

I'm disappointed that the bill contains no competitive bid process. It may be that the number of available vessels to fully meet MSF requirements will exceed the number of MSP slots.

In that case, we should have some mechanism to test the market and acquire the needed services at the lowest cost to the taxpayer through some appropriate bidding procedure. Again, the majority leader and I have discussed this issue. We have agreed to request the Pentagon, the Department of Transportation, and the General Accounting Office to work together to craft an appropriate competitive bidding procedure. The Agencies will report their recommendation no later than April 1, 1997, so that the procedure can be employed prior to the renewal of any contracts in fiscal year 1998. Implementing the procedure will require statutory changes and the majority leader has pledged to assist in effecting this modification.

Mr. LOTT. My colleague is correct in that I am pleased to join with him to request the appropriate Federal agencies to determine whether a competitive bidding process is appropriate to the Maritime Security Program and, if so, to recommend procedures for Congress to consider. Such a determination and any recommendations should be submitted to us so that we can proceed accordingly for fiscal year 1998 appropriations.

In finally deciding on a competitive bidding process, however, we must not undermine the program in the interest of competition. If operators do not have some assurance of stability if they are doing a good job, they will not participate in the program and upgrade their vessels. In that event, we will be throwing our money away.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to raise with the majority leader an additional question. Section 16(e) of the bill requires the Secretary of Defense to select nine ships in the DOD's Ready Reserve Fleet to receive regular maintenance and the bill directs the Secretary to geographically distribute the maintenance contracts. As we learned in the Gulf war, properly maintaining RRF vessels is critical to ensuring timely and efficient sealift capabilities.

Two issues are raised. First, we must make it absolutely clear that in selecting which Ready Reserve ships will be maintained, our national defense needs take priority over any secondary goal of geographically distributing the contracts.

Those ships best able to meet our sealift needs under the most likely contingency scenarios should be selected without any extraneous considerations.

Second, the goal of geographically spreading out the maintenance work must not take precedence over the Secretary's responsibility to obtain the highest quality services at the lowest price to the taxpayers. Quality and

price must remain the primary consideration of where we choose to have maintenance work conducted. Would the majority leader comment on that?

Mr. LOTT. I appreciate the Senator's concerns. It is certainly our intent that the Secretary choose those ships that are most militarily useful no matter where they are ported. Furthermore, it is not our intention that efforts to geographically distribute RRF maintenance contracts take precedence over quality and cost considerations.

Mr. MCCAIN. So the intent of the legislation is that the Government acquire the highest quality services at the lowest prices, irrespective of where the shipyard is located, and that the ships are selected for maintenance based on their military utility first and foremost.

Mr. LOTT. The Senator is correct. I appreciate the opportunity to make the clarification.

Mr. MCCAIN. Finally, Mr. President, I would like to express my concern about a perhaps unintended impact of a provision of this legislation regarding Maritime Security Fleet carriers who also contract with the Federal Government to carry non-military cargo and are paid the U.S.-flag vessel contract price.

Such carriers will now be allowed to subcontract non-contingency related Government work to foreign-flag carriers as a replacement for U.S. vessels called up under the Maritime Security Fleet Program to serve in a time of conflict.

We must be sure that when such subcontracts are entered into, the U.S. carrier receives from the Federal Government only the amount it pays for the subcontracted services, not the amount the carrier would otherwise receive for providing the services directly. I think this is a very important point.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Senator. It is certainly our intention that carriers do not automatically receive the U.S.-flag vessel contract price if an MSP carrier subcontracts its work to a foreign-flag vessel. It is our intent that the Federal Government be able to renegotiate such contracts, based on the cost of the replacement vessel. Again, I thank the Senator for making this clarification.

Mr. MCCAIN. One final point: When the Pentagon analyzes our sea lift need they should work with the DOT to determine what the availability of American-flagged ships would be without the subsidy program. This is important information we must have before any contracts are renewed.

Mr. BURNS. I understand the benefits that the Maritime Security Program will bring to the United States. However, I am concerned that, because this program will be funded through yearly appropriations, folks will come looking for offsets every year, which might result in new tax proposals, user fee proposals, new duties, or other revenue raising mechanisms to be imposed

upon the maritime industry at some point down the road.

This would be devastating to the export/import trade in my home State of Montana, as well as in other States, because a tonnage tax is particularly harmful to bulk commodities. Bulk commodities, as we all know, are highly price sensitive in the extremely competitive world market—an increase of a few cents a ton, caused by new taxes or fees, can make the difference between whether a foreign purchaser buys U.S. grain or grain from some other country.

I do not believe that exporters and importers should bear the burden of funding—through tonnage taxes or user fees—this program. On the contrary, because the program is designed to benefit the country as a whole, it should be funded from general receipts from the treasury, and, as I understand it, that is what this act does, is that correct?

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct. It is an annual appropriation.

Mr. BURNS. So this act does not, in any way, contemplate funding this program by imposing new taxes, user fees, or other revenue raising devices that would adversely affect the maritime industry customers like the good farmers in Montana.

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WELFARE WAIVER

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, most of my colleagues are well aware that I have introduced legislation to rescind the portion of the DC welfare waiver that was recently enacted by President Clinton, because it went directly in opposition to the welfare bill that was passed overwhelmingly by this body and the House of Representatives and was signed by the President and is now the law of the land.

What a lot of people didn't know—I didn't know it—is that when the President signed the welfare reform bill that had 5-year time limits for everybody in America, where no longer could you get cash assistance for the rest of your life—and President Clinton campaigned on 5-year limits, on limitations of cash benefits, and also on work requirements—what I didn't know is that the District of Columbia was granted a waiver, which the President signed a couple of days before, that allowed the District of Columbia to have a 10-year waiver from time limits. So there is a 5-year limit in Michigan, a 5-year limit everywhere else in the country, but not for the District of Columbia, and there are no work requirements for the District of Columbia.

Frankly, I find that to be very deceitful and misleading by the administration—to go out and tell everybody,

hey, we have ended welfare as we know it—and every time I have heard that line, I applaud, because I know the present welfare system hasn't worked. It has hurt a lot of people who it tried to help. You don't need anymore evidence than to look at the District of Columbia. If anywhere is in need of welfare reform, it is the District of Columbia.

Why in the world would the President, at the same time he is signing welfare reform for the rest of the country, and bragging about it, getting great accolades—and it helps his rise in the polls and his move back toward the political center—suddenly decide to support a bill that had already passed Congress twice? He vetoed it the first time. The third time was a charm. He decided to sign it the third time. But at the same time he signs it, he exempts the District of Columbia from welfare reform, from time limits, and he exempts the District of Columbia from work requirements.

Unbelievable. Misleading. Deceitful. All of the above apply to President Clinton's position on welfare reform. Guess what? He got caught. I didn't know about the DC waiver when he signed the welfare bill. Somebody started to tell me about it, and I looked at it and I said, "I can't believe it. I can't believe that the same administration that has said, yes, we are going to have real time limits, real limitations, real work requirements, would totally exempt the District of Columbia where 1 out of 6 people is now on welfare. That is so misleading, it is unbelievable.

Now, I am very pleased that the Department of Health and Human Services has withdrawn the waiver today. I have a letter that I will have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, signed by Mary Jo Bane, Assistant Secretary for Children and Families, stating that DC's waiver approval as it pertained to work requirements and time limits has been withdrawn by HHS.

Why did they decide to do this? I think because they got caught. I know the House was interested in legislation I introduced, with time limits that would apply to every State and the District of Columbia. We were going to pass that. I think the administration realized they were going to be embarrassed politically for trying to be on both sides of welfare reform, saying they are for welfare reform and, at the same time, exempting the District of Columbia. They realized that that wasn't politically defensible. They figured they better cut their losses and repeal the waiver. That is my guess.

It is interesting to note—and I will put this in the RECORD. I received this. This waiver that protects the District of Columbia from potential welfare reforms is getting a cool reception from some members of the city council. Linda Cropp, a DC council member who chairs the subcommittee on human services, announced Tuesday, at a September 30 hearing on the Federal waiv-

er, that she was concerned that welfare waiver would make the city a "welfare magnet" since there are tougher standards in nearby jurisdictions.

She is exactly right. If you have tougher restrictions in Virginia and Maryland, and in every other State, but you have no restrictions and no limitations on welfare in the District of Columbia, it would be more than a welfare magnet, it would be receiving welfare recipients from all around. DC council member Harold Brazil said the waiver "encourages dependency and ruins initiative." He is exactly right. I will enter that in the RECORD as well.

I have a couple of articles that dealt with this issue. One was an op ed piece that was in the Washington Post on September 15, 1996. It is entitled, "Welfare as Usual in D.C.; The bureaucrats Conspire to Block Reforms," by Matthew Rees, as well as an op ed article by Naomi Lopes and Michael Tanner, entitled, "Welfare Reform Bypass for DC," and one final op ed piece from Investor's Business Daily, "Will Clinton Undo Welfare Reform?"

I ask unanimous consent that all of the material I have referenced be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1996]
WELFARE AS USUAL IN D.C.; THE BUREAUCRATS CONSPIRED TO BLOCK REFORMS HERE
(By Matthew Rees)

It doesn't really matter how you measure the District's social conditions, because by nearly every standard they are appalling. The infant mortality rate is the highest in the nation, the percentage of the population receiving benefits through Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) is double the national average, more than one-third of the children are living in poverty and more than two-thirds are born to single mothers. With the District leading the nation in so many of the wrong categories, it could be an ideal place to gauge the effectiveness of the welfare bill President Clinton signed last month. Unfortunately, some last-minute collaboration between the District and the federal government means the nation's capital will be experiencing little in the way of genuine welfare reform.

To better understand why the prospects for reform are dim, you have to go back to Aug. 19. That was the day the Clinton administration's Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) issued a landmark announcement, telling the District it was free to make cash payments to welfare recipients for up to 10 years so long as the recipients "made a good-faith effort to find employment." The announcement also declared that the District would be granted a relatively liberal definition of what constitutes "work." According to top District officials, obtaining a driver's license, or attending self-esteem classes, would meet the work standard.

The net effect of this decision was obvious: It undermined the welfare legislation the president was about to sign. The District would have no real obligation to comply with the bill's five-year time limit on cash welfare benefits, and the requirement that 50 percent of each state's welfare caseload be engaged in strictly defined work activities by 2002 would be considerably watered down.

"If you wanted to send a message to the District that 'we're not serious about welfare reform,' a 10-year waiver was a pretty good way to do it," intones Mickey Kaus, a neoliberal commentator who's written extensively on welfare.

Some see nothing wrong with the HHS exemption, known as a "waiver," because it gets the District out from under the new law's mandates and allows for local flexibility. That would be an attractive argument if the District had followed the lead of states with pioneering welfare reform projects, such as Michigan and Wisconsin. Unfortunately, just the opposite has been the case: The District maintains a welfare system that is viewed by many welfare experts as one of the country's least demanding, and least oriented toward reform. The results speak for themselves.

That's why allowing the District to opt out of major provisions of the new welfare law is such a grave error. Even when confronted with scenes straight out of Dickens, the District government has chosen to maintain the infrastructure supporting these conditions. The genius of the federal welfare bill is that while it gives states the freedom to craft their own public assistance programs, it also gives them positive and negative incentives to get people off welfare before five years and require them to go to work after two years. For the District to even come close to complying with these demands would require trying new and innovative approaches to old problems. With the waiver, however, it's unlikely such approaches will be considered.

The pro-waiver arguments rested on a simple belief: The District would suffocate under the new rules. It was, therefore, preferable to preserve the old ones. HHS spokeswoman Melissa Scolfield justified the waiver with the explanation that "we are, of course, sympathetic to the special situation of the District."

The shortcoming in this paternalistic approach is self evident. Given the option of doing nothing versus implementing reforms that result in some short-term pain for some greater long-term gain, it's all too easy to choose the former. The Clinton administration was in a position to remove this option by denying the waiver request. But far from discouraging it, top HHS officials saw the District as an opportunity to subvert Clinton's stated intentions of ending "welfare as we know it." The waiver was originally needed because of the welfare reform legislation approved by Mayor Marion Barry in August 1995. Among other things, that legislation instituted a "family cap," which meant mothers on welfare who had additional children would be denied increased AFDC payments. Teen mothers could also be required to attend school and live with a parent, guardian or adult relative. While these are steps in the right direction—though they appear to have substantial loopholes—they are not the sweeping reforms the District desperately needs. Nonetheless the District needed a waiver before it could proceed because parts of the legislation conflicted with federal law. Financial constraints meant the waiver application wasn't submitted to HHS for nearly a year, and it only happened then because President Clinton announced the he would sign the Republican welfare bill.

The president's July 31 announcement set off a flurry of activity at the upper echelons of HHS. Many of the agency's welfare analysts opposed Clinton's decision—three of them have resigned in protest—and they immediately set out to soften the bill's impact, on the District in particular. Top welfare officials in the District government were alerted to the consequences of the legislation by Wendell Primus—one of the HHS officials who has since resigned—and Robert Greenstein, an influential private welfare analyst.

HHS helped fill out the waiver and put it through the "fast track" approval process.

Most striking was the waiver's approval time. Republican governors such as Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin and John Engler of Michigan have been highly critical of waiver delays, charging that HHS bureaucrats have taken forever to approve changes that have already been approved by their state legislatures. Some have been held up for years, yet the District's sailed through in just 13 days. Mary Jo Bane, another of the HHS officials who resigned, was one of the lead staffers who decided that the D.C. waiver—and seven others—would be granted at the last minute.

This incurred the wrath of Bob Dole, the Republican presidential nominee and congressional Republicans such as Representative E. Clay Shaw, chairman of the congressional subcommittee responsible for welfare legislation. Senator Don Nickles, an Oklahoma Republican, has gone so far as to introduce legislation seeking to repeal the waiver, charging that the administration had approved it only because the president was "trying to placate some liberal people who did not like him signing the welfare reform bill." The House Ways and Means Committee will also be holding hearings on the matter this week.

Certainly there are reasons for concern about how the District would fare under a more restrictive system. HHS officials were sure that the District wouldn't be able to meet the legislation's work participation rates. Stephen Fuller, a professor at George Mason University, points out that the District had a net loss of 15,000 jobs over the past 12 months and has lost 60,000 job over the previous five years. While there's been healthy employment growth in Northern Virginia over the past year (25,000 new jobs), nearly all of this growth has occurred outside the Beltway, and it's been in sectors such as engineering and business services.

Another factor is the District's unique demographics: Welfare populations tend to be concentrated in the inner cities, but each state's overall percentage of welfare recipients levels out once it's balanced against the lower percentage found in rural and suburban areas. The District has no suburbs within its rapidly declining population of 560,000—the only state with fewer people is Wyoming—and most of the recent population loss has come from those not on welfare. In other words, there's good reason to expect the proportion of District residents receiving AFDC—currently about 13 percent—to remain stable or increase.

Yet some of these concerns may be exaggerated. The work participation rates, for example, are nowhere near as demanding as many analysts have claimed. Indeed, the District—and all 50 states—have considerable flexibility in determining how they meet the rates. Because the law contains an array of loopholes, a state could have work participation as low as 20 percent—as opposed to the 50 percent rate spelled out in the legislation—and still be in full compliance.

When the federal welfare legislation is viewed in this light, the District's situation doesn't look so dire. The current work participation rate among District welfare recipients is 6 percent, and the District program is recognized as one of the most poorly run in the country. Once the new rules went into effect, as much as 10 percent of the caseload could be expected to stop asking for welfare (studies have shown this has happened elsewhere, probably because some portion of welfare recipients are already working in underground jobs). And at least some of the rest would presumably respond to the threat of having their benefits cut off and go to work. But extending the waiver for such a long period of time ensures only that the status quo will be preserved.

Or, it could get worse. One long-term effect of the waiver could be that it attracts the poor of nearby states such as Virginia and Maryland, which do have tough reforms in place. In Virginia, for example, welfare recipients must go to work within 90 days of beginning to receive public assistance.

"We want to make sure the District doesn't become a welfare magnet," says D.C. Council member Linda W. Cropp (D-At Large).

The fear grows out of the District's past experience with providing relatively generous benefits to the homeless, only to see the homeless population rapidly expand. The situation with welfare is similar: The District's 1994 AFDC benefits were \$428 per month for a parent and two children (the 18th highest when compared to the 50 states). This was \$55 a month higher than in Maryland, and \$137 a month higher than in Virginia, according to a recent study by the Washington-based Population Reference Bureau. When these figures are mixed with the generous time limits on the receipt of cash benefits, and liberal regulations on work, the magnet effect begins to look plausible.

District and HHS officials emphasize there was nothing extraordinary about the waiver, which they claim was similar to those granted other states, such as Wisconsin. But the Wisconsin waiver is part of a strongly reform-oriented plan, where the District's is not. The District will allow welfare recipients to continue receiving cash benefits for a decade or more, with minimal threat of being cut off. That guarantees the District will have little or no real incentive to begin the welfare-to-work experiments found in so many other states.

At a time when the District's social conditions so clearly scream out for major changes, it seems tragically misguided to declare that the nation's capital will be not the first place where there's welfare reform, but the last.

[Briefs from Washington]

WASHINGTON.—A waiver that protects the District of Columbia from stringent welfare reforms is getting a cool reception from some members of the city council.

Council member Linda Cropp, who chairs the committee on human services, announced on Tuesday a September 30 hearing on the Federal waiver.

Cropp said she was concerned the waiver will make the city a "welfare magnet" since there are tougher standards in nearby jurisdictions.

Under reform legislation passed by Congress, most welfare recipients who do not find work cannot continue to receive benefits for more than five years.

The waiver backed by President Clinton and Mayor Marion Barry gives the city a 10-year exemption.

Councilman Harold Brazil said the waiver encourages dependency and "ruins initiative."

The council members aren't alone. Some Republicans in Congress have already voiced their opposition to the waiver.

At a hearing Tuesday before the Human Resources subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee, Congressman E. Clay Shaw Jr., R-Fla., said if the city plans to use the waiver to exempt more than 20 percent of its current caseload, he will move to repeal the exemption.

Democrats countered by saying Idaho, Michigan, Massachusetts and Washington state have all been granted similar exemptions.

WILL CLINTON UNDO WELFARE REFORM?

Having shifted right by signing the Republican welfare-reform bill, President Clinton

is now doing all he can to assure the left that he will "correct" the new law. Machiavelli would be proud.

We can see why Clinton would like political cover on welfare: the left is dead certain the new law will cause untold suffering. And the media seem to feel obliged to give heavy play to anything—instant studies, predictable resignations—that feeds those fears.

Why is the hue and cry so much greater after the fact? Some on the left no doubt were surprised when the president signed the law. Others may think the suffering they expect to see is necessary, but still feel guilty about it. Now that it's too late to change matters, they can safely stand on principle—and demonstrate their purity, too.

Such mixed motives are natural to any large group. Much stranger are the conflicting signals that come from a single man: our president.

Clinton has already promised that, if he can't get the members of Congress to revise the law in the ways he wants, he'll enforce it as if they had.

Thus, he signed a bill into law, but he's actually going to implement something else. It's an incredible bait-and-switch, even for Bill Clinton.

But this is just the culmination of his welfare politics. In 1992, "New Democrat" Clinton vowed to "end welfare as we know it." But in 1993 and 1994, when his own Democrats ran Congress, he dropped the ball.

After voters handed Congress to Republicans, the GOP called Clinton's bluff by sending him a welfare-reform bill not wholly unlike the one he just signed. Clinton vetoed it. Congress sent up another: He vetoed that, too.

Enter '96, a campaign year. Republicans drafted a third welfare-reform bill. Bob Dole prepared to bash Clinton for delivering three vetoes where he had promised reform. So the president finally, reluctantly, signed.

As he's done so often before, Clinton thus signaled to the voters that he'd learned his ways, that he'd moved permanently to the right. Yet he knows full well that he'll turn left after the election. With welfare reform, though, he's signaling left at the same time. Clinton has his hazard lights on.

The welfare backflip exposes what's fundamentally wrong with this White House: It governs by fraud. What's more, it has no shame.

Take Vice President Al Gore's comments on a recent Sunday talk show:

The vice president admitted the welfare system is "cruel" and needs to be changed. Yet, seconds later, he pointed out that the welfare act's changes do not go into effect until July 1, 1997—leaving plenty of time for Clinton and a Democrat Congress to scrap the law.

And if Republicans maintain control, Gore added, Clinton would use the line-item veto to fix things Clinton and liberals don't like about the bill.

What things are those? Ask the first lady. Interviewed in Chicago, she said she didn't like the limits on food stamps or on payouts to legal immigrants. She said she'll speak out next year to "correct" the welfare-reform bill that her husband signed.

If the bill was so flawed, why sign it in the first place? No one held a gun to the president's head. Why not work to fix it, and sign it later?

The questions are obvious. But such logic doesn't work with Clinton. Stand on principle? Avoid shame? This politician never shoots straight: Everything is a bank-shot, or worse.

It's no wonder polls show a majority of us do not trust our president. How can we? Not only can we not trust him to do what he says. We can't even trust him to do what he

does, because he undoes what he does. Next thing, he'll be telling us that's not what he did.

Accepting the GOP nomination, Bob Dole spoke scornfully of leaders "unwilling to risk the truth, to speak without calculation," he went on: "All things flow from doing what is right."

Reforming welfare is right. Now we just need a leader who will do what is right.

[From the Washington Times]

WELFARE REFORM BYPASS FOR D.C.

(By Naomi Lopez/Michael Tanner)

"Welfare as we know it" has been ended, right? Well, not in the District of Columbia. Even as President Clinton was signing the new welfare reform bill with one hand, with the other he was simultaneously granting the District, a 10-year waiver exempting it from most of the requirements in the new welfare bill, including time-limited assistance and certain work requirements.

The waiver for D.C.'s "Project on Work, Employment, and Responsibility" (POWER), submitted in early August, was rushed through the Department of Health and Human Services' "fast track" waiver approval process just three days before Mr. Clinton signed welfare reform into law. As a result, welfare reform will have only a minimal impact on welfare dependency in the District and an even smaller impact on D.C. welfare spending.

For example, the welfare reform bill calls for a five-year lifetime limit on welfare benefits. Not under the District's waiver; there would be no cutoff of benefits for any D.C. resident who could not find a job that pays more than welfare benefits. The most unfortunate aspect of this exemption is that the District, aided and abetted by the Clinton administration, is sending a message that the rules will not apply to its residents and that cash assistance is still an entitlement.

While one of the big selling points of the new welfare reform law was its requirement that welfare recipients work in exchange for benefits, the District's waiver defines work activities so liberally as to be meaningless. Attending a job-training program or engaging in job search (i.e., looking for work) will be enough to satisfy the District's work requirement. Thus, welfare in the District will remain pretty much as we know it. Yet few welfare systems are as badly in need of reform.

Despite the fact that 1 in 6 District residents are on welfare, more than a third of District children still live in poverty. Out-of-wedlock births have reached alarming proportions. Of the District's more than 50,000 children in welfare families, 83 percent were born out of wedlock and 10 percent come from broken homes. Only a mere 1 percent of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) households contain two parents.

* * *

While one of the big selling points of the new welfare reform law was its requirement that welfare recipients work in exchange for benefits, the District's waiver defines work activities so liberally as to be meaningless. Attending a job-training program or engaging in job search (i.e., looking for work) will be enough to satisfy the District's work requirement. Thus, welfare in the District will remain pretty much as we know it. Yet few welfare systems are as badly in need of reform.

Despite the fact that 1 in 6 District residents are on welfare, more than a third of District children still live in poverty. Out-of-wedlock births have reached alarming proportions. Of the District's more than 50,000 children in welfare families, 83 percent were born out of wedlock and 10 percent come

from broken homes. Only a mere 1 percent of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) households contain two parents. Long-term dependency is increasingly the norm as is second- and third-generation welfare dependence.

D.C. has followed the liberal route of trying to solve its welfare problems with money. On a per capita basis, the District has the highest federal social welfare program spending in the nation. Of the 50 states and District, the District ranks:

First in per capita federal spending on AFDC, food stamps, Medicaid, housing assistance, job training under the Job Training Partnership Act, and community development.

Second on Medicare and state employment services.

Fourth on compensatory education for disadvantaged children.

Fifth on Supplemental Security Income and the social service block grant.

Twelfth on child nutrition programs.

The value of the full package of welfare benefits in the District (including cash assistance, food stamps and nutrition assistance, housing assistance, Medicaid and so on) totals more than \$22,745 per year for a single mother with two children. Because welfare benefits are tax-free, a working person would have to earn nearly \$14 per hour to take home an equivalent paycheck. Indeed, the District's welfare package is the fifth-most-generous in the nation. Is it any wonder that so many recipients make the rational choice of welfare over work?

The welfare reform bill fell far short of what is necessary to truly end welfare as we know it. But the District, with the complicity of the Clinton administration, seems unwilling to make any change in the status quo.

The District government is setting up a social time bomb that the rest of the nation will, most likely, be responsible for defusing. In 10 years, the District's waiver will expire only after it will have promoted and perpetuated a failed and reckless system. And at that time, the federal government will be called upon to bail out the District again. By that time, the damage may be irreversible.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, the Washington Post today had an editorial that was critical of me. Basically, it said, wait a minute, we granted waivers to other areas. Why would you try and take away parts of the waiver—they actually said we were repealing the entire waiver. They were wrong. Why would you do this just for the District of Columbia if not for other areas?

The legislation I introduced, frankly, did not apply just to the District of Columbia. It says a 5-year time limit applies to everybody in the country. There won't be a single waiver to exempt someone from the 5-year limit. That was the guts of the bill. There would not be a waiver that would undo work requirements. Those were the two major elements of the bill. It just so happens that the District of Columbia was the only waiver request that went directly away from welfare reform.

There are 30 States, plus the District of Columbia, who have received welfare waivers. Guess what? All 30, except for the District of Columbia, moved toward work requirements, toward time limits—most of which had shorter time limits than 5 years. But not the District of Columbia; it was a waiver away

from welfare reform, a waiver for the status quo, and it was a waiver, basically, where President Clinton and the Clinton administration was saying: District of Columbia, you are exempt from welfare reform. We don't think you need to do it.

I am pleased I finally hear that HHS has rescinded the order. I believe they did it because it is the political season, and they knew they were going to take some heat. They made a serious mistake. But we have to make sure they are not just postponing it for 2 months. We want to make absolutely sure that there is no way that sometime after the election, in November or December, they would go ahead and grant a 10-year waiver. We want to make sure that is not up their sleeve. If we have to pass legislation to make sure of that, we will do it. There is no reason in the world why we would work as hard as we did for real welfare reform for everybody in the country—to end cash assistance as an open-ended entitlement, a perpetual way of living—and not do it in the District of Columbia.

I might mention, Mr. President, I think there are some games that were played. This waiver request by the Clinton administration was granted in 14 days. I might tell my colleagues that some areas have had waiver requests pending before the administration for months, some for years, some for 2 years, all of which were trying to have a waiver from the old law, which would not allow time limits. Most of the waivers that States wanted to enact, like Wisconsin, Illinois, Oklahoma, and others, wanted to have time limits and work requirements. They wanted people to get off welfare and go to work. They wanted to have learnfare requirements where children of welfare recipients would be required to go to school, like every other child. If they didn't have their kids in school, they would lose welfare payments; or they have to make sure their kids receive vaccinations, or they might receive penalties.

States have had great initiatives. So this administration has been very slow on many of those States. As a matter of fact, the President, in May, made a nationwide radio address complimenting Wisconsin on their welfare reform and talked about granting their waiver, and this is great. Guess what? He hasn't granted the Wisconsin waiver yet. That was months ago. But he granted the DC waiver in 14 days. That was granted right before signing the welfare reform bill. And the DC waiver had no time limits. It has a 10-year exemption. How is that fair to the people in New Hampshire? They are going to have a limitation on how long they can receive cash payments. The State of Hawaii had a waiver request granted by the administration in just the last couple of months, since signing the bill. But the State of Hawaii had a 5-year limit. Indiana got a waiver request signed, but it was a 2-year limit, not a 5-year limit. But the District of Columbia comes up and, in 14 days—unbelievable speed for the Department of

Health Human Services—they get a waiver signed by the President that says you are going to have a 10-year exemption—10 years, no limit, and no work requirement. What a sham. What a shame. What a shame that this President and this administration would be so deceitful as to try to pull that over on the American people.

I am pleased that the Department of Health and Human Services realized their mistake. My guess is that the political people said, "Hey. This could come back to hurt us, or haunt us. Therefore, let us withdraw it."

I am pleased that the District of Columbia City Council, which never requested a 10-year waiver on work requirements, never requested a 10-year waiver on lifetime benefits—I am pleased that some of the council members realized that this is terrible. This would be a disaster for the District of Columbia. So I am pleased that evidently not only are they going to have some hearings but some Members think it would be a serious mistake, and they don't want the District of Columbia to become the welfare capital of the United States.

So I am pleased with the announcement of HHS today. I think the administration got caught in trying to have it both ways on welfare reform. To say "Yes, we need welfare reform with time limits and work requirements" while at the same time trying to undo welfare reform—to exempt work requirements, to exempt time limits—they should be ashamed of themselves. I am pleased they reversed themselves for about the fourth time on this issue.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

MARITIME SECURITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. What is the pending business, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 1350 is the pending business.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I just wanted to advise my colleagues that we have not received any requests to submit amendments on this side. Do we have any amendments pending at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no amendments pending that the Chair is aware of.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. INOUE. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa is conferring off the floor concerning amendments that he may offer. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. I will state to the Chair it will be about 30 minutes.

There being no objection, at 6:27 p.m., the Senate recessed subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 7:08 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SANTORUM).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 1350. Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 8 minutes as in morning business.

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

FEDERAL WILDLIFE REFUGES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in the United States, there are 571 Federal wildlife refuges. There is only one State that doesn't have any, and that, unfortunately, is the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

To look at a couple of States that are comparable in the size of population to my State, Oklahoma has 9, Louisiana has 16, Alabama has 7.

Mr. President, it is pretty clear that Kentucky, when it comes to Federal wildlife refuges, has not been treated properly down through the years. I have been working on this issue since 1989. I introduced the first bill to create the first Federal wildlife refuge in Kentucky. It is not easy to find appropriate spots in the east. Many of our friends out west have more public land than they want. But in the east, it is not so.

We isolated—"we," working with the Kentucky Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—identified an area in Kentucky that makes sense. I introduced a bill which was reported out of the Environment and Public Works committee to authorize this refuge. It is my hope that the Interior appropriations bill will include both the authorization and appropriation to begin the acquisition.

Let me just say that no land will be condemned under this proposal. Only land will be purchased from willing sellers. That is a little bit different from the way some Federal wildlife refuges have been created. As a result of that, there is very minor opposition in our State to the creation of our first Federal wildlife refuge.

My dear colleague from Kentucky earlier today took to the floor to point out that this was not needed, and that we had another facility called the Land Between the Lakes—which is operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority; it

is a wonderful facility; a wonderful place—but that it really needed the money; and, if he were given the opportunity to do so, would offer an amendment to take the money away from the Federal wildlife refuge and give it to the Land Between the Lakes.

Mr. President, the Land Between the Lakes has already been given all the money they asked for. I am on the appropriations Subcommittee of Energy and Water which receives the request. We gave them all they asked for. They may ask for more someplace down the road, and it may be appropriate to give them more someplace down the road. But I do not think, particularly in these tight times, that it makes sense to throw money at a group, or a project, or an activity that is not asking for it.

So, if this amendment is offered at some subsequent time, obviously I am going to oppose it. I find it somewhat astonishing that my colleague would find it inappropriate for Kentucky to finally—it came into the Union in 1792—to finally have a Federal wildlife refuge.

It was suggested by my colleague that this was an incredibly controversial proposal. In fact, it is just the opposite. There are few who may oppose it, although if they own land in the area and don't want to sell they don't have to. And a wildlife refuge is a good neighbor. If you do not want to sell, it is a great neighbor to have right next to you. There is nothing that would keep any landowner in this area from keeping this property forever in this proposal.

There are 57 conservation groups and sportsmen from Kentucky who support this.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, Mr. President.

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

ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE ENDORSED THE CREATION OF THE KENTUCKY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Appalachia Science in the Public Interest.
Association of Chenoweth Run Environmentalists.

Audubon Society of Kentucky.
Bell County Beautification Association.
Berea College Biology Club.
Brushy Fork Water Watch.
Community Farm Alliance.
Daviess County Audubon Society & Kentucky Ornithological Society.

Department of Parks.
Eastern Kentucky University Wildlife Society.

Elkhorn Land & Historic Trust Inc.
Floyds Fork Environmental Association.
Friends of Mill Creek.
Gun Powder Creek Water Watch.
Harlan County Clean Community Association.

Hart County Environmental Group.
Highlands Group Cumberland Chapter Sierra Club.

Kentucky Academy of Science.
Kentucky Association for Environmental Education.

Kentucky Audubon Council.
Kentucky Citizens Accountability Project.
Kentucky Conservation Committee.