



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 1995

No. 42

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, March 6, 1995)

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Neal T. Jones, Columbia Baptist Church, Falls Church, VA, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Heavenly Father, help us to discover an everlasting joy to replace our perennial search for happiness. We are weary of hunting for momentary happiness. We are tired of recreation that does not recreate. We are tired of smiling with a lump in our throat. We are exhausted by moments of leisure when we cannot shed our pain.

We praise You that we have located the Master, our joyful Person. For the joy that was set before Him, He endured the cross. We ask for the power to pursue the joy of purpose. Thank You that joy can come in our pain because our purpose is great. Restore unto us the joy of living with Your help.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 244, the Paperwork Reduction Act. Under the agreement four amendments remain in order to the bill.

We hope to finish the bill and handle all amendments prior to the policy luncheon. Any votes will be stacked to begin at 2:15 or later, depending on how much debate time remains. For the luncheons we will be in recess from 12:30 until 2:15.

After disposition of the Paperwork Reduction Act, we will begin consideration of H.R. 889, the supplemental appropriations bill.

So I advise my colleagues there could be votes throughout the afternoon and into the evening.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 244, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 244) to further the goals of the Paperwork Reduction Act to have Federal agencies become more responsible and publicly accountable for reducing the burden of Federal paperwork on the public, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Michigan will offer an amendment on which there will be 10 minutes equally divided.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 319

(Purpose: To provide for the elimination and modification of reports by Federal departments and agencies to the Congress, and for other purposes)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], for himself and Mr. COHEN, proposes an amendment numbered 319.

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

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

(The text of the amendment appears in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer today in behalf of Senator COHEN and myself the Federal Reports Elimination and Modification Act of 1995 as an amendment to the pending bill.

Our amendment will eliminate over 200 outdated and unnecessary reporting requirements. These are reporting requirements which have been placed into the law over many, many years that are now useless. These are over 200 reports that are not needed or used by congressional committees. They require up to \$10 million of cost in their preparation. We have gone through each of the reports mandated by law. We have talked to each of the agencies. We have consulted with each of the congressional committees. This is the list of those reports which are totally dispensable which for the most part no one even uses anymore. But they just stay in the law, filed every year or every 6 months by agencies at great cost.

My subcommittee, the oversight subcommittee of governmental affairs, which Senator COHEN now chairs and which I am now the ranking member of, has gone through all of the reporting requirements. We have again made this assessment as to those reports. Each committee having proposed what their needs are, these reports are the ones that are no longer needed.

• 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 3547

This legislation is designed to improve the efficiency of agency operations by eliminating unnecessary paperwork and staff time by consolidating the amount of information that flows from the agencies to Congress.

So this amendment is the product of a coordinated and a thorough and aggressive effort to identify the congressionally mandated agency reporting requirements that have outlived their usefulness and now serve only as an unnecessary drain on agency resources, resources that could be devoted to more important program use. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that enactment of this legislation could result in savings of up to \$5 to \$10 million.

This is the second wave of reports elimination from the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management which Senator COHEN chairs and on which I now serve as the ranking Democrat. We passed a similar bill that eliminated or modified other reporting requirements in 1985.

Since it had been over 8 years since that effort, I decided it was time once again to take a look at agency reporting requirements that we, in Congress, have enacted and take those reports that have outlived their usefulness off our books. That is much easier said than done. There are literally thousands of different congressionally mandated reporting requirements. Each of those reporting requirements was enacted for a reason. To make a responsible choice about whether or not a particular reporting requirement should be eliminated, that reason must be identified and evaluated as to whether it remains valid. That is time-consuming, painstaking work; however, it is necessary work.

For example, by the time the 1985 legislation was enacted into law, the number of report eliminations contained in the bill had dropped from over 100 on introduction to just 23. The General Accounting Office [GAO] did a review of the 1985 reports elimination effort to see why the number of reports in the bill dropped so drastically. GAO uncovered certain weaknesses in that effort; primarily that the agencies did not consult with Congress when making their recommendations for eliminations or modifications and that the agency recommendations were not accompanied by adequate justifications.

We took heed of GAO's findings in developing this legislation. The 1985 legislation was based on a list of agency recommendations generated by the Office of Management and Budget. This time around, there was no such list available, so we had to generate our own. In 1993, Senator COHEN and I wrote to all 89 executive and independent agencies and asked that they identify reports required by law that they believe are no longer necessary or useful and, therefore, that could be eliminated or modified. In our request letter, we stressed the importance of a

clear and substantiated justification for each recommendation made.

We received responses from about 80 percent of the agencies. For the most part, the agencies made a serious effort to review and recommend a respectable number of reporting requirements for elimination, but given the opportunity our effort presented, some were surprisingly less aggressive. Certain agencies already had report elimination projects underway. For example, the Department of Defense, at the request of Senator MCCAIN, conducted an internal review of the congressionally mandated reporting requirements for all of its services. Numerous reporting requirements were then eliminated and modified in the fiscal year 1995 defense authorization bill and were not included, therefore, in this legislation.

After receiving the agency responses, a member of the subcommittee staff generated a master list of all the agency recommendations. At the same time we sent to the chairman and ranking member of each of the relevant Senate committees, for their review and comment, the recommendations made by the agencies under their respective jurisdictions. Feedback from the committees of jurisdiction is necessary to ensure that this effort eliminates as many reporting requirements as possible without losing needed information. We also asked that the committees provide us with any additional recommendations for eliminations or modifications they might have.

Many of the committees responded to the request for comments. Those responses were generally supportive of the subcommittee's efforts and most contained only a few changes to the agency recommendations. Those changes were primarily requests by committees to retain reports under their jurisdiction because the information contained in the report is of use to the committee or, in some cases, of use to outside organizations. We adjusted the master list of eliminations and modifications based on those committee comments. Subcommittee staff then worked with the Senate legislative counsel's office to check statutory references to make sure we are addressing the correct provisions in law.

Senator COHEN and I introduced S. 2156 on May 25, 1994. As introduced, the bill contained nearly 300 recommendations for eliminations or modifications. Senators GLENN, ROTH, STEVENS, and MCCAIN cosponsored that bill.

Shortly after the introduction of S. 2156, Senator COHEN and I again wrote to all the committees and asked for comments on the bill as introduced. This was a continuation of our effort to avoid the problems of the 1985 effort by including the committees of jurisdiction in each step of the development of S. 2156. Certain committees have responded to that second request and generally they have asked for few changes to the bill.

While most of the recommendations we received from the agencies and included in the bill concern targeted, agency-specific reporting requirements, we did receive several recommendations regarding governmentwide reporting requirements. Again, we turned to the committees of jurisdiction for guidance on how or whether to enact these governmentwide agency recommendations. A number of these recommendations concerned reporting requirements that fall under various financial management statutes such as the Chief Financial Officers Act. Our bill does not address these particular recommendations due to the proposal contained in H.R. 3400 and other legislation to allow the administration to set up a pilot program aimed at streamlining the reporting and other requirements contained in these laws.

We are in the process of reviewing other governmentwide reporting requirements to see if some changes can be made. For instance, there were several recommendations to change inspector general [IG] reports from semi-annual to annual. From our initial discussions with the IG community and the relevant committee staff it seems that it might be possible to make this shift without jeopardizing the oversight responsibilities of the IG's. We will continue to discuss this recommendation to see if we can't achieve some change. Another issue that we will be looking at is creating thresholds for governmentwide reporting requirements. We received several recommendations from smaller agencies that talked of the burden of complying with certain governmentwide reporting requirements that have no relevance to their small agency.

Every reporting requirement takes away resources that could be used elsewhere in the agency. Sometimes the burden is slight—as low as a few hundred dollars. Sometimes the burden is great—as high as a few million dollars. Enactment of this legislation will save time and money.

This legislation gets at those reports that no one uses. These are the reports that come into our offices and sit in staff in-boxes for weeks, maybe months, until they are either rerouted to someone else or filed in that popular circular file drawer. On several occasions in the process of drafting this legislation, agencies told us that, for whatever reason, they hadn't been doing or had never done the reporting requirement they were now seeking to eliminate. Apparently no one had noticed the agency's failure to report or, if they did, no one complained. We have taken care to be aggressive in identifying reports, but deferential to the committees with substantive responsibility that may use these reports.

This amendment, which is the same as S. 2156 with a few changes, is a bipartisan effort. It was unanimously reported out of the Governmental Affairs Committee by voice vote on August 2, 1994. We tried to get it to the floor last

year, but were unable to do so. I am pleased that the Senate will act on this legislation today to move the Federal Report Elimination and Modification Act of 1995 one step closer to becoming law. In today's day and age, we need all the resources we can get. The longer the reporting requirements contained in this bill stay on the books, the more resources are unnecessarily spent to comply. I thank Senator COHEN and his staff for their assistance in developing and moving this bill through the legislative process. I also want to take this opportunity to thank Tony Coe of the Senate legislative counsel's office for his fine work in drafting this legislation. I also want to thank Kay Dekuiper who was a member of the Oversight Subcommittee staff when this legislation was being developed and who did the bulk of the hard, tedious work putting this legislation together. She has since left the Senate to pursue her career elsewhere, but our appreciation for her efforts while she was here remain undiminished.

Mr. President, I believe this amendment has been cleared on the other side. I spoke to Senator ROTH about this last night. He, again, was a supporter of this in the last Congress.

This matter came up quite quickly last night, so we did not even have an opportunity to list him as a cosponsor. I am quite confident, however, from his quick comments to me last night on the floor, that he does support this amendment.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of the manager of this legislation, my understanding is that this is not a controversial amendment. I am basing that, at least partially, on the assurances of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I also understand from the staff that this amendment is acceptable.

So, at this juncture, there will be no objection to this amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Again I thank the manager of the bill for his support.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

The amendment (No. 319) was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 320

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 320.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me start out with a definition for my colleagues. The definition of hunger. This amendment talks about hunger among children.

The mental and physical condition that comes from not eating enough food due to insufficient economic, family or community resources.

Mr. President, the way in which this is measured would be if there was a "yes" on at least five of the following eight questions.

Does your household ever run out of money to buy food to make a meal?

Do you or other adult members of your household ever eat less than you feel you should because there is not enough money to buy food?

Do you or other adult members of your household ever cut the size of meals or skip meals because there is not enough money for food?

Do your children ever eat less than you feel they should because there is not enough money for food?

Do you ever cut the size of your children's meals or do they ever skip meals because there is not enough money for food?

Do your children ever say they are hungry because there is not enough food in the house?

Do you ever rely on a limited number of foods to feed your children because you are running out of money to buy food for a meal?

Do any of your children ever go to bed hungry because there is not enough money to buy food?

Mr. President, the Food Research Action Council Community Childhood Hunger Identification Project, estimated in 1991 that there are 5.5 million children under 12 years of age who are hungry in the United States. Let me repeat that. There are 5.5 million children today, with existing programs of support, who are hungry in the United States of America.

Mr. President, the U.S. Council of Mayors Status Report on Hunger and Homelessness in American Cities in 1994 found that 64 percent of the persons receiving food assistance were from families with children.

I could go on with other definitions and would be pleased to do so as we move forward with this amendment.

Homelessness. The U.S. Council of Mayors Status Report on Hunger and Homelessness in American Cities estimated that 26 percent of the requests at the emergency shelters were for children, homeless children.

In 1988, the National Academy of Sciences, Institute of Medicine, esti-

mated that there were 100,000 children who are homeless each day—100,000 children, Mr. President, homeless in the United States of America.

Mr. President, on the very first day or the second day of this session, going back to the Congressional Accountability Act, I brought this amendment to the floor. I said that I feared that what was going to happen in the 104th Congress would go way beyond the goodness of people and that part of the safety net would be eviscerated, in particular, support for children in America. That was voted down. I could not get the Senate to go on record.

Then, Mr. President, with the unfunded mandates bill, I came out and said, "Why don't we at least do a child impact statement so we know what we are doing with these cuts, be they rescissions or proposed cuts in the budget and reconciliation bill?" That was voted down.

Then I brought a motion to refer which was a direction back to the Budget Committee as a part of the balanced budget amendment. At that time, I held up some headlines, and I said, "I have been told by colleagues, 'Senator WELLSTONE, there is no reason for you to come out here with scare tactics because we are not going to cut nutrition programs for children. We are not going to do anything that could lead to more hunger or homelessness among children.'"

I came out here just last week with several headlines, one from February 23, "House Panel Votes Social Funding Cuts, Republicans Trim Nutrition and Housing." Another one, "House Panel Moves to Cut Federal Child Care, School Lunch Fund."

Mr. President, today, just by way of background, what is the headline in the Washington Post, Tuesday, March 7? It is a front-page story about a school in Fayette, MS. The headline is "School Fearful That Johnny Can't Eat"—not "School Fearful That 'Johnny Can't Read'"—"School Fearful That 'Johnny Can't Eat.'"

The Congress' school lunch debate worries some in rural Mississippi.

I got a little boy come in here every morning and eats everybody's food. Just licks the plate. And you know he's not the only one," said Jeanette Reeves, eagle-eyed and dressed in starched white, a cafeteria manager who doesn't have to tell the children twice to eat all their lima beans. "Many of these children get their only meals right here at school. Lord, it'll be cruel to change that.

That, Mr. President, is a front-page story from the Washington Post. Now we are moving to the point where we are not worried about whether "Johnny can't read." We are worried about whether or not "Johnny can't eat"—cuts in School Lunch Programs and School Breakfast Programs and Child Nutrition Programs.

Mr. President, the same Washington Post piece, page A-4, headline: "House Panel Votes to Curtail Program for Disabled Children."

Mr. President, I think we have just plain run out of excuses here on the Senate side.

Let me just give a little bit more context. Last week we had charts out on the importance of the debt and the annual budget deficits. I have brought some charts out about the importance of children in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Bob Herbert, "Inflicting Pain on Children," in a New York Times op-ed piece, Saturday, February 25.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 25, 1995]

INFLECTING PAIN ON CHILDREN

(By Bob Herbert)

THE HELPLESS ARE TAKING THE BRUNT OF THE REPUBLICANS' ATTACK ON OUR SOCIAL SYSTEM

The Republican jihad against the poor, the young and the helpless rolls on. So far no legislative assault has been too cruel, no budget cut too loathsome for the party that took control of Congress at the beginning of the year and has spent all its time since then stomping on the last dying embers of idealism and compassion in government.

This week Republicans in the House began approving measures that would take food off the trays of hungry school children and out of the mouths of needy infants. With reckless disregard for the human toll that is sure to follow, they have also aimed their newly powerful budget-reducing weapons at programs that provide aid to handicapped youngsters, that support foster care and adoption, that fight drug abuse in schools and that provide summer jobs for needy youths.

They have also targeted programs that provide fuel oil to the poor and assistance to homeless veterans. And they have given the back of their hand to President Clinton's national service corps.

The United States has entered a nightmare period in which the overwhelming might of the Federal Government is being used to deliberately inflict harm on the least powerful people in the nation. The attacks on children have been the worst. If the anti-child legislation that is moving with such dispatch through the House actually becomes law, "the results will be cataclysmic," according to James Weill, general counsel to the Children's Defense Fund.

Mr. Weill said: "The Republican leadership has targeted children for almost all of the pain. They've cut, I think, \$7 billion out of the child nutrition programs, and that's not even counting food stamps, which they haven't done yet.

"Foster care and adoption have been cut by \$4 billion over five years. They've cut Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and they're eliminating most of the entitlements as they go along. They're just smashing their way through all of the children's programs. To me, this so-called revolution is more like a massacre of the innocents."

President Clinton denounced the cuts and accused the G.O.P. majority in Congress of "making war on children." At a press conference yesterday in Ottawa, Canada, Mr. Clinton said: "What they want to do is make war on the kids of this country to pay for the capital gains tax cut. That's what's going on."

There is a breathless, frenzied quality to the Republican assault, as if the party leaders recognize that they must get their work done fast—while the Democrats are still in a

post-election stupor, and before the public at large becomes aware of the extremes of suffering and social devastation that are in the works.

"This agenda is too harsh," said Senator Paul Wellstone, a Democrat from Minnesota. "I realize that the Republicans won the election, but these measures are too extreme, too mean-spirited. They go beyond what the goodness of the people in this country would permit. Most Americans do not want to see vulnerable people hurt, especially children."

Mr. Wellstone has irritated some of his Republican colleagues by frequently offering a legislative amendment that says the Senate "will not enact any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless." Each time it is offered, the amendment is defeated.

The Senate majority leader, Bob Dole, dismissed the Wellstone amendment as an "extraneous" measure designed solely to make Republicans "look heartless and cold." No doubt. But Senator Wellstone is right on target when he says that the Republican legislative strategy was carefully designed to hurt the people "who aren't the big players, who aren't the heavy hitters, who don't make big contributions, who don't have lobbyists, who don't have clout."

If anything is funny in this dismal period, it's that the Republicans are touchy about being called heartless and cold. That's a riot. Has anyone listened to Newt Gingrich lately? To Dick Arme? To Phil Gramm? This is the coldest crew to come down the pike since the Ice Age.

An indication of just how cold and heartless the Republicans have become is the startling fact that Mr. Dole, of all people, is starting to look a little warm and fuzzy.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I quote from that article:

The Republican jihad against the poor, the young and the helpless rolls on. So far no legislative assault has been too cruel, no budget cut too loathsome for the party that took control of Congress at the beginning of the year and has spent all its time since then stomping on the last dying embers of idealism and compassion in government.

This week Republicans in the House began approving measures that would take food off the trays of hungry schoolchildren and out of the mouths of needy infants. With reckless disregard for the human toll that is sure to follow, they have also aimed their newly powerful budget-reducing weapons at programs that provide aid to handicapped youngsters, that support foster care and adoption, that fight drug abuse in schools and that provide summer jobs for needy youths.

Mr. President, 1 day in the life of American children: 636 babies are born to women who had late or no prenatal care. One day in the life of American children: 801 babies are born at low birthweight; by the way, to many women who never had any proper nutrition, and we now have proposed cuts in the Women, Infants, and Children Program. One day in the life of American children: 1,234 children run away from their homes. One day in the life of American children: 2,255 teenagers drop out of school each school day. One day in the life of American children: 2,868 babies are born into poverty. One day in the life of American children: 7,945 children are reported abused or neglected. One day in the life of American children: 100,000 children are homeless. One day in the life of Amer-

ican children: Three children die from child abuse. One day in the life of American children: 9 children are murdered; 13 children die from guns; 27 children—a classroomful—die from poverty; 63 babies die before they are 1 month old—63 babies die before they are 1 month old; and 101 babies die before their 1st birthday.

Mr. President, it is just time for the U.S. Senate to go on record. Let me just make it clear again what this amendment does. This amendment on the paperwork reduction bill is just a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. We are not going to do anything that creates more hunger or homelessness among children. There is no excuse not to go on record. The U.S. Senate needs to take this position.

Mr. President, a little bit more in context, I have a report: "Unshared Sacrifice; The House of Representatives' Shameful Assault on America's Children," March 1995, the Children's Defense Fund, that I ask be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Children's Defense Fund, March 1995]

UNSHARED SACRIFICE—THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES' SHAMEFUL ASSAULT ON AMERICA'S CHILDREN

INTRODUCTION

In a "revolution" that so far has spared just about everyone else, the House leadership and key committee majorities have targeted America's children for the earliest, broadest, and by far the deepest pain in budget cuts, program restructuring, and rescissions. In less than two weeks key committees and subcommittees have voted to cut \$40 billion from crucial child survival programs, and to end the federal safety net for children and their families. This is a wholly unshared sacrifice: the House seems to be postponing for a later day, if ever, any contemplation of major cuts for other constituencies. Savings from savage cuts in programs for needy and helpless children would be used to fund a new and unnecessary defense build-up; to pay for a capital gains tax cut of which 71 percent goes to the richest 1 percent of Americans; and to reduce a tax on the richest 13 percent of the elderly by \$56 billion (over 10 years) when that tax goes to pay part of Medicare's cost.

While the House majority's welfare plan has gotten most media attention, that plan's unprecedented savaging of children is merely symptomatic of a broad-gauged assault on hungry children's nutrition programs, disabled children's disability assistance, preschool children's child care and child development centers, unemployed youths' summer jobs, sick children's medical care, and abused children's foster care and hope for adoptive families. Block grants, rescissions, and consolidations are being used in a multi-front attack on children's services. Not even proven money-saving programs like Head Start have been spared. And in the midst of this series of brutal reductions, the most severe have been reserved for the most vulnerable children—those who are disabled or in foster care.

Based on data from the Congressional Budget Office, the Department of Health and

Human Services and the Department of Agriculture, and analysis of congressional numbers by the Children's Defense Fund, \$40 billion in core safety net program cuts were adopted in the past two weeks that would force out of these programs millions of the children eligible under current rules (see chart, next page).

These numbers assume that states would reduce spending by the amount of federal reductions, and do so by eliminating eligible children from the program rather than reducing benefits across-the-board. In some

programs like AFDC and SSI, the strategy of dropping children is virtually dictated by the proposed legislation. In others, it is possible for states to spread out the cuts and reduce benefits for more children, but completely deny benefits to fewer. In that case, many more children would be hurt, but the damage to each would be a bit less. In either instance, the pain will be massive.

The numbers in this report actually understate the real depth of the cuts, since they assume there is no recession driving up the number of children needing help; assume

there are no transfers from the new block grants to other programs (as is allowed with some of the funds); assume that there are not larger cuts in state funds by states that would be freed from any matching requirements; and do not account for how cuts in one area (such as AFDC) will drive up the need in other areas (such as foster care). Moreover, the AFDC losses in 2000 disguise the full impact of the House welfare plan: 3 million to 5 million children could lose AFDC when that plan is fully phased in.

THE UNSHARED SACRIFICE

	Dollars cut over 5 years	Dollars cut in the fifth year (2000)	Children losing benefits in the year 2000	Percentage of all eligible children who would lose benefits in the year 2000
AFDC	\$12.8 billion	\$3.7 billion	1.7 million (3-5 million in later years)	18.1
SSI for children	\$12.1 billion	\$5.5 billion	516,000	67.0
Foster Care and Adoption Assistance	\$5.5 billion	\$1.7 billion	111,000	26.0
School Lunches	\$2 billion	\$510 million	2.22 million	8.8
Child Care	\$2.5 billion	\$612 million	378,000	24.0
Child and Adult Care Food Program	\$4.6 billion	\$1.1 billion	1,048,000	50.0

This assault on America's children is also an assault on America's future. The millions of infants and toddlers who would be denied food necessary for their physical and intellectual development in the years ahead are the ones America will want to be computer programmers in 2017. The millions of five-year-olds who would be denied any cash aid for housing, food, or clothing are the ones we will want to be learning in college or apprenticing in industry in 2010. The thousands of battered 10-year-olds denied counseling and foster care and adoptive homes are the ones we will want not to be violent 16-year-olds in 2001. By ravaging the childhoods of millions of American children, the House simultaneously will be pillaging America's economic and democratic future.

The assault on children is unique in its size and severity. No other group, except for legal aliens, has been touched by more than a small fraction of the cuts aimed at children. No massively subsidized corporation has yet to see a dime threatened. (In fact, a handful of big businesses got a \$1 billion gift from higher prices on infant formula—and less formula purchased—when the House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities voted down competitive bidding in the WIC program, a step USDA says will cause "increased malnutrition, growth stunting, and iron deficiency anemia.") No farmer has had his crop subsidies cut. No military or civil service retiree—or member of Congress—has seen his pay or health insurance or retirement benefits cut. Defense contractors have been given a gift of new and higher spending. Programs for poor families have faced extra cuts in order to spare traditional "pork" like visitors' centers or NRA-sponsored efforts to teach school children to shoot guns.

The House majority has put almost all its cost-cutting effort into slashing and burning its way through programs for children and the parents, grandparents, foster parents, and others who are struggling to care for them.

This is not what America voted for last November. This is not what Americans want. This is not what America needs. Nevertheless, in just 10 days in February, House committees voted to slash these basic supports:

Food for children. The House Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee voted to take away the guarantee that low-income children can get free or reduced-price school lunches and breakfasts. The plan indiscriminately lumps these school-based programs together and cuts them by \$2 billion over five years. In a separate block grant,

the committee ended the guarantee of food for children in Head Start and child care centers through the Child and Adult Care Food Program and lumped this with the WIC program of food for poor pregnant women and infants, the summer food program, and food for the homeless, and cut the package by \$5 billion over five years. Cutting fat? Hardly. Experts estimate that hundreds of millions fewer meals would be served to needy children in the year 2000, thanks to the cut. And 60,000 Head Start placements are likely to end because programs will have to spend the Head Start money on food to replace the child care food program cut for hundreds of thousands of children. Sharing the pain? Hardly. No other food program has yet been cut, whether the cafeteria for members of the House of Representatives or the programs that feed the elderly. House Speaker Gingrich has promised, as well as he should, not to cut food programs for the elderly. But it is perverse to treat food for seniors as deserving of protection but food for children as a waste of national resources. We can afford to feed both.

Income support for children. The House Ways and Means Committee's Human Resources subcommittee voted to take away the guarantee that poor children can get AFDC; voted to order states to deny throughout childhood any aid to children born out of wedlock to young mothers (even though the mother may eventually requalify for aid); and voted to limit to five years the receipt of welfare for children who might still qualify despite the other rule changes. In the year 2000, \$3.7 billion will be taken away from poor children. Is this aimed at parents and personal responsibility? Not really. The plan cuts off children even when parents can get benefits, cuts off families even when they have been working and complying with all rules, and tells a child who has been living with his low-income, elderly grandparents since birth that she'll get no help after the age of five. Cutting fat? No! In the year 2000, 1.7 million children who by definition do not have enough for food or shelter are projected to lose AFDC. Even more will lose help if states cut back further or divert state and federal AFDC funds to other purposes. Sharing the pain? Hardly.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will just read a couple of operative paragraphs.

In a "revolution" that so far has spared just about everyone else, the House leadership and key committee majorities have targeted America's children for the earliest,

broadest, and by far the deepest pain in budget cuts, program restructuring, and rescissions. In less than two weeks key committees and subcommittees have voted to cut \$40 billion from crucial child survival programs, and to end the federal safety net for children and their families. This is a wholly unshared sacrifice: the House seems to be postponing for a later day, if ever, any contemplation of major cuts for other constituencies. Savings from savage cuts in program for needy and helpless children would be used to fund a new and unnecessary defense build-up; to pay for a capital gains tax cut of which 71 percent goes to the richest 1 percent of Americans; and to reduce a tax on the richest 13 percent of the elderly by \$56 billion (over 10 years) when that tax goes to pay part of Medicare's cost.

Mr. President, when I go to gatherings of senior citizens, they list children and their grandchildren right at the top of their concerns. We talk about their concerns about block granting congregate dining and Meals on Wheels, which older Americans made sure did not happen in the House. The first thing they say to me is, "Senator, we also want to make sure that the school lunch program is not eliminated or cut back. We want to make sure that there are not cuts in childhood nutrition programs."

Mr. President, I say to my colleagues that we do not have, in this Contract With America, we have not seen in any of these rescissions, we have not seen in any of the action on the House side, one word about oil company subsidies being cut, one word about coal company subsidies being cut, one word about pharmaceutical company subsidies being cut, one word about the privileged, about the powerful, about Pentagon contractors having to sacrifice at all.

Instead, those citizens who are being asked to sacrifice and tighten their belts are the very citizens who cannot—the children in this country. I suggest today that there is a reason for that. They are the citizens who are not the heavy hitters. They are the citizens who are not the well connected. They are the citizens who do not have all the

lobbyists. They are the citizens with the least amount of political power. I do not think we should be making decisions on that basis.

How interesting it is, Mr. President, that we are willing to cut free lunches for children, but we are not willing to ban gifts and cut free lunches for Senators and Representatives. Let me repeat that once again: How interesting it is that in the U.S. Congress, on the House side, there is a willingness to cut free lunches for hungry children, but no commitment to have a gift ban and end free lunches for Representatives and Senators. That small example tells a large story about what is going on here right now in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. President, people voted for change. But it always begged the question, What kind of change? With these cuts in nutrition programs, now we have to have fear, in the schools of Ohio, Minnesota, Mississippi, and all across the land, not that Johnny cannot read, but that Johnny cannot eat. These cuts go beyond the goodness of people in this country.

This is not what people voted for. And when we see the rescissions coming over, and some of these block grants and mean-spirited cutbacks in child nutrition programs, and mean-spirited cuts in other children's programs that will lead to more homeless, all I ask my colleagues in the U.S. Senate to do today is to go on record with a mild sense-of-the-Senate resolution that we will not do anything that will increase more hunger or homelessness among children.

Now, Mr. President, I say to my colleagues—because I have had this amendment on the floor over and over again—that I do not think they can hide any longer. First, at the beginning of the session, it was all about prerogative, not on the Congressional Accountability Act.

I also heard about this type of rationale and even read in the New York Times Magazine about this the other day in relation to gift ban. No, we do not want to do that because we want to show that we are in control. Or we do not want to give a Senator ink. I did not think we made decisions on that basis, but the gift ban amendment was voted down. This amendment was voted down also. Then I brought it up again on unfunded mandates—it was voted down. Then I brought it up as just a motion to refer to the Budget Committee, not as an amendment to the constitutional amendment to balance the budget. Senator HATCH was on the floor, a Senator whom I deeply respect, and he said, "Look, Senator WELLSTONE, I really think that this is based upon your opposition to the balanced budget amendment, and these amendments are not going to be amendments we will accept." Fine.

But now we have a bill that is sailing through the Senate. There is tremendous support for it. I support it. And all I am doing, since this bill is out here, is asking for a sense of the Senate. We

see the front page stories; we hear it on the radio; we see it on television. Sometimes, I think, Mr. President, if I had time, I would retrace the hunger tour that Senator Robert Kennedy took. I really would. I almost feel as though Senators need to see it themselves.

All I am saying is, the writing is on the wall. We see where the deep cuts are. We see what its effects on children are going to be. Everybody agrees that these programs are harsh, that these programs will have a very serious impact on children, the most vulnerable of our citizens, the poor children of America.

I am saying, because all eyes are on the Senate to put a stop to this, today is the day. Let Members go on record. We can do this on a nonpartisan basis. We should have Democrats and Republicans in a resounding vote go on record that we will not do anything to create more hunger or homelessness among children. Let Members agree on that. Let Members agree when it comes to deficit reduction, there will be a standard of fairness. Let Members agree we will represent children in America and we will represent them well. Let Members agree this is a part of the priorities of what we stand for. Let Members put to rest the fears that so many people have in this country that what is happening right now in the Congress is a juggernaut that is mean spirited, that will hurt so many children in the country.

We, today, can go on record saying we are not going to do that. That is what I ask my colleagues to do.

Mr. President, I do not really understand. One of the things that has been interesting to me is the silence on the other side of the aisle. We know rescissions are coming over here. We know the kind of cuts that have already taken place in committee and on the floor in the House of Representatives. So there is not one Senator who can look me in the eye and say any longer, "Senator WELLSTONE, you're crying Chicken Little." That is what some of my colleagues had to say to me at the beginning of the session.

But now the evidence is irrefutable and irreducible. We know the proposed cuts. We know what is coming over here. I do not think there is one Senator who can come out on the floor and say to me today "You are wrong, we don't need to go on record with this statement, because no one will do this to children in America." The evidence is clear it is being done. Nor are there any excuses any longer about it being the beginning of the session or about it being the constitutional amendment to balance the budget. It is all very clear.

One more time, Mr. President:

It is the sense of the Congress that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

Is that too much to ask of my colleagues?

Moments in America for children, a Children's Defense Fund study last year:

Every 5 seconds of the school day a student drops out of public school;

Every 30 seconds a baby is born into poverty;

Every 2 minutes a baby is born at low birthweight;

Every 2 minutes a baby is born to a mother who had late or no prenatal care;

Every 4 minutes a child is arrested for an alcohol-related crime;

Every 7 minutes a child is arrested for a drug crime;

Every 2 hours a child is murdered;

Every 4 hours a child commits suicide.

Mr. President, we cannot savage children in America today. It is unconscionable, as I look at what the House of Representatives is doing right now, that we in the U.S. Congress seem to be willing to cut free lunches for poor children in America, but we have not yet passed a gift ban that would end free lunches for Representatives and Senators. Today I ask the U.S. Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, to go on record, "It is the sense of Congress that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that would increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless."

How much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The Senator from Minnesota has 23 minutes 15 seconds.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we have no request for time on this side. We are prepared to yield our time back if the Senator from Minnesota is ready to conclude the debate.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, before I do, and while my colleague is on the floor, I would like to get his attention just for a moment. I will be pleased to do so, and I understand the votes will all take place after our caucus meetings this afternoon.

I have a lot of respect for the whip. I think we have a good friendship, agree or disagree, on all issues. But I want my colleague to know why I continue to bring this amendment to the floor. It certainly is not for ink because there has not been a lot of coverage for this amendment.

I said at the beginning I was going to do it, and every day as I read the papers and hear what is happening on the House side, I realize that it is really going to be up to the Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, in a careful nonpartisan way to take certain action that I think 90 percent of the people in the country want us to take.

Part of that action is to certainly not, for example, cut nutrition programs for children. I refer the Senator from Mississippi to this article today regarding Fayette, MS, and there were

two parts to this. There are wonderful interviews with some of the parents and some of the women who work at the cafeteria and teachers who work with children about the tremendous fear.

The headline is "School Fearful That 'Johnny Can't Eat,'" not "Johnny Can't Read."

Congress' school lunch debate worries some in rural Mississippi. The Senator may have been off the floor. It starts out with this quote. I find this quote to be, at a personal level—it moves me and really worries me.

"I got a little boy come in here every morning and eats everybody's food. Just licks the plate. And you know he's not the only one," said Jeanette Reeves, eagle-eyed and dressed in starched white, a cafeteria manager who doesn't have to tell the children twice to eat all their lima beans. "Many of these children get their only meals right here at school. Lord, it'll be cruel to change that."

And then there are some teachers, I say to my colleague from Mississippi. This is in Fayette, MS, and they say, "Listen, these children just cannot learn, if they are not going to have at least one good meal a day, they can't learn, they can't do well in school."

Mr. President, we all say we are for the children in America. As I have said on the floor before, I think that includes all God's children, not just our children, and that includes the children that are poor and, unfortunately, a sizable percentage of children in America are poor.

I say to my colleague from Mississippi, if there is no further debate, I would be pleased to yield back the remainder of my time, but I am hoping that in the absence of debate today that finally the Senate is willing to go on record:

It is the sense of Congress that Congress should not enact or adopt any legislation that will increase the number of children who are hungry or homeless.

I do not think there should be one Senator who should have a problem voting for this. I think it is time we go on record as an institution. If there is no debate, I take that silence as consent, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will be happy to yield back the remainder of time, but first, since my State has been referred to several times—that is normal, if you want to make a case, it has been the practice around here for 20 years to attack Mississippi.

Frankly, we do not appreciate that. But also I just want to emphasize, there is a lot of misinformation out here. What we would like to do is to take nutrition programs, a lot of other programs, reform them, get the fraud out of them where it exists—and it may not be the case in the nutrition program—cut back on administration costs because there is a lot of waste and money going to the administration

of these programs instead of getting to children, food for children, nutrition for children.

One of the points that people in Washington seem to miss is—

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield? Can I ask the Senator before he moves to table if I could have a couple minutes to respond?

Mr. LOTT. I am sure we can work that out.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LOTT. I just ask the Senators here, is there anybody among us who would not like to see us find some savings in programs, maybe actually get more money to the children? What I understand is being proposed in the House of Representatives actually with the block grants is that you would get more money actually going for food to the children by cutting out the bureaucracy and the redtape.

It seems to me like that is a good idea: More flexibility for the States, a better way, perhaps, being found to administer these programs. The Governors believe that can happen—the Governor of my State, the Governor of Michigan.

So what we are talking about is a better program, a better deal that will help more children. What we have been doing is we are feeding bureaucrats. How about if we feed the children instead?

What everybody is saying is we cannot change anything. "Oh, no, don't touch this one, don't touch that one." For 40 years this stuff has been building up. It is a bureaucratic nightmare, with all kinds of waste. It is time that we find a way to improve some of these programs. We believe we can do that. That is all we are seeking with these nutrition programs. There is a tremendous amount of misinformation out there on this and other programs.

Last week we had debate on the balanced budget amendment. They said, "Oh, we don't need this. Let's just go and find a way to reduce the deficit." And then the list begins: "Oh, but, you can't touch this program, you can't even improve it, you can't limit the rate of increase in spending on programs."

That is all we are talking about. Most of these programs we are not talking about cutting a nickel; we are talking about controlling the rate of growth. So here they come, the same crowd we heard in the eighties: "Oh, don't cut this one, don't cut that one, don't cut the Low Income Energy Assistance Program," that gives \$19 million for air conditioning in the State of Florida, and I am sure a lot of money for air conditioning in my State.

We all have our little program and say, "Don't touch this one." You cannot have it both ways. You cannot find ways to begin to control spending and reduce the deficit without looking at every program, every agency, every department and seeing if we cannot do a better job. If we say do not touch any

program, we will never get anything done.

I did not want to start a full debate here, but I had to at least get that on the record. I think what we are talking about is better programs, less bureaucracy, and more funds for people who really need the help.

Does the Senator wish to use additional time?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, if I might just ask for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Since the Senator yielded back his time, I will yield back 5 minutes from our time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Let me just be really clear about, first of all, what this vote is on. I do take exception to some of what my colleague had to say. But I am not even debating today whether or not some of what has been proposed in block grants will work better or not. I take what the Senator has said to be said in good faith.

What this amendment says is the Senate goes on record that we will not enact or adopt any legislation which will increase the number of children hungry or homeless.

So the Senator from Mississippi would agree with me on that. He has not proposed that we do make cuts that would increase hunger and homelessness.

This does not cast judgment on any particular proposal. Given what is moving through and given some of the discussion, let us go on record that we are not going to do anything that would do that. I should think the Senator would agree. That is my first point. To vote for this means that Senators are willing to go on record saying certainly one thing that is important to us is not to increase any hunger or homelessness among children. That is all this says. That is point one.

Point two—and I say this with some sense of sadness to my colleague—actually there is a considerable amount of empirical data about the cuts. I have before me a Department of Agriculture study, and actually there are many other studies that are now coming out about the cuts that are being proposed, cuts I say to my colleague, in child nutrition programs State by State. Alabama, school-age children, fiscal year 1996, \$1,972,000; preschool children, \$15,098,000; Mississippi—but I will get to Minnesota so you do not think it is just Mississippi—\$2,421,000 for school-age children and \$14 million cuts for preschool children in nutrition programs. In my State of Minnesota, cuts of \$1,627,000 for school-age children and \$15,189,000 for preschool children.

That is why I am worried about this, I say to my colleague from Mississippi. So, first, there is no one any longer who is really arguing we are not facing deep cuts that will have a harmful effect on children. But, even if I was to agree with what my colleague just said, that is not what this amendment is about. We should together vote for

this because then we make it clear that regardless of our disagreement about specific policies, one thing we are in agreement on is that the Senate as an institution certainly is not going to take any action that would increase hunger or homelessness among children. I do not know how my colleagues can continue to vote against this.

Finally, I would like to say this by way of an apology because I agree with my colleague from Mississippi about this. I think this is a powerful story, but in no way, shape or form did I intend to pick on Mississippi. I believe that one of the things we do over and over again is that we look everywhere but home. It is so easy for those of us in Pennsylvania or Minnesota to focus on Mississippi, and I fully understand the sentiment of my colleague from Mississippi. Unfortunately, Mr. President, I say to my colleague, I can point to children that are struggling in Minnesota. I am sure that the Presiding Officer can in Pennsylvania. The kind of issues that concern me are all across the United States of America, not just in the State of Mississippi, which, indeed, is a wonderful State. But this is a wonderful story because it puts faces, it puts real people, it puts real children behind all the statistics, and that is why I use this as an example.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I really hope I will have support from colleagues on this.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. I yield back the remainder of our time, and I move to table the amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, does the Chair have business pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] is recognized to offer an amendment on which there shall be 90 minutes equally divided.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, yesterday, I had reserved time for another slot and had considered an amendment, which is the gift ban amendment, and again the connection I make over and over again today, it just strikes me as being more than ironic; I think it is unconscionable that, apparently, as I look at what the House of Representatives is doing right now, we are willing to cut free lunches for children but we are not willing to pass a gift ban that ends free lunches for Senators and Representatives.

However, Mr. President, while I think there has to be action on this, I look forward to working with my colleagues, Senator LEVIN from Michigan, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator LAUTENBERG, and certainly the majority leader, who has gone on record in favor of this. So this amendment will be in the

Chamber, though not today, and we will have a vote on it. I will not propose this amendment today.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. I would like to say to the Senator from Minnesota and remind all of our colleagues that the majority leader, Senator DOLE, has indicated this issue will be addressed. He is working on legislation in the gift ban area, and I do expect that we will have a vote in this area in the not too distant future. So rest assured, we are going to take up this issue.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Mississippi, and I would just say I appreciate that. Rest assured, I will be out in the Chamber with other colleagues with this amendment and keep pushing this, and hopefully we will all do this together.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, at this time I had the right to offer an amendment. I do not intend to offer the amendment at this time and withdraw that right.

THE OREGON OPTION

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, recently, the State of Oregon and several Federal agencies signed a memorandum of understanding to create a new partnership which will test unique methods of delivering Government services in a better and more efficient manner. When this revolutionary partnership, called the Oregon option, is fully implemented, Federal grants or transfers to State and local governments in Oregon will be based on results rather than compliance with procedures.

I believe that this project has the potential to vastly improve intergovernmental service delivery in my State and may well prove to be a national model for future governmental partnerships. For this reason, I am pleased the managers of the pending legislation, the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, have included in their bill my sense-of-the-Senate resolution urging the Federal Government to continue to be an active partner in this effort.

Mr. President, I would specifically like to thank Senators ROTH and GLENN for their assistance and would also like to thank Senator NUNN for his help in including my amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of this important legislation, I am pleased that the Senate will soon pass the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. I am a longtime supporter of the Paperwork Reduction Act which seeks

to reduce the Federal paperwork burdens imposed on the public.

I have been particularly concerned about the effects of the Federal regulatory burden on small businesses throughout my years in Congress. Americans spend billions of hours a year filling out forms, surveys, questionnaires, and other information requests for the Federal Government at a cost of several hundred billions dollars. Increasing paperwork burdens force small businesses to redirect scarce resources away from activities that might otherwise allow them to provide better services to their customers or provide additional jobs. America's small businesses are the backbone of our economy and, as such we need to ensure that they are not crippled by regulatory burdens that hinder their ability to compete in the increasingly competitive global marketplace.

I am also pleased to cosponsor an amendment offered by Senator LEVIN to eliminate or modify over 200 statutory reporting requirements that have outlived their usefulness. This is an issue that Senator LEVIN and I have worked on for a number of years in our capacity as chairman and ranking minority member of the Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management. The Levin amendment is consistent with efforts by the administration and the Congress to reinvent Government and make it more efficient. It is based on a bill Senator LEVIN and I introduced last Congress which CBO estimated would reduce agencies' reporting costs by \$5 to \$10 million annually. The legislation was the product of more than a year's worth of discussions with Government agencies and congressional committees.

Examples of the types of reports that the amendment will eliminate or modify include a provision to eliminate an annual Department of Energy reporting requirement on naval petroleum and oil shale reserves production. The same data included in this report is included in the naval petroleum reserves annual report. Another provision would modify the Department of Labor's annual report to include the Department's audited financial statements and, thereby, eliminate the need for a separate annual report for all money received and disbursed by the Department.

The Levin amendment is consistent with the goals of the Paperwork Reduction Act. It is intended to reduce the paperwork burdens placed on Federal agencies and streamline the information that flows from these agencies to the Congress.

Mr. President, I would now like to make a few statements about the overall legislation. The bill before us contains provisions to maximize the use of information collected by the Federal Government and keep in place the 1980 act's goal of reducing the paperwork burdens imposed on the public through

an annual governmentwide paperwork reduction goal of 5 percent.

It reauthorizes the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs [OIRA], within the Office of Management and Budget [OMB], which implements the act and requires each Federal agency to thoroughly review proposed paperwork requirements to make sure they are truly needed and have a practical utility. It also enhances public participation in reviewing paperwork requirements.

The bill clarifies that the act applies to all Government-sponsored paperwork, eliminating any confusion over the coverage of so-called third party burdens—those imposed by one private party on another due to a Federal regulation—caused by the U.S. Supreme Court's 1989 decision in *Dole versus United Steelworkers of America*. This decision created a loophole for agencies to avoid public comment and OMB review. Florida Gov. Lawton Chiles, who authorized the Paperwork Reduction Act when he was in the Senate, filed an amicus brief with the Supreme Court arguing that no such exemption for third party paperwork burdens where intended when the act was created. Unfortunately, the Court held that the plain meaning of the statute could not support such a finding.

Finally, I am pleased that the Governmental Affairs Committee accepted an amendment I offered in committee to make changes to the information technology provisions of the bill and allow the opportunity for information technology reform later this Congress. This is an important issue that warrants separate legislative consideration. In closing, I want to commend Senators ROTH, GLENN, and NUNN for their work in this area. The bill enjoys broad bipartisan support and I hope my colleagues will move expeditiously to vote on final passage.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess until 2:15.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:23 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ABRAHAM).

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 320

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the motion to table amendment No. 320, offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE].

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is absent because of death in the family.

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 99 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Abraham	Gorton	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gramm	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Packwood
Brown	Hatch	Pressler
Burns	Hatfield	Roth
Chafee	Helms	Santorum
Coats	Hutchison	Shelby
Cochran	Kassebaum	Simpson
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Smith
Craig	Kerrey	Snowe
D'Amato	Kyl	Specter
DeWine	Lieberman	Stevens
Dole	Lott	Thomas
Domenici	Lugar	Thompson
Faircloth	Mack	Thurmond
Frist	McCain	Warner

NAYS—47

Akaka	Exon	Lautenberg
Baucus	Feingold	Leahy
Biden	Feinstein	Levin
Bingaman	Ford	Mikulski
Boxer	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Graham	Moynihan
Breaux	Gregg	Murray
Bryan	Harkin	Nunn
Bumpers	Heflin	Pell
Byrd	Hollings	Reid
Campbell	Inouye	Robb
Cohen	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Conrad	Johnston	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kennedy	Simon
Dodd	Kerry	Wellstone
Dorgan	Kohl	

NOT VOTING—2

Inhofe Pryor

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 320) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] is absent because of death in the family.

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

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 100 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Abraham	Boxer	Campbell
Akaka	Bradley	Chafee
Ashcroft	Breaux	Coats
Baucus	Brown	Cochran
Bennett	Bryan	Cohen
Biden	Bumpers	Conrad
Bingaman	Burns	Coverdell
Bond	Byrd	Craig

D'Amato	Hollings	Murkowski
Daschle	Hutchison	Murray
DeWine	Inhofe	Nickles
Dodd	Inouye	Nunn
Dole	Jeffords	Packwood
Domenici	Johnston	Pell
Dorgan	Kassebaum	Pressler
Exon	Kempthorne	Reid
Faircloth	Kennedy	Robb
Feingold	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Feinstein	Kerry	Roth
Ford	Kohl	Santorum
Frist	Kyl	Sarbanes
Glenn	Lautenberg	Shelby
Gorton	Leahy	Simon
Graham	Levin	Simpson
Gramm	Lieberman	Smith
Grams	Lott	Snowe
Grassley	Lugar	Specter
Gregg	Mack	Stevens
Harkin	McCain	Thomas
Hatch	McConnell	Thompson
Hatfield	Mikulski	Thurmond
Heflin	Moseley-Braun	Warner
Helms	Moynihan	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Pryor

So the bill (S. 244) as amended was passed as follows:

S. 244

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—PAPERWORK REDUCTION

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995".

SEC. 102. COORDINATION OF FEDERAL INFORMATION POLICY.

Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 35—COORDINATION OF FEDERAL INFORMATION POLICY

- "Sec.
- "3501. Purposes.
- "3502. Definitions.
- "3503. Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.
- "3504. Authority and functions of Director.
- "3505. Assignment of tasks and deadlines.
- "3506. Federal agency responsibilities.
- "3507. Public information collection activities; submission to Director; approval and delegation.
- "3508. Determination of necessity for information; hearing.
- "3509. Designation of central collection agency.
- "3510. Cooperation of agencies in making information available.
- "3511. Establishment and operation of Government Information Locator Service.
- "3512. Public protection.
- "3513. Director review of agency activities; reporting; agency response.
- "3514. Responsiveness to Congress.
- "3515. Administrative powers.
- "3516. Rules and regulations.
- "3517. Consultation with other agencies and the public.
- "3518. Effect on existing laws and regulations.
- "3519. Access to information.
- "3520. Authorization of appropriations.

"§ 3501. Purposes

"The purposes of this chapter are to—
 "(1) minimize the paperwork burden for individuals, small businesses, educational and nonprofit institutions, Federal contractors, State, local and tribal governments, and other persons resulting from the collection of information by or for the Federal Government;
 "(2) ensure the greatest possible public benefit from and maximize the utility of information created, collected, maintained,