

Mr. MOYNIHAN. If the Senator from Florida would be understanding, I do not know that we could get a time agreement at this point. But in the sequence, he would come after the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would modify my request for unanimous consent just to be in sequence after the Senator from Illinois and settle at a later date the question of time.

Mr. DOLE. I think the only point I would make—I am not certain we could do that. We do not want to get to one amendment at 5 o'clock tomorrow and be on it for the rest of the day.

If I could get consent, before I move to the Graham amendment, on the previous three amendments, Ashcroft, Shelby—no time agreements.

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President. And I say to my friend, the majority leader, there are some that are very involved, and the floor manager here understands that very well. We have not been able to check about the time limits on food stamps.

If we could do sequence, then work out the time agreements after that, I think that would be best. But as far as agreeing to a time as it relates to these amendments, it would be very difficult for us to do it at this time unless we could get all of those Senators that are involved and interested in the particular amendments that are going to be brought forward.

We are talking about basically six amendments here, and one of them you cannot give a time agreement on; one you have the time agreement for an hour on the three; but then that does not include time in opposition, so 2 hours. I would be put in a very untenable position to having to object.

I see the minority leader is here, the Democratic leader is here now.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. DOLE. That is OK.

Mr. President, I will just modify my request.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Again, I must say we still have a couple hundred amendments pending. I do not want to get carried away that we are making progress if we take up four amendments, five.

Mr. FORD. They are major, though.

Mr. DOLE. I would ask the following sequence: Following disposition of the Breaux amendment, Senator ASHCROFT be recognized to offer an amendment on food stamps; following disposition of that amendment, we hope to get a time agreement, and that the Senator from Alabama, Senator SHELBY, be recognized to offer an amendment on food stamps; following disposition of that amendment, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, be recognized to offer three amendments with a 2-hour time agreement, 1

hour on each side; followed by the Graham-Bumpers amendment on formulas, as I understand it.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. That is right.

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object. Might I ask the majority leader a question?

Mr. Majority Leader, there is no time agreement yet as to when this bill has to be disposed of, is there?

Mr. DOLE. No. But it is my hope, and I hope the hope of the Democratic leader, that we finish it Thursday. Otherwise, I think we will go the reconciliation route. We could be here on this for the next 3 weeks, and we have six appropriations bills to pass. We have got some people pressing for a recess in October. And we want to try to accommodate people, but sometimes we have to accommodate the work at hand. And there is a lot of work at hand.

For 49 hours we have been on this bill. It is a very important bill. But this will take us into tomorrow evening, even this agreement—one, two, five, six, seven, eight, nine amendments, which will get us to sometime tomorrow evening. That would still only leave 200 left. That may be progress; not in my book.

I will send a cloture motion to the desk.

First, I will yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I share the view just expressed by the majority leader. I think we have made some progress. We have a long way to go. I know that some of the amendments that have been offered are duplicative amendments, so there is probably a much shorter list than 200.

I think we can make a real good-faith effort tomorrow and see if we cannot accommodate both sides in not having votes on all of these. I think if we can work with the managers and accept some of these amendments, it would be very helpful as well.

There are two other amendments, at least I will just put our colleagues on notice, on the Democratic side. I would like the Lieberman amendment and the Kennedy amendment having to do with work as our next two amendments, regardless of whether they are part of the unanimous-consent agreement or not. I think it would be helpful for Democrats on our side at least to know what the sequencing will be.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. This is the amendment to strike the training aspects of the welfare proposal; basically, the Kassebaum training programs that deal with dislocated workers, the workers that would be covered under NAFTA, GATT, defense downsizing, corporate restructuring, environmental considerations, an amendment that

would be used to strike those provisions from the Dole bill.

Mr. DOLE. Any time agreements?

Mr. KENNEDY. We would be glad to work out a reasonable time, and I will be glad to talk with others who are the cosponsors and Senator KASSEBAUM and make a recommendation to the leaders tomorrow and try to get that in prior to the time of the cloture vote.

Mr. DOLE. I will just say for my colleagues, we have two Republican amendments, and then we have three amendments from Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN and then the amendment of Senators GRAHAM and BUMPERS. I assume following that there would be a Republican amendment, and then we can accommodate.

Mr. DASCHLE. The next two Democratic amendments following those would be the two I just mentioned.

Mr. DOLE. I also want to say, as I indicated earlier, since the leader is on the floor, there are a number of amendments that have been cleared on this side, and if they can be cleared on the other side—I think there are a total of 19—that would be a sign of progress, too. As I understand, they are amendments from Republicans and Democrats. They are not controversial. They probably would not have been cleared. That would be a sign we are making progress, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the majority leader's request?

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if the Senator will add Senator DOMENICI's amendment on family cap to the sequencing when he is finished.

Mr. DOLE. Following the Graham-Bumpers amendment, how much time?

Mr. DOMENICI. At least an hour on my side; maybe an hour on the other side.

Mr. DOLE. They may want to check that. I can seek agreement but not give a time agreement. I ask unanimous consent that Senator DOMENICI be sequenced in after Graham-Bumpers, but we cannot get an agreement on time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Dole substitute amendment to H.R. 4, the welfare reform bill.

Bob Packwood, Hank Brown, Bob Dole, Paul D. Coverdell, Conrad Burns, Don Nickles, Trent Lott, Bill Roth, Rick Santorum, Ted Stevens, Pete V. Domenici, Robert F. Bennett, Mike

DeWine, Slade Gorton, Larry Pressler, Craig Thomas, Rod Grams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

#### FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2469

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank you for the recognition, and I speak to amendment No. 2469, which was earlier offered, which has to do with the growth formula provided for in this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator BOXER be added as a cosponsor to the legislation.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, let me try to be succinct as to how this amendment would change the Dole bill. Essentially what the Dole bill does, as drafted, is present a growth fund for the next 5 years of \$877 million. It then submits a formula under which that growth fund is disbursed. The formula would provide funds only to 19 States. You cannot convince me that only 19 States are going to grow in terms of poor families in this Nation.

So what I have tried to do is come up with a fair formula that measures the growth of poor families. The House bill has a formula in it which measures the growth of people and then applies that to this bill. Ours is very similar to the House, with one distinction, and the distinction is that it would use the census data to count the increase in poor families to determine how the growth money is spent. The House uses the census data to count the increase in the general population. Then, the way in which the growth money is spent is simply: The percentage of growth is divided into the overall total growth. In that way, every State is accommodated, and the growth funds are distributed to each state proportionate to its share of the total growth.

Specifically, it would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to publish every 2 years data relating to the incidence of poverty. The methodology employed mirrors title 13 of the United States Code, section 141(a) of the census statute, and as I have said, is the same as the House welfare reform bill. So people should know that what we are doing is simply following the way the census produces the material, under current law, and then empowering the Secretary of Health and Human Services to disburse funds according to the results of that data, and proportionate to each state's share of the total growth in poor people.

There is no additional cost associated with this amendment.

I would like to add that all States are being held harmless; in other words, no State's grant would be reduced if that State experiences a de-

cline in poor population. According to the present population projections, four States are expected to experience an actual decline of population. They are Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. These States are all held harmless in this amendment.

If, of course, the projections prove wrong and those States do experience an increase, because no one can actually predict future growth, they will receive their fair share of the growth formula.

If I may, I would like to contrast this with the approach taken in the underlying bill. Eight hundred seventy-seven million dollars over 5 years is authorized in this bill to accommodate growth. As I said, only 19 States are funded with this growth formula. Under the Dole bill, the 19 States receive automatic additional funding, 2.5 percent of their 1996 grant, in each of fiscal years 1997 to 2000 if, one, their State's welfare spending is less than the national average level of State spending and, two, their rate of population growth is greater than the national average population growth.

For reasons which are unclear, certain States are deemed as qualifying if their level of State welfare spending per poor person is less than 35 percent of the national average level of State welfare spending per poor person in fiscal year 1996.

So Federal taxpayers are being asked to spend almost \$1 billion over 5 years in the name of growth. But, in fact, the result is that States that, until now, have spent less than the average level of State spending in assisting their poor will now be subsidized by taxpayers from all 50 States. I think that is plain wrong. The State with the greatest growth—and that is California—is significantly disadvantaged because its funding is frozen for the next 5 years. I have distributed a letter with our proposal, with the Dole-Hutchison formula in it and with the difference. So there are three charts on everyone's desk tonight so everybody can look up their State.

Certainly, the 19 States recognized in the Dole bill—and I know Senator HUTCHISON will comment on this—will be cut back somewhat so that everybody could have a fair share of the growth fund based on the actual growth of poor people in their State as determined by the Bureau of the Census. What could be fairer than that? If in the census you achieve more people, the growth fund is there to give you your percent share of the total growth fund.

So I will yield the floor for the moment. I know Senator HUTCHISON would like to debate this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I will be managing the time on this amendment for our side. Mr. President, I want to lay out exactly what my amendment does, or my formula, the Dole-Hutchison formula, does. Senator

SANTORUM is going to have to leave in 7 minutes, so I would like to ask him to speak for 2 or 3 minutes, and then I will lay out the parameters of the Dole-Hutchison formula so that everyone understands why it is the fairest formula.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding.

As I discussed the other night, I want to congratulate the Senator from Texas for working diligently in coming up with this formula. It is a fair formula. On the surface, it sounds like the Feinstein formula is fair because it is based on growth in poverty population.

What the Feinstein formula ignores is how we got to the allocation in the first place. In other words, how did we get to today? It is based on not how many poor children there are in California, Pennsylvania, or New Mexico; it gets to the State today based on how much the State of California ponied up, as did the States of Texas and Pennsylvania. As a result, you have States like California—and Pennsylvania being another one and New York—who had large welfare contributions. They put up a substantial State match. As a result, they got more Federal dollars. If you put up more State money, you got more Federal money. So you had certain States who were more generous with their welfare—or more progressive, some would say—and put up more dollars.

Well, now the match is gone. There is no longer a match required under the Dole substitute, the bill we are going to pass. So to suggest that we should now take a formula based on what a State match was and apply that in the future, based on what the growth in the poverty population is, already gives those States that had high State matches an artificial advantage in the first place.

So what the Hutchison formula tries to do is say—starting at this inequity, because the Hutchison formula holds every State harmless and says that, from there on, we are going to have the States who get less per child under current law get more money over time to equal out what the Pennsylvanias and Californias and New Yorks get. So her growth formula targets the low-benefit States that are growing and allows them to catch up with these Federal dollars.

It is fair in the sense that these are block granted funds and there is no match required anymore. California does not want to spend a penny on this. They will not anymore because we have a 75 percent maintenance of effort. But California can reduce their contribution, which would be a lot more to their State budget than Mississippi's reduction in their welfare contribution. So they have a lot more flexibility under the current law. There is no match requirement except to the extent of the 75 percent maintenance of effort.