for waivers or modifications of regulations to improve job creation, small business formation and expansion, community development, or economic revitalization objectives of the enterprise zones;

(3) Homeownership incentives and grants to encourage resident management of public housing and home ownership of public housing;

(4) School reform pilot projects in certain designated enterprise zones to provide low-income parents with new and expanded educational options for their children's elementary and secondary schooling.

AMENDMENT NO. 2512

(Purpose: To increase the block grant amount to States that reduce out-of-wedlock births)

On page 46, after line 24, insert the following:

“(a) GRANT INCREASED TO REWARD STATES THAT REDUCE OUT-OF-WEDLOCK BIRTHS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the grant payable to a State under section 403(a)(1)(A) for fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 shall be increased by—

“(A) 5 percent if—

“(i) the illegitimacy ratio of the State for the fiscal year is at least 1 percentage point

lower than the illegitimacy ratio of the State for fiscal year 1995; and

“(ii) the rate of induced pregnancy terminations in the State for the same fiscal year is not higher than the rate of induced pregnancy terminations in the State for fiscal year 1995; or

“(B) 10 percent if—

“(i) the illegitimacy ratio of the State for the fiscal year is at least 2 percentage points lower than the illegitimacy ratio of the State for fiscal year 1995; and

“(ii) the rate of induced pregnancy terminations in the State for the same fiscal year is not higher than the rate of induced pregnancy termination in the State for fiscal year 1995.

“(2) DETERMINATION OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall not increase the grant amount under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that the relevant difference between the illegitimacy ratio of a State for an applicable fiscal year and the illegitimacy ratio of such State for fiscal year 1995 is the result of a change in State methods of reporting data used to calculate the illegitimacy ratio or if the Secretary determines that the relevant non-increase in the rate of induced pregnancy terminations for an applicable fiscal year as compared to fiscal year 1995 is the result of a change in State methods of reporting data used to calculate the rate of induced pregnancy terminations.

“(3) ILLEGITIMACY RATIO.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “illegitimacy ratio” means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year—

“(A) the number of out-of-wedlock births that occurred in the State during the fiscal year; divided by

“(B) the number of births that occurred in the State during the same fiscal year.

“(4) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated and there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 for the purpose of increasing the amount of the grant payable to a State under section 403(a)(1) in accordance with this subsection.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be set aside.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. President, I defer to the distinguished Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 2513 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

(Purpose: To limit deeming of income to cash and cash-like programs, and to retain SSI eligibility and exempt deeming of income requirements for victims of domestic violence)

Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California (Mrs. Feinstein) proposes an amendment numbered 2513 to amendment No. 2280.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN, 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:

On page 276, line 22, strike “or”.

On page 276, line 23, insert “, or (VI)” after “(V)”.

On page 277, line 10, strike “and”.

On page 277, line 16, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

On page 277, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(F) assistance or services provided to abused or neglected children and their families; and

(G) assistance or benefits under other Federal non-cash programs.

On page 278, line 22, strike “or”.

On page 278, line 25, insert “; or (VI) an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence who has been subjected to domestic violence, or whose household members have been subjected to domestic violence, by the alien's sponsor or by members of the sponsor's household” after “title II”.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 2514 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

(Purpose: To establish a job placement performance bonus that provides an incentive for States to successfully place individuals in unsubsidized jobs, and for other purposes)

Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], for Mr. LIEBERMAN, for himself and Mr. BREAUX and Mr. CONRAD, proposes amendment numbered 2514 to amendment No. 2280.

Mr. MOYNIHAN, 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:

On page 17, line 8, insert “and for each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000, the amount of the State's job placement performance bonus determined under subsection (f)(1) for the fiscal year” after “year”.

On page 17, line 22, insert “and the applicable percent specified under subsection (f)(2)(B)(ii) for such fiscal year” after “(B)”.

On page 29, between lines 15 and 16, insert: “(f) JOB PLACEMENT PERFORMANCE BONUS—“(1) IN GENERAL.—The job placement performance bonus determined with respect to a State and a fiscal year is an amount equal to the amount of the State's allocation of the job placement performance fund determined in accordance with the formula developed under paragraph (2).

“(2) ALLOCATION FORMULA: BONUS FUND.—

“(A) ALLOCATION FORMULA.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 1996, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall develop and publish in the Federal Register a formula for allocating amounts in the job placement performance bonus fund to States based on the number of families that received assistance under a State program funded under this part in the preceding fiscal year that became ineligible for assistance under the State program as a result of unsubsidized employment during such year.

“(ii) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.—In developing the allocation formula under clause (i), the Secretary shall—

“(I) provide a greater financial bonus for individuals in families described in clause (i) who remain employed for greater periods of time or are at greater risk of long-term welfare dependency; and

“(I) take into account the unemployment conditions of each State or geographic area.

“(B) JOB PLACEMENT PERFORMANCE BONUS FUND.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount in the job placement performance bonus fund for a fiscal year shall be an amount equal to—

“(I) the applicable percentage of the amount appropriated under section 403(a)(2)(A) for such fiscal year; and

“(II) the amount of the reduction in grants made under this section for the preceding fiscal year resulting from the application of section 407.

“(ii) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of clause (i)(I), the applicable percentage shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

The applicable percentage is:

“For fiscal year:	
1998	3
1999	4
2000 and each fiscal year thereafter	5.

On page 29, line 16, strike “(f)” and insert “(g)”.

On page 66, line 13, insert “and a preliminary assessment of the job placement performance bonus established under section 403(f)” before the end period.

AMENDMENT NO. 2515 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

(Purpose: To establish a national clearinghouse on teenage pregnancy, set national goals for the reduction of out-of-wedlock and teenage pregnancies, require States to establish a set-aside for teenage pregnancy prevention activities, and for other purposes)

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk in behalf of Senator LIEBERMAN and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], for Mr. LIEBERMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2515 to amendment No. 2280.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. 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:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEENAGE PREGNANCY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a national center for the collection and provision of information that relates to adolescent pregnancy prevention programs, to be known as the “National Clearinghouse on Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Programs”.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The national center established under subsection (a) shall serve as a national information and data clearinghouse, and as a material development source for adolescent pregnancy prevention programs. Such center shall—

(1) develop and maintain a system for disseminating information on all types of adolescent pregnancy prevention programs and on the state of adolescent pregnancy prevention program development, including information concerning the most effective model programs;

(2) identify model programs representing the various types of adolescent pregnancy prevention programs;

(3) develop networks of adolescent pregnancy prevention programs for the purpose of sharing and disseminating information;

(4) develop technical assistance materials to assist other entities in establishing and improving adolescent pregnancy prevention programs;

(5) participate in activities designed to encourage and enhance public media campaigns on the issue of adolescent pregnancy; and

(6) conduct such other activities as the responsible Federal officials find will assist in developing and carrying out programs or activities to reduce adolescent pregnancy.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. . ESTABLISHING NATIONAL GOALS TO REDUCE OUT-OF-WEDLOCK PREGNANCIES AND TO PREVENT TEENAGE PREGNANCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1, 1997, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish and implement a strategy for—

(1) reducing out-of-wedlock teenage pregnancies by at least 5 percent a year, and

(2) assuring that at least 25 percent of the communities in the United States have teenage pregnancy prevention programs in place.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than June 30, 1998, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Congress with respect to the progress that has been made in meeting the goals described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

(c) OUT-OF-WEDLOCK AND TEENAGE PREGNANCY PREVENTION PROGRAMS.—Section 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1397a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f)(1) Beginning in fiscal year 1996 and each fiscal year thereafter, each State shall use at least 5 percent of its allotment under section 2003 for the fiscal year to develop and implement a State program to reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock and teenage pregnancies in the State.

“(2) The Secretary shall conduct a study with respect to the State programs implemented under paragraph (1) to determine the relative effectiveness of the different approaches for reducing out-of-wedlock pregnancies and preventing teenage pregnancy utilized in the programs conducted under this subsection and the approaches that can be best replicated by other States.

“(3) Each State conducting a program under this subsection shall provide to the Secretary, in such form and with such frequency as the Secretary requires, data from the programs conducted under this subsection. The Secretary shall report to the Congress annually on the progress of the programs and shall, not later than June 30, 1998, submit to the Congress a report on the study required under paragraph (2).”.

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ENFORCEMENT OF STATUTORY RAPE LAWS.

It is the sense of the Senate that States and local jurisdictions should aggressively enforce statutory rape laws.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments numbered 2514 and 2515 be set aside.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we are waiting for a few minutes for Senator CRAIG to get here to offer the next

amendment that will be considered this afternoon. So, until he arrives, I would like to have permission to speak as if in morning business to introduce a bill that Senator LEVIN and I are introducing.

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

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1224 are located in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1996

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate H.R. 2126. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, all after the enacting clause is stricken and the language of S. 1087 is inserted.

The clerk will read the bill for the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is passed and the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

So the bill (H.R. 2126), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, the Senate insists on its amendments, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair is authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER appointed Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BOND, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MACK, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. HARKIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, S. 1087 is indefinitely postponed.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BROWN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?