tighten eligibility for food stamps. It would toughen child support enforcement. The Dole bill also would streamline child care programs, child nutrition programs, and job training programs. Collectively, these steps would move our antipoverty programs from welfare to workfare; dependency to personal responsibility. It is about time.

We all agree that we have a responsibility to provide public assistance to truly needy children and families. This bill would continue the necessary transition assistance for those families who find themselves in circumstances beyond their control. It would not cut benefits to needy children. Instead, it would eliminate one-third of the cumbersome bureaucracy at the Department of Health and Human Services and scores of needless Federal regulations.

The second pillar of personal responsibility is family. Welfare reform should remove disincentives to a sound family structure. The current system rewards illegitimacy and discourages marriage. An entire class of children are growing up in single parent families, usually without fathers. South Dakota small towns and cities are no longer immune to these problems. If we expect to restore family values, we must first restore the family structure. We should encourage marriage and family values while we encourage work.

Perhaps most importantly, the Dole bill would give South Dakota and other States the ability to craft the solutions that best serve local needs. It has been proven time and again that Washington bureaucrats cannot completely understand unique local needs from thousands of miles away. Nor can we expect Washington bureaucrats to be the sole source of creative changes. By giving States welfare funds in a block grant, South Dakota would be free to pursue innovative ways to meet the needs of their welfare recipients.

Like many other States, South Dakota has been operating under a waiver from the Federal Government since January 1, 1995. This waiver has allowed them to make some of the key reforms called for in the Dole bill. South Dakota implemented work for benefits, and incentives to moving off welfare, such as a transition period between AFDC support and employment. These changes are working. Case rolls are decreasing dramatically. In fiscal year 1994, South Dakota had a monthly average of 19,446 people on aid to families with dependent children [AFDC]—the central welfare cash assistance program. In May 1995, we had 16,737 people on AFDC. This reduction is proof that workfare truly works. We can change the incentives in the system. Further, South Dakota, like other States, can do a better job than the Federal Government.

I would like to speak for a few moments about the unique welfare problems in South Dakota. A number of the welfare problems in South Dakota are ours alone—in fact, they differ greatly from even our Midwest neighbors. My State has three of the five poorest counties in the entire Nation. Our State has the lowest wages in the country. More than half of our welfare recipients—58 percent—are native Americans—the highest percentage in the country. In some reservation areas, unemployment runs more than 80 percent. Long distances between towns and a lack of public transportation are further barriers to gainful employment and quality child care. All of these factors create a situation that needs special attention. What is needed to end welfare dependency in Oglala, Fort Thompson, or Rapid City, SD, is not what is needed in Los Angeles or Mississippi. With this bill, we recognize that we are a nation with people of vastly different needs. As such, we need individualized solutions.

True welfare reform in South Dakota demands welfare reform on our reservations. Because of South Dakota's special problems, I have been especially concerned with the treatment of native American tribes in this legislation. Both the tribes and the State of South Dakota agree that the best way to relieve poverty and welfare dependency on reservations is give tribes the option to run their own welfare programs. A number of my colleagues—Senators MCCAIN, HATCH, MURKOWSKI, and DOMENICI—and myself, have agreed on a proposal which is included in the Dole bill. Our proposal would give tribes the ability to allocate their share of a State's AFDC dollars among tribal members. Much like the overall welfare system, handing out unlimited Federal dollars in public assistance has not changed the deplorable poverty on reservations. Welfare reform for native American tribes also means changing incentives. Workfare must be employed on our native American tribes, but done in a manner that recognizes the unique circumstances that exist. By making tribes directly responsible for their members, tribes will have an incentive to find solutions to chronic unemployment and poverty. This also is consistent with the long-standing Federal policy of tribal self-governance. Under our proposal, for example, tribes in high unemployment areas such as Shannon County would be given some flexibility in meeting participation rates. This proposal is fair and I thank all my colleagues for their help in taking the first step to resolve this important, but difficult issue.

I am proud to be part of this effort today. Ultimately, what this bill is about is change—positive change. We can change the current failed system to help people become self-sufficient and productive members of society. We can change incentives to restore personal responsibility and family values. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to see that workfare becomes a reality.

## ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 15

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 9:15 a.m. on Friday, September 15, 1995, that following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then immediately resume consideration of H.R. 4, the welfare reform bill, and there then be 10 minutes of debate, equally divided, on the Bingaman amendment No. 2483.

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

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

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

## AIR SERVICE TO SMALL CITIES

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a problem which severely affects the economic growth of my home state of South Dakota. This problem is an acute shortage of air service within my state coupled with insufficient connecting air service between South Dakota cities and hub airports in nearby states. Congressional attention is needed.

The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978 created significant domestic travel benefits for many Americans. In addition, airline efficiencies resulting from deregulation have helped reduce the cost of international travel. Unfortunately, these benefits have not been evenly distributed across the country. Indeed, they have not been shared by Americans living in many smaller cities and rural communities.

One need only try to schedule air travel to South Dakota to know that my state, as well as other rural states, have paid a harsh price for airline deregulation. For numerous small cities, fares are higher and service less frequent since deregulation. Moreover, I know from personal experience—and statistics from the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) confirm—that non-stop jet service to many South Dakota cities has been replaced by connecting turboprop service. The result? Often, it is less desirable service involving circuitous routing on slower and less comfortable aircraft.

Mr. President, several months ago I requested the General Accounting Office (GAO) to prepare a study comparing air service for large, medium and small cities across the country. That study, which I understand is progressing well, is considering differences between these markets in terms of the cost of air travel for consumers, the extent to which jet service is available, and safety. I am confident this study will be very enlightening.

In connection with the GAO study, the DOT already has provided statistics that dramatically illustrate the great burden rural states like South Dakota bear as a result of airline deregulation. For example, for the month of February 1978, prior to deregulation, there were a total of 2,384 scheduled commercial flights departing South Dakota airports with 186,080 seats available for the traveling public. By comparison, for the month of February 1995, there were 2,421 commercial flights departing my home state but only 94,538 seats were available on these flights. These statistics show that at the same time the number of flights departing South Dakota increased by 1.5 percent, the total number of seats available to the traveling public have dramatically decreased—a 49.1 percent reduction in seating capacity.

At first glance, these statistics seem inconsistent. How is it possible for the number of seats available for departing passengers to fall so dramatically at a time the number of departing flights actually increased? The answer is that airlines are substituting small, non-jet aircraft in small city markets previously served by larger jets. For example, in May 1978, 19 percent of commercial flights departing Rapid City, South Dakota involved non-jet aircraft. In May 1995, that percentage has more than doubled to 42 percent. Turboprop aircraft substitution in many small city markets is a post-deregulation reality.

The impact of non-jet aircraft substitution in smaller markets is significant. It hits my constituents and other small city air travel consumers right in the wallet. Let me explain.

Like most goods and services, the price of air travel for consumers depends to a large extent on the supply and demand of seats. Naturally, therefore, air fares increase when demand for seats goes up at a time when the supply of available seats declines. That is precisely what has happened in my state. As I mentioned, while the demand for air travel has been generally increasing, the supply of seats available to passengers departing South Dakota has declined by 49.1 percent. Just ask my constituents if this ‘‘supply squeeze’’ has caused higher air fares. It clearly has increased the price of air travel in South Dakota.

At my request, the GAO is examining these air service issues on a national scale. When the GAO report is issued, I plan to hold a hearing on its findings. The report is expected to be completed in the Spring of next year.

Mr. President, I cannot stress strongly enough what a problem insufficient and unaffordable air service is in South Dakota as well as other rural states. However, there may be hope for improvement. Indeed, I am guardedly optimistic about a new development.

The development to which I refer is the availability of a new generation of small commuter jets, so-called ‘‘junior jets.’’ These smaller jets will give airlines a service option that previously did not exist. Previously, when airlines’ planners assigned aircraft to particular routes, there was a choice only between larger jetliners and turboprops. Now, they have a third option.

Let me illustrate this point. On a flight which customarily serves 40 passengers, it is currently uneconomical for airlines to use jet aircraft, which generally have 100 or more seats. Previously, the only alternative was to use turboprop service on such routes. Now, however, junior jets will permit airlines to serve that market with a 50 seat jet aircraft.

If airlines purchase and use junior jets, jet service may return to some small cities. Other small cities may see an increase in jet service. Of significant importance, use of junior jets could increase the number of seats available in small city markets and this added capacity could help to lower the cost of air travel. In fact, these jets could reduce airlines’ costs of serving some routes and this could lead to lower air fares in the long run. All the air service challenges small communities face surely will not be resolved by junior jets. Use of these aircraft would, however, be a step in the right direction.

I will ask unanimous consent that a recent article appearing in the New York Times which addresses the great potential junior jets represent in providing service to smaller air service markets be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. Will airlines take advantage of the option of providing air service to small cities on junior jets? As airlines mull over this questions, I urge them to keep several important points in mind.

First, last year more than 37 percent of all passenger enplanements in the United States occurred at airports other than the 25 large connecting hubs, such as Chicago O’Hare. Many of these more than 200 million enplanements were passengers flying to or from small cities. I urge airlines to never forget that small cities, such as Sioux Falls, Rapid City and Aberdeen, SD, are a very important component of their customer base and provide critical passenger feed for the airline industry’s domestic and international networks.

Second, improved quantity and quality of service and lower fares that could result from the use of junior jets could stimulate demand in small city markets. In addition to making passengers happier, using junior jets could also benefit airlines by increasing the number of passengers traveling in these markets.

Mr. President, the benefits of airline deregulation have not been shared by citizens living in smaller cities. Fairness dictates this unfortunate reality be changed. I urge airlines to carefully consider the benefits of using junior jets to serve these cities. These new aircraft have the potential to make a bad situation better. I also urge airlines not to underestimate the importance of small city markets.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 19, 1995]

RELIEF FOR THE TURBOPROP BLUES—SMALL IS SUDDENLY BEAUTIFUL FOR SHORT-HOP TRAVELERS

(By David Cay Johnston)

Until recently, whenever Scott Hansen, a Salt Lake City lawyer, had to visit clients in Boise, Idaho, he dreaded calling his travel agent. Of the eight daily flights, four were on 135-passenger Delta Air Lines jets but the four others were on much smaller turboprops flown by SkyWest Airlines, a Delta commuter affiliate.

Of his last 75 flights, Mr. Hansen said, 45 required him to squeeze into the bumpy, low-flying turboprops. ‘‘There’s no comparison,’’ he said. ‘‘In the jet you have good seats, you board through a jetway and you can stand up when you walk down the aisle.’’

But some relief for travelers like Mr. Hansen is in sight. Several manufacturers from around the world are racing to deliver a new wave of what might be called junior jets, able to carry between 50 and 80 passengers. They are a vast improvement over the somewhat smaller short-hop turboprop planes, with their propeller-droning, often stomach-wrenching flights as they go right through the middle of the seemingly inevitable summer thunderstorm.

Forget about all the attention focused on the competition between Boeing and Airbus for the next generation of jumbo jets. What will really make a big difference in the daily trials and tribulations of tens of thousands of bedraggled airline passengers are these small, often overlooked, regional jetliners.

Already, junior jets have started to replace turboprops on some midlength routes like the Salt Lake City-Boise run. And they are increasingly being used to connect less traveled, more widespread cities where passengers were once condemned to go through a connecting airport, often from one turboprop to another.

In Brazil yesterday, the newest junior jetliner took its first test flight after rolling out of its factory hangar in São Jose dos Campos, a 170-mile hop from Rio de Janerio. The Embraer–145 is a 50-seat regional jet built by Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A., as the company is formally known, to replace slightly smaller turboprops. That includes Embraer’s own Brasilia, which is the most widely used turboprop in the United States. More than 200 are operated by American carriers today.

The new plane, which costs $14.5 million, is basically a stretched Brasilia turboprop fitted with jet engines. Meanwhile, another 50-seat jet aircraft, the Canadair Regional Jet, has started to make inroads in the United States and elsewhere since it was introduced in 1993.

That Canadian-built plane, a derivative of Bombardier Inc.’s Challenger corporate jet, is intended not so much to replace turboprops on short hops as to allow nonstop jet service between distant cities with limited economic ties, such as Rapid City, S.D., and Salt Lake City, which are 508 air miles apart. Even so, Sky West recently turned to

Canadair to replace its Brasília turboprop planes on the Salt Lake City-Boise run. Thirty-one Canadair Regional jets currently operate in the United States.

That's not all. Earlier this summer two Fokker 70's a new Dutch jet with 79 seats, began service for America West Express, a unit of Mesa Air Group. They provide non-stop service from Phoenix to Des Moines and to Spokane, Wash., both long, thinly used markets that previously required at least one stop. Also flying in the United States are 16 four-engine British Aerospace BAe-146 jets and a few newer models of the same plane. Fokker is a unit of Daimler-Benz A.G.

And at least one American plane maker, McDonnell Douglas, is trying to develop a shorter version of its smooth-flying MD-80. It has not yet decided whether to go ahead with construction.

Over the next 20 years airlines worldwide are expected to buy as many as 1,500 jets that carry fewer than 100 passengers, said Barbara Beyer, president of Avmark, an airline industry consulting firm in Arlington, Va.

Still, the turboprop is not about to disappear. Bombardier, the Canadian plane maker, estimates that between 1993 and 2012 airlines worldwide will spend $91 billion to buy 8,107 regional aircraft with 15 to 90 seats. Most of these planes will be low-cost turboprops with 40 of more seats. Airline industry experts say that turboprops will continue to serve as the backbone of flights between small- and medium-sized cities like Concord, N.H., and Syracuse and nearby major airports, such as Boston and New York.

For an increasing number of lucky fliers, though, the junior jets will provide a lot more speed and some added comfort over turboprops. And for thousands of others, there is the prospect of an end to the time-wasting change of planes.

''After two hours a turboprop is a real pain,'' Miss Beyer said, ''Essentially there are two kinds of markets that can be served by regional jets. Those that are more than 400 miles apart, but are not large enough to command larger jet equipment. And those markets that have been abandoned by the major carriers since deregulation of the airlines—markets that had been jet markets and should be jet markets.''

For years, the big United States aircraft manufacturers—Boeing and McDonnell Douglas—resisted building smaller jets, arguing that the development costs would be too high to justify the expense of building jets that would inevitably sell for much less than their bigger bread-and-butter jet aircraft.

''Then we hounded Canadair with the idea that they ought to turn their Challenger business jet into a regional airliner,'' Miss Beyer said. ''And ultimately they did and now it is an absolute raving success.''

While off to a good start, it remains to be seen just how successful the Canadair will be. Bombardier has delivered 65 such Canadair jets and has orders for 37 more. It says it plans to bring out a lengthened version that can carry 75 passengers.

Aircraft makers readily acknowledge that most passengers do not like turboprops, not just because of their noisy vibrations and cramped space, but also because they appear outdated and less safe. And the crash last October of a French-made ATR turboprop plane, which led the Federal Aviation Administration to ban the planes temporarily from flying in icy weather, only added to the safety fears surrounding turboprops. But the manufacturers insist that view is misguided.

''People tend to look at propellers and think old-fashioned,'' said Colin Fisher, a spokesman for Bombardier, which also makes a 50-seat turboprop, the Dash 8. ''But Turboprop and jet technology were born in the same time frame, around the time of World War II.''

Whatever the manufacturers say, passengers recognize a clear difference. On a flight from Rochester to Cincinnati, a Canadair Regional jet operated by Comair, another Delta commuter affiliate, was exceptionally quiet and smooth, taking off quickly and flying above the turbulence. But the seats in junior jets do not vary that much in appearance and comfort from those typically found in most turboprops.

The main reason more airlines do not rely on junior jets is because they are much more expensive to buy than turboprops. And even though they hold more seats, that's still a real burden, particularly for commuter operators without a lot of extra investment capital that are operating on paper-thin margins. The new Embraer regional jet, for example, will cost nearly double the $7.7 million price of its Brasilia turboprop. A Canadair Regional jet costs even more—$17 million to $22 million a copy.

But the new Brazilian operating costs are expected to be comparable. Its new regional jet, Embraer says, should cost about $27 an hour per seat to fly, compared with $29 per hour for a Brasilia. And some airlines think the investment is worthwhile, in part because jets fly much faster than turboprops, allowing more flights each day. Delta Connection flights on a Saab 340 turboprop between Rochester and La Guardia Airport in New York City are scheduled for 85 minutes, compared with USAir's 64 minutes via a 737 jet, adding about one-third to the gate-to-gate time.

Jets can also cruise higher, which means fewer cups of coffee ending up in passenger laps. ''You can fly up quickly and get above the weather, which is especially attractive during thunderstorm season,'' said David A. Siebenburgen, president of Comair Holdings, the regional airline in Cincinnati that introduced the Canadair Regional Jet into service. ''Our customers love them.''

Comair operates 64 turboprops and 23 Canadair Regional jets, but within five years the company expects to operate fewer than 50 turboprops and at least 70 Canadair Regional jets, Mr. Siebenburgen said.

And even though the carrying costs are higher, SkyWest, based in Salt Lake City, sees advantages in the eight Canadair Regional Jets, all leased, that it now flies.

''The reason we feel comfortable with the risk,'' said Bradford R. Rich, SkyWest's chief financial officer, ''is that the plane fits into the longer, thinner markets we have. We believe it can expand our market area because of the high speed and comfort.''

As far as Canadair's new Brazilian competitor goes, it already has 18 firm orders for its regional jet, five of them from BWIA, a Caribbean airline. Embraer also says it has 16 options and 127 letters of intent.

So far, however, no airline in the United States has ordered an EMB–145. But Michael Warwicke, Embraer's vice president for sales, is counting on a few orders to roll in once the airplane completes flight-worthiness testing. Long-suffering prop-jet passengers may want to start counting the days.

## THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before discussing today's bad news about the Federal debt, how about ''another go'', as the British put it, with our pop quiz. Remember? One question, one answer.

The question: How many millions of dollars does it take to add up a trillion dollars? While you are thinking about it, bear in mind that it was the U.S. Congress that ran up the Federal debt that now exceeds $4.9 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business yesterday, September 13, the total Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at $4,967,410,712,825.60, of which, on a per capita basis, every man, woman and child in America owes $18,856.78.

Mr. President, back to our pop quiz, how many million in a trillion: There are a million million in a trillion.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SABO, and Mr. OBEY as the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1162. An act to establish a Deficit Reduction Trust Fund and provide for the downward adjustment of discretionary spending limits in appropriation bills.

H.R. 1594. An act to place restrictions on the promotion by the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies and instrumentalities of economically targeted investments in connection with employee benefit plans.

H.R. 1655. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

## MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1162. An act to establish a Deficit Reduction Trust Fund and provide for the downward adjustment of discretionary spending limits in appropriation bills; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, to the Committee on the Budget, and to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1594. An act to place restrictions on the promotion by the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies and instrumentalities of economically targeted investments in connection with employee benefit plans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

H.R. 1655. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United