

on these traditionally overlooked veterans. •

#### ADMINISTRATION STUDIES ON WELFARE LEGISLATION

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on Thursday, November 9, 1995, the Office of Management and Budget released a study requested on October 24 by the Senator from New York and 11 other

members of the conference committee on the welfare legislation. The OMB study concludes that the Senate welfare bill would push 1.2 million children into poverty, while the House bill would force 2.1 million children into poverty.

Also on November 9, the Department of Health and Human Services released a separate report containing data on the number of children who would be cut off from welfare benefits as a result

of the time limits in both bills. Under the 5-year time limit required by the House welfare bill, 4.3 million children would become ineligible for Federal benefits by the time of full implementation. The Senate bill would cut off 3.3 million children.

Mr. President, I ask that excerpts from both studies be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The excerpts follow:

TABLE 1.—PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN DENIED AFDC DUE TO THE 60 MONTH TIME LIMIT: UNDER THE HOUSE AND SENATE WELFARE BILLS

	Projected number of children on AFDC in 2005 under current law	Number of children denied AFDC under the House bill because the family received AFDC for more than 60 months	Percentage of children denied AFDC because the family received AFDC for more than 60 months	Number of children denied AFDC under the Senate bill because the family received AFDC for more than 60 months	Percentage of children denied AFDC because the family received AFDC for more than 60 months
State:					
Alabama .....	122,000	32,697	28	25,013	21
Alaska .....	30,000	9,072	32	7,902	26
Arizona .....	170,000	50,154	31	39,433	23
Arkansas .....	63,000	17,075	29	14,476	23
California .....	2,241,000	948,677	45	749,922	33
Colorado .....	101,000	30,570	32	23,259	23
Connecticut .....	136,000	46,386	36	32,815	24
Delaware .....	28,000	8,422	32	6,408	23
District of Columbia .....	56,000	26,086	49	19,556	35
Florida .....	605,000	150,149	26	111,926	19
Georgia .....	348,000	135,319	41	98,377	28
Hawaii .....	48,000	15,187	33	10,979	23
Idaho .....	17,000	3,997	25	3,427	20
Illinois .....	598,000	227,477	40	170,122	28
Indiana .....	177,000	59,905	36	44,914	25
Iowa .....	82,000	25,084	32	18,727	23
Kansas .....	73,000	24,005	35	19,162	26
Kentucky .....	187,000	52,970	30	38,398	21
Louisiana .....	235,000	85,702	38	66,900	28
Maine .....	55,000	21,934	42	16,090	29
Maryland .....	185,000	72,393	41	54,817	30
Massachusetts .....	256,000	95,402	39	71,770	28
Michigan .....	553,000	275,880	52	213,522	39
Minnesota .....	155,000	55,886	38	41,332	27
Mississippi .....	153,000	46,807	32	33,399	22
Missouri .....	218,000	79,099	38	60,813	28
Montana .....	28,000	7,208	27	5,677	20
Nebraska .....	39,000	12,461	34	9,029	23
Nevada .....	30,000	9,378	33	6,889	23
New Hampshire .....	24,000	7,664	34	5,841	24
New Jersey .....	302,000	121,217	42	91,373	30
New Mexico .....	72,000	18,521	27	14,279	20
New York .....	917,000	339,748	39	261,306	28
North Carolina .....	281,000	102,353	38	79,410	28
North Dakota .....	15,000	4,743	33	3,019	20
Ohio .....	597,000	164,001	29	130,185	22
Oklahoma .....	111,000	40,752	39	30,866	28
Oregon .....	97,000	31,974	35	24,385	25
Pennsylvania .....	517,000	238,855	49	189,759	37
Rhode Island .....	52,000	19,286	39	16,224	31
South Carolina .....	135,000	33,390	26	25,488	19
South Dakota .....	18,000	6,736	39	5,060	28
Tennessee .....	246,000	73,059	31	53,450	22
Texas .....	670,000	181,695	29	137,641	21
Utah .....	45,000	11,616	27	8,838	20
Vermont .....	22,000	7,565	36	5,561	25
Virginia .....	166,000	51,987	33	38,050	23
Washington .....	237,000	82,401	37	62,774	26
West Virginia .....	93,000	32,898	37	23,230	25
Wisconsin .....	205,000	54,127	28	40,460	20
Wyoming .....	14,000	4,266	32	3,115	22
Territories .....	173,000	44,677	27	33,806	20
Total .....	12,000,000	4,300,000	38	3,300,000	28

Notes: 1. HHS/ASPE analysis. States may not sum to national total due to rounding. 2. The analysis shows the impact at full implementation. 3. The analysis assumes states fully utilize the hardship exemption from the time limit: 10% in the House and 20% in the Senate.

Source: Department of Health and Human Services.

#### POTENTIAL POVERTY AND DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS OF WELFARE REFORM BILLS AND BALANCED BUDGET PLANS

(Presented by the Office of Management and Budget, Prepared with the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of the Treasury, and Other Agencies, November 9, 1995)

TABLE 1.—THE IMPACT OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON POVERTY—USING A COMPREHENSIVE POST-TAX, POST-TRANSFER DEFINITION OF INCOME

[Simulates effects of full implementation in 1993 dollars]

	Effect of 1993 changes		House budget plan		Senate budget plan		Senate Democratic welfare plan <sup>1</sup> (S. 1117)
	Prior law	Current law	Entire plan	Welfare bill	Entire plan	Welfare bill	
Children under 18:							
Number in poverty (millions) .....	10.8	10.0	12.3	12.1	11.6	11.2	10.1 to 10.5
Change from current law .....			2.3	2.1	1.7	1.2	0.1 to 0.5

TABLE 1.—THE IMPACT OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON POVERTY—USING A COMPREHENSIVE POST-TAX, POST-TRANSFER DEFINITION OF INCOME—Continued

[Simulates effects of full implementation in 1993 dollars]

	Effect of 1993 changes		House budget plan		Senate budget plan		Senate Democratic welfare plan <sup>1</sup> (S. 1117)
	Prior law	Current law	Entire plan	Welfare bill	Entire plan	Welfare bill	
Poverty rate (percent) .....	15.5	14.4	17.6	17.4	16.8	16.2	
Change from current law .....			3.3	3.0	2.4	1.8	
Families with children:							
Number in poverty (millions) .....	18.3	17.0	20.9	20.6	19.9	19.2	17.2 to 18.0
Change from current law .....			3.9	3.7	2.9	2.2	0.2 to 1.0
Poverty rate (percent) .....	12.6	11.7	14.4	14.3	13.8	13.3	
Change from current law .....			2.7	2.5	2.0	1.5	
Poverty gap (billions) .....	17.6	16.2	24.8	24.3	21.5	20.6	
Change from current law .....			8.6	8.1	5.3	4.4	
All persons:							
Number in poverty (millions) .....	29.5	28.1	32.6	32.1	31.6	30.7	28.3 to 29.3
Change from current law .....			4.5	4.0	3.5	2.6	0.2 to 1.2
Poverty rate (percent) .....	11.3	10.8	12.6	12.4	12.2	11.8	
Change from current law .....			1.7	1.6	1.3	1.0	
Poverty gap (billions) .....	48.6	46.8	57.4	56.2	54.0	52.3	
Change from current law .....			10.6	9.3	7.2	5.5	

<sup>1</sup> These estimates of the Senate Democratic bill are preliminary. The Senate Democratic welfare reform bill is being modeled, but results are not ready yet. The poverty effects are much smaller than that of the bills that were passed because it ensures States have adequate funding for work programs and child care, ensures that children can receive vouchers for housing and other needs after their parents reach the time limit for receiving cash assistance, ensures States have adequate funding for benefits regardless of the economy, and has much smaller cuts in SSI and food programs.

Notes.—The Census Bureau publishes a family of poverty statistics using alternative definitions of income. The definition of income displayed here includes the effect of taxes (including EITC). Food Stamps, housing programs, and school meal programs. Changes in government-provided health coverage are not included, not are there any adjustments for medical costs. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Source.—HHS's microsimulation model, based on data from the March 1994 Current Population Survey.

TABLE 2.—THE IMPACT OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON POVERTY—UNDER THE PRE-TAX MONEY INCOME DEFINITION USED FOR OFFICIAL POVERTY STATISTICS

[Simulates effects of full implementation in 1993 dollars]

	Effect of 1993 changes		House budget plan		Senate budget plan		Senate Democratic welfare plan <sup>1</sup> (S. 1117)
	Prior law	Current law	Entire plan	Welfare bill	Entire plan	Welfare bill	
Children under 18:							
Number in poverty (millions) .....	15.5	15.5	16.0	16.0	15.8	15.8	15.3 to 15.7
Change from current law .....			0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3	—0.2 to 0.2
Poverty rate (percent) .....	22.3	22.3	23.1	23.1	22.8	22.8	
Change from current law .....			0.7	0.7	0.5	0.4	
Families with children:							
Number in poverty (millions) .....	26.5	26.5	27.5	27.5	27.2	27.2	26.1 to 26.9
Change from current law .....			1.0	1.0	0.7	0.6	—0.4 to 0.4
Poverty rate (percent) .....	18.3	18.3	19.0	19.0	18.8	18.8	
Change from current law .....			0.7	0.7	0.5	0.4	
Poverty gap (billions) .....	41.6	41.6	50.6	50.6	47.0	46.9	
Change from current law .....			9.0	9.0	5.4	5.3	
All persons:							
Number in poverty (millions) .....	38.8	38.8	39.9	39.9	39.6	39.6	38.4 to 39.4
Change from current law .....			1.1	1.1	0.9	0.8	—0.4 to 0.6
Poverty rate (percent) .....	14.9	14.9	15.4	15.4	15.3	15.2	
Change from current law .....			0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	
Poverty gap (billions) .....	76.3	76.3	85.9	85.9	82.9	82.5	
Change from current law .....			9.6	9.6	6.6	6.2	

<sup>1</sup> These estimates of the Senate Democratic bill are preliminary. The Senate Democratic welfare reform bill is being modeled, but results are not ready yet. The poverty effects are much smaller than that of the bills that were passed because it ensures States have adequate funding for work programs and child care; ensures that children can receive vouchers for housing and other needs after their parents reach the time limit for receiving cash assistance; ensures States have adequate funding for benefits regardless of the economy; and has much smaller cuts in SSI and food programs.

Notes.—The definition used for official poverty statistics counts all cash income, but excludes the effect of taxes (and EITC). Food Stamps, housing programs, and other near-cash government assistance programs. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Sources.—HHS's microsimulation model, based on data from the March 1994 Current Population Survey.●

## ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. WARNER. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. REID. I object.

Mrs. BOXER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WARNER. I now move the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 10 o'clock.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. FORD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

The clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. I would ask the yeas and nays be vitiated.

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

Mr. DOLE. And the pending motion be withdrawn.

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

## RECESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate that at 10 o'clock the Democratic leader, Republican leader in the Senate, and our counterparts in the House, the Speaker and I assume the majority leader and the minority leader, will go to the White House to meet with the President to see if there is

something we can do yet this evening to work out a continuing resolution.

If we are going to do that, we ought to be doing it in good faith and not be engaged in a brawl up here on the Senate floor. I therefore would hope that we could recess until the hour of 11 p.m., if that is satisfactory with the distinguished Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. If the majority leader will yield, that is satisfactory. I think we need to come back and share with our colleagues whatever it is that may have occurred at the meeting, and so I think at least the two leaders will be coming back. But at that time we can make a decision about further action.

Mr. DOLE. So I ask unanimous consent we stand in recess until 11 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:10 p.m., recessed until 11 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. JEFFORDS).