

have an appointment at 5, I will be happy to either recess until tomorrow morning, or if we want to continue debate, we can. I know the Senator from Georgia is here, and the Senator from Idaho wishes to be recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, last Saturday the White House political machine was running at full tilt trying to convince the American people that welfare reform is well underway when, in fact, President Clinton has vetoed welfare reform twice. Once again we find that the administration is using the old theory as to whether you can fool all of the people all of the time. This time, the administration is trying to use figures to confuse the public into believing that it is implementing a successful welfare reform strategy when, in fact, it has not.

Last Saturday, President Clinton told the American people that, All across America the welfare rolls are down, food stamps rolls are down, and teen pregnancies are down compared to 4 years ago. Unfortunately for the administration, the facts get in the way of the rhetoric.

According to the latest available data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the estimated average monthly number of AFDC recipients for 1995 was 13.6 million. The final figures for all of 1995 are not yet available, and there is a 9-month average from January to September 1995. By comparison, the monthly average for all of 1992 was 13.8 million recipients. This is a modest decline of 200,000 people, or 1.5 percent.

But the real story about the welfare rolls which this administration does not want the public to see is how the current welfare rolls compare to previous years and administrations. This first chart shows the number of people receiving AFDC benefits over time, and while the estimated 1995 AFDC caseload is 13.6 million people, the average monthly number of AFDC recipients between 1970 and 1995 was 11.3 million.

When you look back at the AFDC program over time, you find that the AFDC rolls under the Clinton administration are still well above the historical levels. Comparing 1995 to the averages of the 1980's, it is even more dramatic. If the 1995 welfare rolls had declined to the level of the 1980's, there would have been 2.7 million fewer people on AFDC.

Let me also point out, as this chart shows, that the AFDC rolls were rel-

atively constant throughout the 1970's and 1980's. There was an average of 10.6 million AFDC recipients over the 1970's. In the 1980's, the AFDC rolls rose at a slightly higher level, at 10.8 million.

The AFDC rolls increased dramatically in the early 1990's. In fact, the AFDC rolls reached their highest point ever during the Clinton administration in 1993. There have been only 2 years in which the AFDC caseload has ever exceeded 14 million people, and those years were 1993 and 1994.

Until 1994, there were 14.1 million recipients on AFDC, well above the 1992 level. If the welfare rolls would have declined just to the historical average, never mind ending welfare as we know it, there would be 2.2 million fewer people on AFDC than there are today. At best, the Clinton administration can only claim that the number of AFDC recipients is just now returning to the level of 4 years ago. Thus, President Clinton is claiming success for bringing the number of AFDC recipients to a level which is nearly 20 percent higher than the historical average. It is a little bit like the teenager claiming victory in the Indianapolis 500 just because he found the keys to the family car.

In the Food Stamp Program, we find similar patterns but the news is slightly worse for the White House spin doctors. Let me first point out, as this second chart shows, that the 1995 food stamp caseload was higher than the 1992 level, not lower, as the administration has claimed. On average, there were about 900,000 more food stamp recipients in 1995 than in 1992. And even if you use only 1 month of data, the most recent food stamp caseload is still higher than the 1992 level. The February 1996 food stamp caseload was at 25.7 million people. This is 300,000 more people than the 1992 level. And second, there were nearly 7 million more food stamp recipients in 1995 than for the 25 year historical average.

Over the past 25 years, the average monthly number of food stamp recipients is 19.4 million people. In 1995, there were 26.3 million people receiving food stamps. There were nearly 6 million more food stamp recipients in 1995 than the average for the 1980's.

As welfare rolls are linked at least in part to the economy, you should expect the number of welfare recipients to decline even without any change in welfare policy.

We can see this relationship especially in the food stamp program in the late 1970's and 1980's. This chart shows significant growth beginning in 1979. At the same time the median money income for families was declining in real terms from \$39,227 in 1979 to \$36,326 in 1982, food stamp caseload peaked in 1981 at 22.4 million recipients. But the chart shows the subsequent steady decline in food stamp caseload during the Reagan administration to less than 19 million recipients in 1988 and 1989. What was happening with the econ-

omy? Well, the median money income for families during the Reagan-Bush years increased to \$40,890 in 1989 in real terms.

The relationship follows in bad economic times as well. Caseloads increased once again as family income declined sliding down to \$37,905 in 1993. According to Census Bureau reports, the 1993 poverty rate for all families with children under age 18 was 18.5 percent, the highest level since 1962.

If administration officials can claim success, they need to explain precisely which Clinton welfare policy change is responsible for bringing the caseload back to the 1992 level. We need to question whether the Federal bureaucracies at USDA and HHS are really responsible for this decline.

The waivers the President continues to talk about appear to have very little if any effect. Obviously, the administration can claim credit for only those waivers which have been actually approved and implemented since 1993. Even then, the waivers must be evaluated to determine if they are or not some other factors were, indeed, the cause of the change.

In 1993, only four State welfare waivers were implemented. Obviously, these four waivers had no effect on other States. They may not have had any effect within the respective States depending upon when they were implemented during that year. In 1994, 14 waivers were implemented, in 1995 another 7. But these figures tell us very little. Waivers may not be implemented throughout the State. A State may have more than one waiver, some of which may have no impact on caseload. Some States with waivers have seen increases in their welfare caseload.

What this confusion should really tell the American people is that waivers are no substitute for authentic welfare reform. President Clinton did not mention that the welfare rolls and other programs have increased from their 1992 levels.

In September 1995, the most recent data available, there were 6.5 million people receiving supplemental security income benefits. This is an increase of nearly 1 million people from December 1992. We have also added about 5 million people to the Medicaid Program since 1992.

Mr. President, here are a couple of more facts to go with the White House data. It has now been 39 months since President Clinton outlined his welfare reform goals to the American people and promised to deliver welfare reform to the Nation's Governors. Instead, he has vetoed authentic welfare reform not once but twice in the past 5 months.

Mr. President, there are important differences between a vision and an optical illusion. The Republicans have outlined their vision for ending the vicious cycle of dependency through restoring the timeless values of work and family life. Meanwhile, the White

House magicians will continue to conjure up a few minor, if not meaningless, figures in an attempt to divert the public's attention from the real facts of welfare reform.

FOREIGN OIL CONSUMED BY THE UNITED STATES? HERE'S THE WEEKLY BOX SCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the American Petroleum Institute reports that for the week ending May 3, the United States imported 7,301,000 barrels of oil each day, 1,184,000 barrels more than the 6,117,000 barrels imported during the same week a year ago.

Americans now rely on foreign oil for 53 percent of their needs, and there are no signs that this upward spiral will abate. Before the Persian Gulf war, the United States obtained about 45 percent of its oil supply from foreign countries. During the Arab oil embargo in the 1970's, foreign oil accounted for only 35 percent of America's oil supply.

Anybody else interested in restoring domestic production of oil—by U.S. producers using American workers? Politicians had better ponder the economic calamity sure to occur in America if and when foreign producers shut off our supply—or double the already enormous cost of imported oil flowing into the United States—now 7,301,000 barrels a day.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will examine this information in the context of rapidly rising gasoline prices. U.S. reliance on foreign oil has caused us to forsake the use of alternative domestic fuels and allowed for serious declines in domestic crude oil production. In 1970, the United States produced 9,600,000 million barrels per day. Currently, we are producing only 6,500,000 million barrels per day. Thus, more than half of the gasoline consumed in this country comes from foreign sources, and the problem is getting worse.

Where's the leadership from the White House on this critical issue? The President ordered a draw down of the strategic oil reserves. The American people recognize this for what it is—a cynical joke. Of course Congress should cut the Clinton gas tax. We should also cut taxes on domestic alternative fuel sources, and on a host of other taxes Democrats have heaped on the shoulders of hardworking American taxpayers.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on Friday, February 23, 1996, the U.S. Federal debt broke the \$5 trillion sound barrier for the first time in history. The records show that on that day, at the close of business, the debt stood at \$5,017,056,630,040.53.

Twenty years earlier, in 1976, the Federal debt stood at \$629 billion, after the first 200 years of America's history, including two world wars. The total Federal debt in 1976, I repeat, stood at \$629 billion.

Then the big spenders went to work and the compounded interest on the Federal debt really began to take off—and, presto, during the past two decades the Federal debt has soared into the stratosphere, increasing by more than \$4 trillion in two decades, from 1976 to 1996.

So, Mr. President, as of the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, May 7, the Federal debt stood—down-to-the-penny—at \$5,093,910,014,740.64. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,236.90 as his or her share of that debt.

This enormous debt is a festering, escalating burden on all citizens and especially it is jeopardizing the liberty of our children and grandchildren. As Jefferson once warned, "to preserve [our] independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude." Isn't it about time that Congress heeded the wise words of my hero, Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence?

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 168(b) of Public Law 102-138, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House to the British American Interparliamentary Group: Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana, Mr. LANTOS of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 232(c)(2) of Public Law 103-432, the Speaker appoints the following members from private life to the Advisory Board on Welfare Indicators on the part of the House: Ms. Eloise Anderson of California, Mr. Wade F. Horn of Maryland, Mr. Marvin H. Kusters of Virginia, and Mr. Robert Greenstein of the District of Columbia.

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

H.R. 2137. An act to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to require the release of relevant information to protect the public from sexually violent offenders.

H.R. 2974. An act to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims.

H.R. 2980. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to stalking.

H.R. 3120. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering.

H.R. 3269. An act to amend the Impact Aid program to provide for a hold-harmless with respect to amounts for payments relating to the Federal acquisition of real property, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for an event displaying racing, restored, and customized motor vehicles and transporters.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 2:43 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 641. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs established pursuant to the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency Act of 1990.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following measure was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3269. An act to amend the Impact Aid program to provide for a hold-harmless with respect to amounts for payments relating to the Federal acquisition of real property, and for other purposes.

The following measure was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and ordered placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2137. An act to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to require the release of relevant information to protect the public from sexually violent offenders.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 8, 1996 he had presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bill:

S. 641. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs established pursuant to the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency Act of 1990.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-2484. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (RIN2515-AD73); to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2485. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (RIN2125-AD38); to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2486. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a final rule (RIN2125-AD61); to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.