



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1995

No. 140

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 12, 1995, at 10:30 a.m.

Senate

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1995

(Legislative day of Tuesday, September 5, 1995)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

The Word of the Lord is: "Be still and know that I am God; I will be exalted among the nations, I will be exalted in the earth!"—Psalm 46:11.

Let us pray:

Holy God, Your call to prayer startles us. Be still? We are wordsmiths and find it difficult to be still. Our craft is to talk and we are proud of our polished sentences and carefully worded paragraphs. Sometimes we forget to listen to Your voice before we speak. Now in the quiet of this time of prayer we realize how much we want You to be exalted among the nations, particularly this Nation You have called us to lead. Our deepest desire is to know what You desire; our lasting pleasure is to please You. Be exalted in our hearts: our goal is to glorify You. Be exalted in our minds: our purpose is to be bold and creative thinkers. Be exalted in this Senate as each Senator humbles himself and herself to speak the truth as You reveal it and listen to each other with patience and openness. Remind us again that the meaning of the Hebrew words "Be still" imply "let go, leave off, let up." We want to do that consistently today as we open the floodgates of our minds and hearts to receive the inflow of Your power and peace. In our Lord's name. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Iowa is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will be immediately resuming the consideration of the welfare reform bill.

Under the consent agreement, which was reached on Friday, there will be three consecutive rollcall votes beginning at 5 p.m. today. A large number of amendments, as we know, are pending to H.R. 4. Therefore, additional rollcall votes are expected this evening on amendments to this welfare reform bill.

As a reminder to all Members, the voting sequence at 5 o'clock will be, first, the Dodd amendment regarding child care to be followed by the Kassebaum amendment regarding block grants, that to be followed by the Helms amendment on work requirements for food stamps.

The first vote will be 15 minutes in length with the remaining votes in sequence limited to 10 minutes each.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, may I simply thank my distinguished friend and colleague for setting out the day's procedure, and call to the attention of those who might be listening that we have some 200 more amendments that were filed on Friday, and that if we are

to dispose of them by Wednesday, as the majority leader has indicated would have to be done if we are going to get through with the year that ends in 3 weeks' time, we will have to hear from Senators about which amendments they wish to have called up and get time agreements for them as we have done today.

I see the distinguished Senator from Kansas has risen, and I look forward to her remarks.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 4, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dole Modified Amendment No. 2280, of a perfecting nature.

Subsequently, the amendment was further modified.

Feinstein Modified Amendment No. 2469 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide additional funding to States to accommodate any growth in the number of people in poverty.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S 13143

Feinstein Amendment No. 2470 (to Amendment No. 2280), to impose a child support obligation on paternal grandparents in cases in which both parents are minors.

Moseley-Braun Amendment No. 2471 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require States to establish a voucher program for providing assistance to minor children in families that are eligible for but do not receive assistance.

Moseley-Braun Amendment No. 2472 (to Amendment No. 2280), to prohibit a State from imposing a time limit for assistance if the State has failed to provide work activity-related services to an adult individual in a family receiving assistance under the State program.

Moseley-Braun Amendment No. 2473 (to Amendment No. 2280), to modify the job opportunities to certain low-income individuals program.

Moseley-Braun Amendment No. 2474 (to Amendment No. 2280), to prohibit a State from reserving grant funds for use in subsequent fiscal years if the State has reduced the amount of assistance provided to families under the State program in the preceding fiscal year.

Feinstein Amendment No. 2478 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide equal treatment for naturalized and native-born citizens.

Feinstein Amendment No. 2479 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for State and county demonstration programs.

Feingold Amendment No. 2480 (to Amendment No. 2280), to study the impact of amendments to the child and adult care food program on program participation and family day care licensing.

Feingold Amendment No. 2481 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for a demonstration project for the elimination of take-one-take-all requirement.

Bingaman Amendment No. 2483 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require the development of a strategic plan for a State family assistance program.

Bingaman Amendment No. 2484 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide funding for State programs for the treatment of drug addiction and alcoholism and for the National Institute on Drug Abuse Research.

Bingaman Amendment No. 2485 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide Indian vocational education grants.

Simon Amendment No. 2468 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide grants for the establishment of community works progress programs.

Levin Amendment No. 2486 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require recipients of assistance under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to participate in State mandated community service activities if they are not engaged in work after 6 months receiving benefits.

Breaux Amendment No. 2487 (to Amendment No. 2280), to maintain the welfare partnership between the States and the Federal Government.

Breaux Amendment No. 2488 (to Amendment No. 2280), to maintain the welfare partnership between the States and the Federal Government.

Breaux Amendment No. 2489 (to Amendment No. 2280), to improve services provided as workforce employment activities.

Breaux Amendment No. 2490 (to Amendment No. 2280), to strike provisions relating to workforce development and workforce preparation.

Rockefeller Modified Amendment No. 2491 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide States with the option to exempt families residing in areas of high unemployment from the time limit.

Rockefeller Modified Amendment No. 2492 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for a State option to exempt certain individuals

from the participation rate calculation and the time limit.

Snowe/Bradley Amendment No. 2493 (to Amendment No. 2280), to clarify provisions relating to the distribution to families of collected child support payments.

Snowe Amendment No. 2494 (to Amendment No. 2280), 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.

Pryor Amendment No. 2495 (to Amendment No. 2280), to modify the penalty provisions.

Bradley Amendment No. 2496 (to Amendment No. 2280), to modify the provisions regarding the State plan requirements.

Bradley Amendment No. 2497 (to Amendment No. 2280), 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.

Bradley Amendment No. 2498 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide that existing civil rights laws shall not be preempted by this Act.

Bond Amendment No. 2499 (to Amendment No. 2280), to establish that States shall not be prohibited by the Federal Government from sanctioning welfare recipients who test positive for use of controlled substances.

Glenn Amendment No. 2500 (to Amendment No. 2280), 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.

Grassley (for Pressler) Amendment No. 2501 (to Amendment No. 2280), 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.

Grassley (for Cohen) Modified Amendment No. 2502 (to Amendment No. 2280), to ensure that programs are implemented consistent with the First Amendment.

Wellstone Amendment No. 2503 (to Amendment No. 2280), to prevent an increase in the number of hungry children in states that elect to participate in a food assistance block grant program.

Wellstone Amendment No. 2504 (to Amendment No. 2280), to prevent an increase in the number of hungry and homeless children in states that receive block grants for temporary assistance for needy families.

Wellstone Amendment No. 2505 (to Amendment No. 2280), 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.

Wellstone Amendment No. 2506 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for an extension of transitional Medicaid benefits.

Wellstone Amendment No. 2507 (to Amendment No. 2280), 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.

Simon Amendment No. 2509 (to Amendment No. 2280), to eliminate retroactive deeming requirements for those legal immigrants already in the United States.

Simon Amendment No. 2510 (to Amendment No. 2280), to maintain a national Job Corps program, carried out in partnership with States and communities.

Abraham/Lieberman Amendment No. 2511 (to Amendment No. 2280), to express the sense of the Senate that the Congress should adopt enterprise zone legislation in the 104th Congress.

Abraham Amendment No. 2512 (to Amendment No. 2280), to increase the block grant

amount to States that reduce out-of-wedlock births.

Feinstein Amendment No. 2513 (to Amendment No. 2280), 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.

Moynihan (for Lieberman) Amendment No. 2514 (to Amendment No. 2280), to establish a job placement performance bonus that provides an incentive for States to successfully place individuals in unsubsidized jobs.

Moynihan (for Lieberman) Amendment No. 2515 (to Amendment No. 2280), to establish a national clearinghouse on teenage pregnancy, set national goals for the reduction of out-of-wedlock and teenage pregnancies, and require States to establish a set-aside for teenage pregnancy prevention activities.

Hatch Amendment No. 2516 (to Amendment No. 2280), to establish a block grant program for the provision of child care services.

Hatch (for DeWine) Amendment No. 2517 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for quarterly reporting by banks with respect to common trust funds.

Hatch (for DeWine) Amendment No. 2518 (to Amendment No. 2280), to modify the method for calculating participation rates to more accurately reflect the total case load of families receiving assistance in the State.

Hatch (for DeWine) Amendment No. 2519 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for a rainy day contingency fund.

Hatch (for Burns) Amendment No. 2520 (to Amendment No. 2280), to establish procedures for the reduction of certain personnel in the Department of Health and Human Services.

Hatch (for Simpson) Amendment No. 2521 (to Amendment No. 2280), to ensure State eligibility and benefit restrictions for immigrants are no more restrictive than those of the Federal government.

Hatch (for Kassebaum) Amendment No. 2522 (to Amendment No. 2280), to modify provisions relating to funds for other child care programs.

Helms Amendment No. 2523 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require single, able-bodied individuals receiving food stamps to work at least 40 hours every 4 weeks.

Exon Amendment No. 2525 (to Amendment No. 2280), to prohibit the payment of certain Federal benefits to any person not lawfully present within the United States.

Shelby Amendment No. 2526 (to Amendment No. 2280), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable credit for adoption expenses and to exclude from gross income employee and military adoption assistance benefits and withdrawals from IRAs for certain adoption expenses.

Shelby Amendment No. 2527 (to Amendment No. 2280), to improve provisions relating to the optional State food assistance block grant.

Moynihan (for Conrad/Lieberman) Amendment No. 2528 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide that a State that provides assistance to unmarried teenage parents under the State program require such parents as a condition of receiving such assistance to live in an adult-supervised setting and attend high school or other equivalent training program.

Moynihan (for Conrad/Bradley) Amendment No. 2529 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide States with the maximum flexibility by allowing States to elect to participate in the TAP and WAGE programs.

Moynihan (for Conrad) Amendment No. 2530 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide that a State that provides assistance to unmarried teenage parents under the State program require such parents as a condition of receiving such assistance to live in an adult-supervised setting and attend high school or other equivalent training program.

Moynihan (for Conrad) Amendment No. 2531 (to Amendment No. 2280), to prevent States from receiving credit toward work participation rates for individual who leave the roles due to a time limit.

Moynihan (for Conrad) Amendment No. 2532 (to Amendment No. 2280), in the nature of a substitute.

Moynihan (for Levin) Amendment No. 2533 (to Amendment No. 2280), to improve the provisions relating to incentive grants.

Moynihan (for Pell) Amendment No. 2475 (to Amendment No. 2280), to clarify that each State must carry out activities through at least 1 Job Corps center.

Moynihan (for Dodd) Amendment No. 2534 (to Amendment No. 2280), to award national rapid response grants to address major economic dislocations.

Moynihan (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 2535 (to Amendment No. 2280), to express the sense of the Senate on legislative accountability for the unfunded mandates imposed by welfare reform legislation.

Moynihan (for Lieberman) Amendment No. 2536 (to Amendment No. 2280), to establish bonus payments for States that achieve reductions in out-of-wedlock pregnancies, establish a national clearinghouse on teenage pregnancy, set national goals for the reduction of out-of-wedlock and teenage pregnancies, and require States to establish a set-aside for teenage pregnancy prevention activities.

Moynihan (for Lieberman) Amendment No. 2537 (to Amendment No. 2280), to establish a national clearinghouse on teenage pregnancy, set national goals for the reduction of out-of-wedlock and teenage pregnancies, and require States to establish a set-aside for teenage pregnancy prevention activities.

Moynihan Amendment No. 2538 (to Amendment No. 2280), to strike the provisions repealing trade adjustment assistance.

Hatch (for Coats/Ashcroft) Amendment No. 2539 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide a tax credit for charitable contributions to organizations providing poverty assistance.

Hatch (for McCain) Amendment No. 2540 (to Amendment No. 2280), to remove barriers to interracial and interethnic adoptions.

Hatch (for McCain) Amendment No. 2541 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide that States are not required to comply with excessive data collection and reporting requirements unless the Federal Government provides sufficient funding to allow States to meet such excessive requirements.

Hatch (for McCain) Amendment No. 2542 (to Amendment No. 2280), to remove the maximum length of participation in the work supplementation or support program.

Hatch (for McCain) Amendment No. 2543 (to Amendment No. 2280), to make job readiness workshops a work activity.

Hatch (for McCain) Amendment No. 2544 (to Amendment No. 2280), to permit States to enter into a corrective action plan prior to the deduction of penalties from the block grant.

Harkin Amendment No. 2545 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require each family receiving assistance under the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to enter into a personal responsibility contract or a limited benefit plan.

Chafee Amendment No. 2546 (to Amendment No. 2280), to maintain the welfare partnership between the States and the Federal Government.

Chafee (for Cohen) Amendment No. 2547 (to Amendment No. 2280), to deny supplemental security income cash benefits by reason of disability to drug addicts and alcoholics, and to require beneficiaries with accompanying addiction to comply with appropriate treatment requirements as determined by the Commissioner.

Moynihan (for Kerrey) Amendment No. 2549 (to Amendment No. 2280), to allow a State to revoke an election to participate in the optional State food assistance block grant.

Moynihan (for Kohl) Amendment No. 2550 (to Amendment No. 2280), to exempt the elderly, disabled, and children from an optional State food assistance block grant.

Moynihan (for Kohl) Amendment No. 2551 (to Amendment No. 2280), to expand the food stamp employment and training program.

Moynihan (for Bryan) Amendment No. 2552 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide that a recipient of welfare benefits under a means-tested program for which Federal funds are appropriated is not unjustly enriched as a result of defrauding another means-tested welfare or public assistance program.

Moynihan (for Bryan) Amendment No. 2553 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require a recipient of assistance based on need, funded in whole or in part by Federal funds, and the noncustodial parent to cooperate with paternity establishment and child support enforcement in order to maintain eligibility for such assistance.

Moynihan (for Bryan) Amendment No. 2554 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide that State welfare and public assistance agencies can notify the Internal Revenue Service to intercept Federal income tax refunds to recapture over-payments of welfare or public assistance benefits.

Moynihan (for Bryan) Amendment No. 2555 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide State welfare or public assistance agencies an option to determine eligibility of a household containing an ineligible individual under the Food Stamp program.

Hatfield Amendment No. 2467 (to Amendment No. 2280), to increase the participation of teacher, parents, and students in developing and improving workforce education activities.

Hatch (for Nickles) Amendment No. 2556 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require the transmission of quarterly wage reports in order to relay information to the State Director of New Hires to assist in locating absent parents.

Hatch (for Jeffords) Amendment No. 2557 (to Amendment No. 2280), to amend the definition of work activities to include vocational education training that does not exceed 24 months.

Hatch (for Jeffords) Amendment No. 2558 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for the State distribution of funds for secondary school vocational education, postsecondary and adult vocational education, and adult education.

Hatch (for Kyl) Amendment No. 2559 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require the establishment of local workforce development boards.

Dodd Amendment No. 2560 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for the establishment of a supplemental child care grant program.

Ashcroft Amendment No. 2561 (to Amendment No. 2280), to replace the supplemental security income program for the disabled and blind with a block grant to the States.

Ashcroft Amendment No. 2562 (to Amendment No. 2280), to convert the food stamp program into a block grant program.

Graham (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2563 (to Amendment No. 2280), to terminate sponsor responsibilities upon the date of naturalization of the immigrant.

Graham (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2564 (to Amendment No. 2280), to grant the Attorney General flexibility in certain public assistance determinations for immigrants.

Graham Amendment No. 2565 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide a formula for allocating funds that more accurately reflects the needs of States with children below the poverty line.

Graham Amendment No. 2566 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require each responsible Federal agency to determine whether there are sufficient appropriations to carry out the Federal intergovernmental mandates required by this Act, and to provide that the mandates will not be effective under certain conditions.

Graham Amendment No. 2567 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide that the Secretary, in ranking States with respect to the success of their work programs, shall take into account the average number of minor children in families in the State that have incomes below the poverty line and the amount of funding provided each State for such families.

Graham Amendment No. 2568 (to Amendment No. 2280), to set national work participation rate goals and to provide that the Secretary shall adjust the goals for individual States based on the amount of Federal funding the State receives for minor children in families in the State that have incomes below the poverty line.

Graham Amendment No. 2569 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for the prospective application of the provisions of title V.

Dodd (for Leahy) Amendment No. 2570 (to Amendment No. 2280), to reduce fraud and trafficking in the Food Stamp program by providing incentives to States to implement Electronic Benefit Transfer systems.

Jeffords Amendment No. 2571 (to Amendment No. 2280), to modify the maintenance of effort provision.

Santorum (for Domenici) Amendment No. 2572 (to Amendment No. 2280), to improve the child support enforcement system by giving States better incentives to improve collections.

Santorum (for Domenici) Amendment No. 2573 (to Amendment No. 2280), to maintain the welfare partnership between the States and the Federal Government.

Santorum (for Domenici) Amendment No. 2574 (to Amendment No. 2280), to express the sense of the Senate regarding the inability of the noncustodial parent to pay child support.

Santorum (for Domenici) Amendment No. 2575 (to Amendment No. 2280), to allow States maximum flexibility in designing their Temporary Assistance programs.

Santorum (for Domenici) Amendment No. 2576 (to Amendment No. 2280), to create a national child custody database, and to clarify exclusive continuing jurisdiction provisions of the Parental Kidnapping Prevention Act.

Santorum (for D'Amato) Amendment No. 2577 (to Amendment No. 2280), to change the date for the determination of fiscal year 1994 expenditures.

Santorum (for D'Amato) Amendment No. 2578 (to Amendment No. 2280), relating to claims arising before effective dates.

Santorum (for D'Amato) Amendment No. 2579 (to Amendment No. 2280), terminating efforts to recover funds for prior fiscal years.

Santorum (for Grams) Amendment No. 2580 (to Amendment No. 2280), to limit vocational education activities counted as work.

Jeffords Amendment No. 2581 (to Amendment No. 2280), to strike the increase to the grant to reward States that reduce out-of-wedlock births.

Dodd (for Wellstone) Amendment No. 2582 (to Amendment No. 2280), to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rate under such Act.

Dodd (for Wellstone) Amendment No. 2583 (to Amendment No. 2280), to exempt women and children who have been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty from certain requirements of the bill.

Dodd (for Wellstone) Amendment No. 2584 (to Amendment No. 2280), to exempt women and children who have been battered or subjected to extreme cruelty from certain requirements of the bill.

Stevens Amendment No. 2585 (to Amendment No. 2280), of a technical nature.

Santorum (for Cohen) Amendment No. 2586 (to Amendment No. 2280), to modify the religious provider provision.

Santorum (for Specter) Amendment No. 2587 (to Amendment No. 2280), to maintain a national Job Corps program, carried out in partnership with States and communities.

Santorum (for Chafee) Amendment No. 2588 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require States to provide voucher assistance for children born to families receiving assistance.

Santorum (for McCain) Amendment No. 2589 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for child support enforcement agreements between the States and Indian tribes or tribal organizations.

Moynihan Amendment No. 2590 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide that case record data submitted by the States be segregated, and to provide funding for certain research, demonstration, and evaluation projects.

Moynihan (for Boxer) Amendment No. 2591 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for a child care maintenance of effort.

Moynihan (for Boxer) Amendment No. 2592 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide that State authority to restrict benefits to noncitizens does not apply to foster care or adoption assistance programs.

Moynihan (for Boxer) Amendment No. 2593 (to Amendment No. 2280), expressing the sense of the Senate on restrictions on providing medical information by recipients of Federal aid.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2594 (to Amendment No. 2280), to prohibit direct cash benefits for out of wedlock births to minors except under certain conditions.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2595 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to submit a report regarding disqualification of illegal aliens from housing assistance programs.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2596 (to Amendment No. 2280), to express the sense of the Congress regarding a work requirement for public housing residents.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2597 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require ongoing State evaluations of activities carried out through statewide workforce development systems.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2598 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for transferability of funds.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2599 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for transferability of funds allotted for workforce preparation activities for at-risk youth.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2600 (to Amendment No. 2280), to allow a State agency to make cash payments to certain individuals in lieu of food stamp allotments.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2601 (to Amendment No. 2280), to integrate the temporary assistance to needy families with food stamp work rules.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2602 (to Amendment No. 2280), to limit vocational education activities counted as work.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2603 (to Amendment No. 2280), to deny assistance for out-of-wedlock births to minors.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2604 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for no additional cash assistance for children born to families receiving assistance.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2605 (to Amendment No. 2280), to deny assistance for out-of-wedlock births to minors.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2606 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for

provisions relating to paternity establishment and fraud.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2607 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require State goals and a State plan for reducing illegitimacy.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2608 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for an abstinence education program.

Santorum (for Faircloth) Amendment No. 2609 (to Amendment No. 2280), to prohibit teenage parents from living in the home of an adult relative or guardian who has a history of receiving assistance.

Moynihan Amendment No. 2610 (to Amendment No. 2280), to amend title 13, United States Code, to require that any data relating to the incidence of poverty produced or published by the Secretary of Commerce for subnational areas is corrected for differences in the cost of living in those areas.

Moynihan Amendment No. 2611 (to Amendment No. 2280), to correct imbalances in certain States in the Federal tax to Federal benefit ratio by reallocating the distribution of Federal spending.

Abraham/Lieberman Amendment No. 2476 (to Amendment No. 2280), to express the sense of the Senate that the Congress should adopt enterprise zone legislation in the 104th Congress.

Santorum (for Gramm) Amendment No. 2612 (to Amendment No. 2280), to limit the State option for work participation requirement exemptions to the first 12 months to which the requirement applies.

Santorum (for Gramm) Amendment No. 2613 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require that certain individuals who are not required to work are included in the participation rate calculation.

Santorum (for Gramm) Amendment No. 2614 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for increased penalties for failure to meet work requirements.

Santorum (for Gramm) Amendment No. 2615 (to Amendment No. 2280), to reduce the Federal welfare bureaucracy.

Santorum (for Gramm) Amendment No. 2616 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require paternity establishment as a condition of benefit receipt.

Santorum (for Gramm) Amendment No. 2617 (to Amendment No. 2280), to prohibit the use of Federal funds for legal challenges to welfare reform.

Moynihan Amendment No. 2618 (to Amendment No. 2280), to eliminate the requirement that HHS reduce full-time equivalent positions by specific percentages and retain requirements to evaluate the number of FTE positions required to carry out the activities under the bill and to take action to reduce the appropriate number of positions.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2619 (to Amendment No. 2280), to terminate sponsor responsibilities upon the date of naturalization of the immigrant.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2620 (to Amendment No. 2280), to grant the Attorney General flexibility in certain public assistance determinations for immigrants.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2621 (to Amendment No. 2280), to ensure that programs are implemented consistent with the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2622 (to Amendment No. 2280), to repeal food stamp provisions relating to children living at home and to reduce tax benefits for foreign corporations.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2623 (to Amendment No. 2280), to permit States to apply for waivers with respect to the 15 percent cap on hardship exemptions from the 5-year time limitation.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2624 (to Amendment No. 2280), to permit States to provide non-cash assistance to children ineligible for aid because of the 5-year time limitation.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2625 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require States to have in effect laws regarding duration of child support.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2626 (to Amendment No. 2280), to eliminate a repeal relating to the Trade Act of 1974.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2627 (to Amendment No. 2280), to improve provisions relating to the Trade Act of 1974.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2628 (to Amendment No. 2280), to improve provisions relating to the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2629 (to Amendment No. 2280), to improve provisions relating to the unemployment trust fund.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2630 (to Amendment No. 2280), to clarify that the responsibilities of the National Board are advisory.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2631 (to Amendment No. 2280), to improve provisions relating to workforce development activities and funds made available through the unemployment trust fund.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2632 (to Amendment No. 2280), to exclude employment and training programs under the Food Stamp Act of 1977 from the list of activities that may be provided as workforce employment activities.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2633 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for the State distribution of funds for secondary school vocational education, postsecondary and adult vocational education, and adult education.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2634 (to Amendment No. 2280), to establish a job placement performance bonus that provides an incentive for States to successfully place individuals in unsubsidized jobs.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2635 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require that 25 percent of the funds for workforce employment activities be expended to carry out such activities for dislocated workers.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2636 (to Amendment No. 2280), to establish a definition of a local workforce development board.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2637 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide a conforming amendment with respect to local workforce development boards.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2638 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require the establishment of local workforce development boards.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2639 (to Amendment No. 2280), to clarify the role of the summer jobs program.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2640 (to Amendment No. 2280), to expand the provisions relating to the limitation of the use of funds under title VII.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2641 (to Amendment No. 2280), to improve the State apportionment of funds by activity.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2642 (to Amendment No. 2280), to clarify the role of the summer jobs program.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2643 (to Amendment No. 2280), to increase the authorization of appropriations for workforce development activities.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2644 (to Amendment No. 2280), to limit the percentage of the flex account funds that may be used for economic development activities.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2645 (to Amendment No. 2280), to make a conforming amendment regarding limiting the percentage of the flex account funds that may be used for economic development activities.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2646 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for national activities.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2647 (to Amendment No. 2280), to ensure that students have broad exposure to a wide range of knowledge on occupations and choices for skill training.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2648 (to Amendment No. 2280), to clarify the advisory nature of the responsibilities of the National Board.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2649 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide both women and men with access to training in occupations or fields of work in which women or men comprise less than 25 percent of the individuals employed in such occupations or fields of work, with respect to workforce development activities.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2650 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide both women and men with access to training in occupations or fields of work in which women or men comprise less than 25 percent of the individuals employed in such occupations or fields of work, with respect to workforce preparation activities for at-risk youth.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2651 (to Amendment No. 2280), to ensure that States reference existing academic and occupational standards in their State plans.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2652 (to Amendment No. 2280), to ensure that State plans describe activities that will enable States to meet their benchmarks.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2653 (to Amendment No. 2280), to clarify that the term "labor market information" refers to labor market and occupational information.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2654 (to Amendment No. 2280), to explicitly include occupational information in labor market information system provided under workforce employment activities.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2655 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide a conforming amendment relating to labor market and occupational information.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2656 (to Amendment No. 2280), to maintain the administration of the school-to-work programs in the School-to-Work office.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2657 (to Amendment No. 2280), to make the list of workforce education activities for which funds may be used more consistent with the provisions of the amendments made by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Amendments of 1990, and the provisions of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2658 (to Amendment No. 2280), to clarify the role of the State educational agency with respect to workforce education activities and at-risk youth.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2659 (to Amendment No. 2280), to include the participation and resources of the education community with that of business, industry, and labor in the development of statewide workforce development systems, local partnerships, and local workforce development boards.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2660 (to Amendment No. 2280), to include volunteers among those for whom the National Center for Research in Education and Workforce Development conducts research

and development, and provide technical assistance.

Moynihan (for Kerry) Amendment No. 2661 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide supplemental security income benefits to persons who are disabled by reason of drug or alcohol abuse.

Moynihan (for Kerry) Amendment No. 2662 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide demonstration projects for using neighborhood schools as centers for beneficial activities for children and their parents in order to break the welfare cycle.

Moynihan (for Kerry) Amendment No. 2663 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide demonstration projects for using neighborhood schools as centers for beneficial activities for children and their parents in order to break the welfare cycle.

Moynihan (for Kerry) Amendment No. 2664 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require applicants for assistance who are parents to enter into a Parental Responsibility Contract and perform satisfactorily under its terms as a condition of receipt of that assistance.

Moynihan (for Harkin) Amendment No. 2665 (to Amendment No. 2280), to reduce the income tax rate for individuals to equal the estimated cost of certain repealed programs.

Moynihan (for Kerry) Amendment No. 2666 (to Amendment No. 2280), to make the workforce development system more responsive to changing local labor markets.

Moynihan (for Breaux) Amendment No. 2667 (to Amendment No. 2280), to improve the services provided as workforce employment activities.

Moynihan (for Mikulski) Amendment No. 2668 (to Amendment No. 2280), to eliminate a repeal of title V of the Older American Act of 1965.

Moynihan (for Mikulski) Amendment No. 2669 (to Amendment No. 2280), to encourage 2-parent families.

Moynihan (for Kerrey) Amendment No. 2670 (to Amendment No. 2280), to allow a State to revoke an election to participate in optional State food assistance block grant.

Moynihan (for Daschle) Amendment No. 2671 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide a 3 percent set aside for the funding of family assistance grants for Indians.

Moynihan (for Daschle) Amendment No. 2672 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for a contingency grant fund.

Santorum Amendment No. 2673 (to Amendment No. 2280), regarding implementation of electronic benefit transfer system.

Santorum (for McConnell) Amendment No. 2674 (to Amendment No. 2280), to timely rapid implementation of provisions relating to the child and adult care food program.

Santorum (for McConnell) Amendment No. 2675, to clarify the school data provision of the child and adult care food program.

Santorum (for Packwood) Amendment No. 2676, to strike the increase to the grant to reward States that reduce out-of-wedlock births.

Moynihan (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 2677 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for an extension of transitional medicaid benefits.

Santorum (for D'Amato) Amendment No. 2678 (to Amendment No. 2280), relating to the eligibility of States to receive funds.

Moynihan (for Kerry) Amendment No. 2679 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide supplemental security income benefits to persons who are disabled by reason of drug or alcohol abuse.

Moynihan (for Harkin) Amendment No. 2680 (to Amendment No. 2280), to assure continued taxpayer savings through competitive bidding in WIC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from

Kansas, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, is recognized to offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2522 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2280

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I am happy to be able to start off by offering one of the 200 amendments that will be considered today. As we know, all these amendments were laid down before the close of business on Friday.

The amendment that I am offering and that I would like to discuss briefly this morning would restore provisions contained in the Child Care and Development Block Grant Amendments Act of 1995. This is the reauthorization of legislation that has been in law for 5 years. It was approved by the Committee on Labor and Human Resources by a unanimous vote on May 25.

While I am committed to ending the concept of welfare as an entitlement, I have some concerns about the legislation before us, the Work Opportunity Act, regarding changes that have been made to child care.

It seems to me that one of the most important considerations we have to undertake when we are considering welfare reform is how we handle child care. I think that all of us here in the Senate on both sides of the aisle regard our ability to structure welfare reform in an effective manner a top priority for the 104th Congress. We can talk about ending support for mothers who should be working, for families who should be working, but it is the children who become a crucial element. It is with the children that we have to be careful and must begin breaking the cycle of dependence that has occurred through years of being on welfare. It is the protection of the children that is the most important responsibility that we have.

Title VI of the welfare reform bill includes the reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant. It is called the CCDBG and it was enacted in 1990 with bipartisan support because Congress recognized there was a lack of adequate child care for many low-income working families. These just are not families on welfare. These are families that are in the work force, frequently with low-paying jobs, but who do not have the access to affordable, quality child care.

It was in that light that we felt it was very important to address this, with a sliding fee scale determined by the states, so that low-income families could be participants with some subsidies as they worked their way into better paying jobs.

I think this continues to be a nationwide problem. One of the primary goals of the CCDBG as it came out of committee is to ensure that there is a seamless system of child care where it counts the most at the point where the parent, child, and provider meet.

The provision that was in S. 850 that would have consolidated child care funds into one unified system is not included in the leadership welfare reform bill. The amendment I offer today restores that provision so that we will

have one unified system of child care, one State plan, and one set of eligibility requirements.

I believe this only makes sense, Mr. President, as we are trying to consolidate and trying to work together to form a better system. Why continue to have two different child care systems—one under the child care and development block grant, and one under the welfare child care system? I think it makes sense to bring the two systems together in a unified approach.

My amendment does make one change to the original consolidation provision that was included in S. 850, the legislation that we approved out of committee, and that relates to the 15-percent set-aside for quality improvement activities. The set-aside will apply to the discretionary funds appropriated for the CCDBG, but will not apply to other child care services provided through the unified system.

We have tried to take into account some of the concerns of Governors who obviously would like to have a system that does not have too many requirements from Congress, and we have tried to do that. On the other hand, we believe that through the CCDBG there are some important requirements that have proven to be of benefit and to have created a successful child care approach in the States.

My amendment also strikes the provision in the welfare bill that would allow up to 30 percent of the funds to be transferred between the CCDBG and the cash assistance block grant. I oppose the transferability provision for two major reasons.

First, I am concerned that there is too little child care money available now. Funds transferred out of the CCDBG would not necessarily be used for child care, which would create an even bigger problem; the Governors could use it for other assistance such as cash benefits, which they might choose and which they may feel is important. But I feel strongly that these funds need to be targeted toward child care. If we fail in this, we are going to fail to reform welfare in ways that will be beneficial for years to come.

Second, the primary purpose of the CCDBG is to assist the working poor who contribute something toward child care through the sliding fee scale. Having this type of assistance available will become even more important as individuals make the transition from welfare to work. I think we all know that finding the right child care can be one of the most costly and stressful aspects for parents as they enter the work force. Not everyone is fortunate enough to have a grandparent or an extended family member who can help with child care. In fact, many today do not have relatives that can or will care for their children. And that becomes one of the most stressful problems that a mother faces when she goes to work in the morning, if she cannot be certain of some quality child care, or can-

not count on child care that she feels comfortable with for her children.

Having this type of assistance available to those who are trying to work their way off welfare will become even more important as we stress the transition from welfare to work. Diverting CCDBG funds for other purposes diminishes a program which is badly needed by the working poor, and I believe it is unfair to penalize those who are struggling to provide for themselves and their families.

I hope that all of my colleagues can support the amendment I offer today, Mr. President, to consolidate child care into one unified system and to preserve the limited funds allocated to child care.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on a Monday morning, to focus on a very important amendment that the Senator from Kansas has offered, when we are going to have a very long week on this bill, is a sharp contrast from sometimes the easy subjects we are discussing on Friday afternoon when we adjourn for a weekend. To start out with the very basic issue of child care that Senator KASSEBAUM has brought up is really starting out with a heavy burden. The Senator from Kansas is always well prepared, and so we cannot find any fault with the preparation for her amendment, but we do take exception to the rationale behind the amendment and consequently cannot support it.

Behind the amendment I believe is an assumption that somehow if you are on welfare, or are low income, and it comes to the subject of getting up in the morning and going to work—and obviously if you are on welfare, there is a family involved, so there is a child that must be taken some place when you are on welfare—it assumes somehow that low-income people are different than other people; that when it comes to child care, they cannot do it; they cannot seek good child care, go through the business arrangements required, and on their own, without the help of the Federal Government or without the help of the State government, be able to provide for the care of a child while the mother and/or father are at work. It assumes that low-income people are not capable of this or assumes that they do not want to do it.

One of the things our reform proposal intends to do is to assume that whether people are low income or not, they are, first of all, concerned about their family; and, second, that they have the capacity to do what must be done for their family; that you just cannot assume because people are low income, somehow they do not have that ability.

Part of the basis for welfare reform is to enhance individual responsibility, detract from the dependency of the State that has been paramount to the system we have had historically and to start out with the assumption that low income people have the basic innate

capabilities that other people have if given the opportunity.

Just recently, as I have said so many times on the floor of this body, our State of Iowa passed a welfare reform proposal that is going to enhance this individual responsibility. In fact, under our system, welfare recipients sign a contract with the State establishing certain points in the near future when they will take certain actions regarding the family, regarding seeking a job, regarding education, if that is necessary before a job, and eventually to getting a job so they work their way off welfare. Individual responsibility is the essence of that contract which the recipient signs with the State of Iowa.

There is a welfare recipient in my State who recently told a State legislator that the problem with the Iowa welfare reform was that we had gone from a system of no choices, where the State told her what to do, when to do it, and where to do it, to a system of choices in which she had to plan for her future, decide what opportunities to take and, in her words, "to be responsible."

For her being faced with choices was the hardest part of the reform, but I hope she recognizes, and us as well, that the hardest part of the reform is basic to whether or not things are going to be different under a new system. The issue comes down to whether we are going to assume the capabilities that all Americans have of making decisions and wanting to make decisions and set up an environment for those decisions to be made.

I think the amendment that has just been presented by the Senator from Kansas assumes that the welfare recipient might not be totally capable, or ought not to have the responsibility even, of making that decision.

The story I mentioned about the Iowa welfare recipient is true. I think it epitomizes what is wrong with the current system. And when we give States an opportunity to do better than what the Federal Government wants to do, we can move in the direction of changing our paternalistic system. It is promoting and even rewarding dependency.

There are many low-income American families who are struggling to make ends meet and be responsible without any public assistance. They take pride in their successes. And they have dignity for their efforts to be self-sufficient through employment. They get up every morning and they take their children to child care. They go to a job where they work all day. They pick up their children in the afternoon and go home.

That is what most American families do. That is what even most American families who are low income or "working poor" do without any concern by any bureaucracy. They just do it. When you lump in some of the other benefits that go with AFDC that may not have an immediate cash value, there are some people on welfare who are not too

far below what low-income working people make over the course of a year.

And yet somehow with this amendment the assumption is that if you are on welfare and make X number of dollars, the State has all this responsibility to see that you have food on the table, child care, job training before you go to a job, and assistance in finding a job.

In contrast, if you have never been part of the welfare system and you have a job that does not pay very well, you get up in the morning, find your own job, take your kids to child care, pick them up at night. Additionally, you had to worry about your own training if there was training for that job, without any concern of a bureaucrat looking out for you.

Why the difference? One system breeds dependence. The other independence. We want to change that. We want people who are on welfare to assume responsibility and to move forward with life.

They should not somehow be segregated as different from other people without the capability of exercising a normal life.

Well, those families who work are faced with decisions on how to deal with their daily challenges, how to budget for their family's needs, what to do if their child care falls through for the day and how to plan for their future. In contrast, today's welfare system does not allow, expect, or encourage welfare recipients to make these normal, everyday decisions.

I think this legislation is about changing all that, ending business as usual for families, requiring recipients to take responsibility and learn to make decisions that most American families are faced with every day.

And, of course, one of those decisions is child care.

It is conceivable that a State may want to take a new approach of combining cash assistance and child care funding into a single grant to a family. The family then would make the decision on who to provide care for their children and the fair rate that they need to pay in a negotiated agreement with the providers.

That is what most American families do. The amendment before us by the Senator from Kansas would apply all of the child care development block grant standards to all child care funding, no matter what the source of the Federal dollars might be.

For instance, the amendment assumes payment to the provider would be guaranteed directly from the State. This would take away the premise of family responsibility and independence. This is what we need to change. We need a system where a State would be allowed to challenge public assistance recipients to be responsible and to make the child care decisions themselves as well as making the payments themselves.

We should not assume the worst about public assistance recipients, that

they are incapable of making these decisions in the best interest of their children and family. If we really want an environment of State flexibility, we should be minimizing standards, not maximizing them. As we all know, the best welfare reform proposals have come from the State level, not from the Federal Government. So, if we maximize State flexibility to be creative with reforms, including child care, we do that by leaving these decisions to the States. So if we want to give States block grants and the flexibility that goes with it, rather than continue the rigid existing programs and regulations, then it seems to me that we have to limit prescriptive operating guidelines in our legislation.

As well intended as the Senator's amendment is, it is tied to the old way of doing business. It is tied to the philosophy that, first of all, when it comes to the families of AFDC recipients, everyone needs a bureaucrat looking out for them. It assumes that government knows better. It assumes that when government knows better, that of all governments, the Federal Government knows better. It assumes that parents, if low income and on a government program, know less about meeting the needs of their families than low-income families who are not on public assistance.

It assumes because you are low income that you have capabilities less than people who are middle income or higher income, and that is not true.

It segregates too many Americans into certain categories. We ought to be eliminating the categorization of Americans, the balkanization of our society. We ought to be working in this body to bring our country together, not to separate it.

We should be working in this body for eliminating any differences we can, particularly those differences that come because of Government involvement.

So, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Kansas can be defeated. I yield the floor.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I wish to respond for a moment to the Senator from Iowa. I know that Senator GRASSLEY cares as much as I do about making sure that we can enact a welfare reform initiative and the importance of doing that. But I think I need to reiterate that the amendment I am offering deals with child care for low-income working families.

The child care and development Block Grant, which has been in law for 5 years, and is being reauthorized, has been included in this overall welfare reform package. It was designed to provide, as I said earlier, a sliding fee scale of support for low-income working families. It is not addressing the child care provisions for AFDC recipients. It does bring them together into

a single system rather than a two-track system, but it is not Government bureaucracy so much as I would argue the need to continue that support for families that are moving off welfare.

Child care is very expensive. As I say, if you are not lucky enough to have some member of the family or a good neighbor or friend who is assisting with child care—sometimes those provisions and tradeoffs can be made; having a daughter and daughters-in-law who work, I know that sometimes it is possible, but many times it is not—child care can range as low as \$60 to \$80 per week to as high as \$150 to \$200 a week. That is a lot of money for families who are trying to enter the work force at very low-income levels, and that is why I feel strongly about not permitting transferability of funds out of the CCDBG account so that we can help those families in transition.

It seems to me that this is a very important part of this provision. I think we should be concerned about low-income families who do not have any support for child care versus the welfare family who would have total support for child care. For those just right over the line, it is difficult and it does not make a lot of sense. That is why I feel strongly about a sliding fee scale where recipients make a contribution to their child care and are given some Federal assistance based on their income as they are trying to break away from welfare assistance.

I think every State, including Iowa, has some concerns about how to help a population that has been very dependent on benefits over the years and how to make this transition without harming children. This is what I am trying to address by keeping intact the provisions of the child care and development block grant.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is No. 2522.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] proposes an amendment numbered 2522.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. 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 text of the amendment is printed in the Friday, September 8, 1995, edition of the RECORD.)

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, as has been indicated, this will be one of the amendments that will be voted on after 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I announce to Members of this body who have amendments that are pending—and I think under the rules all amendments must have been filed by last week—that several of those amendments have been reviewed and agreed to. If those amendments can be offered

today, we would like to have the Members come and bring those amendments up, and those amendments will be accepted.

I and other managers of this legislation, throughout the course of the day, will be happy to handle those amendments if the Members are not able to do so or do not want to do so this morning, so that we can use this time before the votes at 5 o'clock this afternoon to expedite as many amendments as we can from our list of over 200.

Mr. President, I am going to take this opportunity to speak as in morning business. When somebody comes and wants the floor for work on welfare reform, I will yield it.

I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

DECLINES IN FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS PROGRAMS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in the past several months, the international drug program has not fared very well in Congress. Funding for interdiction, law enforcement, and international efforts have declined steadily. In part this is the result of a failure by the administration to either present a serious strategy or to fight for it in any meaningful way. The President has been all but invisible and his drug czar, left without support, has been ineffective. The obvious consequence of this dereliction in tough budget times is an erosion of funding and support to other projects that have more defenders.

Unfortunately, the administration's indifference has reinforced the attitudes of some in Congress that the program is not worth fighting for, that nothing we do to combat drug use works, and so we should surrender. The result has been devastating for our international effort and for the morale and capabilities of our frontline forces.

It is a myth to believe that nothing we do to combat illegal drugs works. In fact, whenever we have consistently and seriously attacked the problem—and we have a history going back to the beginnings of this century—we have had considerable success in reducing drug use and reversing epidemics. The trouble comes in believing that we should only have to combat illegal drug use once.

The belief in some quarters seems to be that, unlike any other major social problem, we should have some magic formula that banishes the issue forever. This attitude seems peculiarly endemic to our counter drug efforts. Despite a long history, we have yet to solve the problem of murder, spouse abuse, incest, rape, or theft. One rarely hears the call, however, that because these problems persist we should give up trying to stop them or legalize them as a way out of solving our problem.

Everyone recognizes that to seek such a solution would be irresponsible. Yet, when it comes to drugs, we seem to take a vacation from common sense.

We must also remind ourselves that our measure for success cannot be some simplistic formula. Too often, the standard that critics apply to the counter drug effort, to prove that nothing works, is to create an impossible standard of perfection by which to judge it. For some, if there is one gram of cocaine on the streets of America somewhere, then our efforts are a bust. Such counsels of perfection are enemies of realistic approaches. It is a lot like arguing that because we beat the other team 28 to 17 we really lost because they managed to score. Like a football team, our effort must be continually renewed. You do not win the championship once and for all, you have to train for the next season. The struggle to control illegal drug production and trafficking does not simply end when the whistle blows. Nor can our efforts simply stop.

But let us look more closely at whether all our drug efforts are failures. In the mid-1980s, The American public made it quite clear to this body that stopping the flow of illegal drugs to the United States and ending the poisoning of millions of America's young people was a top priority. We got the message. In a series of legislative initiatives, we forced the administration to take the drug issue seriously. We created a drug czar to coordinate efforts. And we voted to increase funding across the board for counter-drug programs, from law enforcement to education and treatment.

Remember that those efforts came after almost two decades of tolerance of drug use and a major cocaine and crack epidemic. When we decided to act, we faced a massive addiction problem and a widespread acceptance of drugs as an alternate life style. Yet, look at what happened. In the space of a few years, less than a third of the time it took us to get into the mess we created, we reversed attitudes toward drug use, and cut causal use of drugs by 50 percent and cocaine use by over 70 percent. Working with our Latin America allies, we wrapped up the Medellin cartel—which critics said would never happen—and made significant inroads in stopping the flow of drugs to this country.

Now, we clearly did not eliminate either drug use or trafficking, but elimination was hardly the criteria for our programs nor the measure of success for evaluating them. It is also clear that we have more to do. But serious reflection on the issue shows that this is one of those problems for which continual effort is our only possible response. And our efforts pay dividends. While there is no ultimate victory parade, surrender is not an option—unless we are prepared to live with the consequences. Our past responses to

public concern indicates that we are not.

But can we afford the price? The notion that we are spending an inordinate amount of money on fighting drug use is one of the arguments used to justify cuts in the program. Such criticism, however, only works in isolation. Looking at the context shows a different picture.

The total Federal budget is \$1.5 trillion. Of that, the entire drug budget of the United States—for all drug-related law enforcement, treatment, education, and international programs—is less than 1 percent of the total. Of the money we allocate to the drug program—before present proposed cuts—we spend less than 4 percent of the total on international efforts. Even adding in all DOD detection, monitoring, and law enforcement support the total is only 8 percent of the Federal drug budget. Hardly significant sums.

Compared to what Americans spend on other activities, these sums are insignificant. We spend annually five times as much on beauty parlors and personal-care products than we spend on the total drug budget. At current wholesale prices, a mere 8 percent of the cocaine imported into the United States would more than cover the costs of our entire international counter-drug effort; and 20 percent would cover the costs of adding in DOD efforts.

Moreover, we cannot afford the annual the costs of not acting. At present levels, the annual costs of drug use—some \$60 billion to industry, some \$50 billion spent on drugs, and untold billions in the costs of crime, violence, and medical costs—dwarf our expenditures on counterdrug programs and create major social problems. Yet, critics argue that we spend too much. We could double our drug budget and still be spending only half of what we spend on legal services. It is simply not the case that we are spending too much.

The issue, however, is not just a question of throwing money, however small, at a problem, but of what we are getting for our investment. As I indicated, the returns are significant and if they had been achieved in other areas of public problems we would regard them as successes. Yet, we act as if a 50-percent overall reduction in drug use is a failure. We become frustrated because this is one of those problems that requires ongoing efforts not one-time quick fixes. If we forget this simple fact, we will find ourselves repeating history—of once again having to dig ourselves out of a major addiction problem. The signs that we are drifting in that direction are already there, we ignore them at the peril of our young people. We need to sustain the efforts that have proven themselves in the past. Success, however, is not a one-time thing. It requires both the moral leadership and the consistent message to our young people that illegal drug use is risky business.