

antitrust exemption would have no effect on matters involving major league players' salaries or working conditions, the subjects of the current strike, now or in the future, so long as the players remain unionized" (p. 10).

That same day, acting baseball commissioner Allan Selig testified that, "because the Union would not bargain collectively with us on the overriding issue of the players' salaries . . . we have not been able to reach an agreement . . . [W]e will play the 1995 season, including spring training, with those players who want to come to work . . . None of that has a scintilla to do with the antitrust laws or the antitrust exemption enjoyed by Baseball. Our relationship with the players is governed by the federal labor laws" (pp. 3-4).

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I note that the distinguished Senator from Ohio is on the floor.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

AT-RISK YOUTH

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, this Congress and the American people are now engaged in a historic debate about welfare. I would like to talk this afternoon about the people we need to focus on in that debate.

Mr. President, when I was in Youngstown, OH, a couple of months ago, I visited a church that ran a program for what is termed "at-risk youth." The kids that I saw that evening were seated in a circle talking about their lives, talking about their problems. One of the teenagers was asked this question: "Why do you get up in the morning?" That is a simple question. This young man responded: "Because I don't want to be dead."

Mr. President, people that were there that evening thought he might have missed the meaning of the question and misunderstood it. So they asked him his goals for the rest of the day. He said, again, that he did not want to die.

That was his objective for an average day.

Mr. President, that teenager, that young man, is growing up in a different country from most of the rest of us—a country most of us would have a very difficult time recognizing.

Now, the sociologists call that teenager at risk. That is kind of a strange term. As parents, we know that, in a sense, all children are at risk at all times. But these children are at risk in a different sense, in a different way. They are in grave danger of living very sad, very unhappy, very tragic lives.

By the term "at-risk," we mean children who are not learning the skills they need to really participate at all in society; children who are more than a grade behind in school; children who drop out; children who are abused, assaulted and live in constant danger of violent crime; children who are homeless or who run away from home. By at-risk, we mean children who are having children, children who are juvenile offenders themselves, already experiencing the justice system because of the crimes that they have committed.

By at-risk, we mean children who live in neighborhoods where work is more the exception than the rule, children who do not have any responsible adults playing a meaningful role in their lives—no role models, no one to look up to, no one to trust.

These young people are growing up so far outside the mainstream that they are going to have really very little chance of ever joining what you and I know as the American community.

They will certainly have very little chance to ever participate in the American dream.

Mr. President, these young people do not share in the values of America. It is not so much that they reject our values. It is not that they are protesting against our values. Rather, they never learned these values to begin with. This group of young people is, unfortunately, tragically, growing.

Since 1965, the juvenile arrest rate for violent crime has tripled. Children are the fastest growing segment of the criminal population.

Mr. President, since 1975, homelessness has been on the rise, and it has increased faster among families with children than among any other group. Every year, nearly one million young people between the age of 12 and 19 are themselves victims of violent crime.

Mr. President, too many young people are not getting the education they need either. Since 1960, we have spent 200 percent more on public schools, in real dollars. But the quality of education is not improving. A 1988 study found that of all the nations tested, the United States finished dead last in science.

In my home State, the State of Ohio, the Ohio Department of Education says that they really do not have complete statistics on graduation. But the statistics they do have suggest that of the children who enter Ohio high schools, only 75 percent graduate 4 years later. But that statistic really sugarcoats the much more dismal reality in many of our cities. In Youngstown, OH, for example, the reported figure is that only 46 percent graduate after 4 years; in Columbus, only 44 percent; and in Toledo, only 37 percent. I suspect that these figures would not be different in any major city in this country today.

Mr. President, these children are really not being educated. We all know what not educating a young person leads to. According to the educational testing service, half of the heads of households on welfare are dropouts. That should not be a surprise. The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections—our State prison system—reports that at least 25 percent of the inmates in Ohio prisons are dropouts.

I would say, Mr. President, based on my own experience as Lieutenant Governor in Ohio and being in charge of our prison system and working with the Governor in this area, that figure is probably a lot higher than that.

Mr. President, these young people are falling behind every day. They are fall-

ing behind too far and too fast. Almost 5 million children are growing up in neighborhoods where the majority of men are unemployed for most of the year.

And certainly too many children are having children. Since 1960, the rate of unmarried teenagers having children has increased almost 200 percent.

Since 1960, the percentage of families headed by single parents has also tripled. You hear a lot, of course, about single-parent families. But I feel that too many people really are missing the point. They are missing the point about why this is really an important issue and what all of the ramifications really are.

Let me point out for the Senate, Mr. President, one reason why that statistic, that figure, is so very important. It is important because children growing up in single-parent families are poorer than children, on the average, who live with two parents.

Children who do not have fathers around are five times more likely to be poor. They are also 10 times more likely to be extremely poor, to live in the kind of grinding poverty which is very hard to escape.

Mr. President, it is hard to escape this poverty because it is more than economic poverty. It is a poverty, really, of the spirit, the poverty especially of young men who are growing up with no role models.

It is a basic fact of human existence that when boys grow up without fathers, they become men without knowing what mature manhood really is supposed to be. That is really what fatherhood is all about, giving young people an adult male, a role model, to learn from. Young people need to have strong adult role models around if they are going to break out of the cycle of dysfunctional behavior.

All the social pathologies I talk about in this speech really reinforce each other. Only the involvement of strong, caring adults in children's lives can ever truly break this vicious cycle.

Consider another fact: 54 percent of all females who drop out of school are either pregnant at the time or already have children. Mr. President, the early, decisive intervention of a strong adult role model can certainly prevent a lot of problems. The young people I am talking about many times lack fathers. They lack role models, they lack education, they lack hope. That is why America today is losing these young people.

The class of young people I am talking about who are seriously at risk is growing, and it is heading toward an explosion, right in the middle of what is and what should remain the richest, greatest, the most powerful country in the world.

Mr. President, that is simply wrong. We, as a society, cannot afford to lose more and more young people to social trends that hurt people and destroy lives. We simply cannot let this problem continue to grow. We have to do

everything we can to roll back that tide of what really is a social collapse.

Now, this is not going to be an easy task. It will be an extremely difficult task. It will take a lot more than Government programs to get America through what amounts to a full-scale social crisis. We need churches, businesses, labor groups, and, indeed, all of American society to reach out to these young people in a way that is truly effective.

This past Wednesday, the Labor and Human Resources Committee reported out the Work Force Development Act. This is, of course, the Senate's job training bill. Mr. President, as we shift responsibility for job training to the States, because I think we should, there will be a temptation to focus the job training effort to a relatively—I say "relatively"—easier task, like assisting the skilled and educated workers who are temporarily out of work. They certainly need help.

I think that our Nation must have a different primary focus. I believe we must target America's No. 1 problem and tackle it head on. There are millions of young people in this country who are growing up in an environment that really all but guarantees their failure. If our job training legislation does not make a difference in the lives of these young people, we will be sacrificing not just an entire generation, but because these kids are having kids, we will be sacrificing the generation to follow.

We will sacrifice more than that, really, because this is an issue not just about these children's future, it is about who we are as a people. These young people are really not strangers among us. They are us. We will not be able to rest until we have brought the young people back into the American mainstream—a mainstream of work, a mainstream of responsibility, and a mainstream of opportunity.

That is why, Mr. President, during Wednesday's hearing, I proposed an amendment that would establish, as part of the Senate job training block grant, a \$2.1 billion fund for programs to help these threatened young people.

My amendment passed the committee by a vote of 12 to 4. I believe that our committee's intent could really not be more clear. We must have a national focus on at-risk youth.

Mr. President, I held a job training field hearing in Ohio a few weeks ago. I heard from people on the front lines, the people who get up every morning and try to make a difference by helping train some of these young people. I also heard at that hearing from some of these young people themselves. It is pretty clear from what we heard that their needs are not being met by our current system.

In fact, State job training programs many times simply do not focus on this very difficult but crucial task. If we, as Americans, want to do something about this problem, I believe that we have to have a national commitment.

Now, it remains as true as ever that Federal mandates are not—let me repeat, are not—an effective way to tackle social problems. That is why it is essential we not try to prescribe particular solutions from Washington, DC. We do not need more micromanagement out of this Capitol.

However, I do believe what we should do is make a national commitment to target this at-risk youth population. At the same time we make this national commitment, we must match that national commitment and a national setting of priorities with a commitment to give the States the maximum amount of flexibility to design their own programs to target this group of our young people.

Mr. President, the history of the last 30 years proves that the Federal Government does not have the answers. We have to give the States the funding and the flexibility they need to design and support programs that will, in fact, work.

I also believe we must, as a nation, as a people, say that the saving of this group of young people is, in fact, a national priority. Even now, as we speak today, a number of communities are pointing the way to possible solutions. They are doing it with programs that may be partially federally funded, may not be federally funded at all, may have some State money in them, or some of the programs I have seen have no government money. A number of the communities I have visited are really leading and pointing the way.

The Youngstown church, for example, which I mentioned earlier at the beginning of my remarks, is a place where kids can go between the end of school, when they get out of school, and bedtime. It is a place where they have things to do and a place where they are safe.

Being safe from physical violence is a good start. In Cleveland, OH, Charles Ballard started a program 13 years ago that helped teach these young people how to be fathers. His organization, the Institute for Responsible Fatherhood, is making a big difference; 2,700 men have participated so far, and 97 percent of the program's graduates are, in fact, supporting their own children.

Last week, Mr. Ballard announced he will be expanding his program to five new cities. I had the opportunity to see him last week when he stopped by my office here in Washington.

In San Jose, CA, there is a project called CET that provides 3 to 6 months of vocational training to disadvantaged young people and adults. A study of this local San Jose program indicates that the young people who participate in it end up doing substantially better many years into the future. Their annual earnings increase by more than \$3,000 a year. That is one of the best results ever achieved by such a youth training program.

Their success in San Jose is really because the program is tied closely—very closely, intimately—to the local

labor market. The CET program's staff keeps in close touch with local employers so they know what jobs really exist in the community, so that they are training people for jobs that really exist. CET emphasizes practical job training over more rigid, classroom-focused instruction.

Mr. President, Cleveland, OH, has a program called Cleveland Works. This program provides training, day care, and health care for welfare recipients. Each welfare recipient receives some 400 or 500 hours of training, and then gets placed with one of the 630 employers who participate in that area in the program. These workers get full-time wages and health care benefits for themselves and for their families. Cleveland Works has tracked all of its clients over the last 9 years and about 80 percent of them—80 percent—never go back on welfare.

Cleveland Works breaks down the barrier between the two cultures of work and welfare. It can be done. Cleveland Works is a success story that is already being replicated by dedicated people in six other American cities.

At the other end of the State is Cincinnati. In Cincinnati's Over-the-Rhine district there is a program called Jobs Plus, which I personally visited, which gives intensive training and counseling to at-risk individuals. All Jobs Plus clients are enrolled in a 90-day program, a crash course in the values and skills that are required in the working world. But the Jobs Plus program does not stop when the client gets a job. The client is then encouraged to join the Jobs Plus Club, to get moral support for what can be a very tough transition to a life of work and responsibility.

Should we mandate any of these programs nationally? No. I do not think so. But they look like good programs, and I think it would be wise for local communities across the country who are concerned about their at-risk youth to consider programs such as these.

The bottom line is that we have to keep on looking for the answers. There is no one right answer. We have to keep the focus on this problem. We have to keep the focus on this challenge. We have to do that. We have to keep reminding ourselves about the problem because there is simply too much of an incentive for us to forget these kids. There is a wall between these children and the rest of America, a wall every bit as real as if it were the stone wall of a prison or a jailhouse. We need to bring that wall down.

That is why, as we discuss the job training legislation and the welfare reform bill that will certainly follow, we must not lose sight of these particular children who have simply been forgotten for too long.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Ohio for his

very thoughtful and indepth statement on the job training programs and how they should be adjusted to better deal with the issue of actually training people versus just creating bureaucracy. I think his proposals are excellent and I hope this Senate will take heed of what he has said and follow them closely. As a member of the Labor Committee, I have certainly tried to do that relative to his recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

THE BUDGET CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I want to talk a little bit here today, however, about the budget conference agreement which has just been reached, because I do think there has been some information presented in the community at large that is inaccurate and misleading. This budget conference, which I had the opportunity to serve on, has reached agreement between the House and the Senate as announced last night by Leader DOLE and Speaker GINGRICH. It is a very positive event for America. It is the first balanced budget in 25 years, something we are in dire need of if we are as a nation to put our fiscal house in order and to pass on to our children a country which is prosperous rather than a country which is bankrupt.

Those of us who have been working hard in the effort of trying to bring fiscal responsibility to this Government, to make sure we have a nation that does not continually spend away the legacy of our children, are proud that we have been successful in developing this budget. I think there are some points about the balanced budget that need to be noted. As we go into the debate next week, I am sure there will be a lot of discussion and a lot of hyperbole. But I hope we begin from a basis of fact.

Some of the facts that are important are these. First, if we continue on our present course of spending, the Medicare trustees have told us—and four of the Medicare trustees happen to be members of the administration, including the Secretary of HHS and the Secretary of the Treasury—have told us that the Medicare trust fund will go bankrupt in the year 2002. Under the law, once the Medicare trust fund goes bankrupt it cannot spend any money. There will, therefore, be no health insurance program for our seniors. This needs to be addressed. The conference agreement which we have reached addresses that issue and reverses that insolvency situation.

Second, we know that if the Federal Government continues to spend in the pattern which is presented in the original budget of the President and in the President's budget as recalculated, the President's most recent budget as recalculated by CBO, that we would

add over \$1 trillion of new debt to our children's shoulders over the next 7 years. That would be a burden that would be unfair to load on them and which we cannot afford to do. I am glad to report that this budget conference does not do that.

This conference leads us to a balanced budget and, as a result of leading us to a balanced budget, it takes out of the debt stream almost \$1 trillion. That is debt our children will not have to pay. That is interest on that debt that we and our children will not have to pay. That is very important.

Of course there are a lot of side effects that are very positive to reaching a balanced budget and to passing this resolution. They include the fact that for the first time in 25 years, the world community will be able to look at this country and say we have our fiscal house in order. As a result, interest rates will come down for Americans and that will benefit us as a Government, but more important, it will benefit our citizens for, in borrowing to buy a home or improve on their home or to buy a car or to educate themselves or their children, they will pay significantly less because interest rates will have come down as a result of us passing this conference report, which is a balanced budget. So that is some of the good news that comes from this proposal.

I heard reported on the news—and this is what I wanted to specifically address this morning—as I was coming in, by a national organization funded by the Federal Government, that this budget proposal cuts Medicare by \$270 billion and increases defense spending by \$33 billion. If you wish to compare apples to oranges, and you wish to take great leave with the English language, maybe you could say something like that. But if you wish to be at all accurate or fair, you would have trouble defending that statement.

The fact is, Medicare spending goes up significantly under this budget. Under the present projected spending patterns, Medicare will increase at 10 percent annually for as far as the eye could see. We cannot afford that rate of growth. That is three times the rate of inflation. It happens to be 10 times the rate of inflation in the private sector's premium costs on health care. And if it continued to grow at that rate, as I mentioned earlier, the trustees of the Medicare trust fund have told us that the Medicare system would go bankrupt.

But there is no proposal to cut Medicare. There is no proposal at all to cut Medicare. There is a proposal to slow that rate of growth, to slow that rate of growth to 6.4 percent, which happens to be twice the rate of inflation. What does that mean in real dollars? It means over the next 7 years we will be adding in spending to Medicare, \$349 billion over what would be a freeze baseline. In other words, if you froze spending today, you would pull that straight line out, and this is what we

spend on Medicare today. How much will we spend over the next 7 years? We will be increasing spending by \$349 billion. In fact, over the next 7 years, we will spend more on Medicare than was spent over the last 7 years. What will the average recipient see as a result of this increased spending? They will see that instead of getting \$4,300 today in benefit support payments, they will be getting \$6,300 by the year 2000. And in the year 2002 alone, the increase in Medicare spending will be \$96 billion.

How some national news media say we are cutting Medicare is beyond me, but they say it. Unfortunately, they are supported in that frame of reference by folks who are activists here in Washington. But it is inaccurate. It is inappropriate.

What we are doing in this proposal is proposing to slow the rate of growth in Medicare. That is accurate. We are proposing it because, if we do not do that, the Medicare trustees have told us that the system will go bankrupt. The way we are proposing to slow that rate of growth is, I think, constructive. We are going to say to senior citizens in this country, you can have more choices for health care. Instead of using fee-for-service, which is the most expensive system, we are going to give you the choice of also using fixed-cost health care such as HMO's, PPO's, things like that. It will allow you to purchase a health care system at the beginning of the year for a fixed cost and get all of the health care provided to you by one group. It will not say that you have to do that. You can still stay with fee-for-service, if you want. But if you decide to go to an HMO, we will encourage you to do that. As a result, we will slow the rate of growth.

There will also be some other action taken but it will be directed at making the system more efficient, more cost responsive, and continue to deliver first-class quality care. But under no circumstances will there be any cut in Medicare.

The same is true of Medicaid. There is no proposal to cut Medicaid. Yet, if we are to listen to some of the media descriptions of this budget conference, you would assume there was, because they say there is. Actually, Medicaid spending will go up \$149 billion over the next 7 years. Yes, we are going to slow the rate of growth in Medicaid spending again. We have to. Otherwise, we end up bankrupting our children's future. But there is no proposal here to cut it; it is to slow the rate of growth. And we will continue to deliver first-class service and, in fact, I think we will end up with better services because hopefully we will send these dollars back to the States with fewer strings attached. As a result of doing that, I am sure the State governments—as the Presiding Officer, who was Lieutenant Governor from the great State of Ohio, knows—will deliver those services much more efficiently and better once they are freed from this huge bureaucracy which is