

Mr. President, the evidence is really irreducible and irrefutable. Bob Greenstein, who has won the MacArthur Genius Award for his work, crunched the numbers about what it means in personal terms, real terms for the most vulnerable citizens in America, but my colleagues are too worried about polls. They are too worried about the politics of it, and they turn their gaze away from all this.

Mr. President, I do not particularly care about words like "entitlement." But I do think as a nation we are a community, and up until the passage of this legislation, if signed into law, we as a nation said, as a community we will make sure there is a floor beneath which no child can fall in America. Now we have eliminated that floor. We are now saying as a Senate that there will no longer be any floor beneath which no child can fall. And you call that reform?

Mr. President, we had a proposal out here on the floor of the Senate that said, if you are going to cut people off from work, if you are going to cut people off from welfare, at least require the States to provide vouchers. The CBO tells us we do not have the money for the job training slots, and people will not necessarily find work, and then you will cut the adult off work. So we added an amendment that said, "For God's sake, at least make sure there are vouchers for Pampers, for health care, for food for the children." That amendment was rejected.

So we have no requirement that at the very minimum, even if you are going to cut a parent off of welfare, at least make sure the law of the land says that every State from Mississippi to Missouri to Minnesota to California to Georgia, that at least there will be vouchers for Pampers, for food, for medical assistance, and you vote "no" and you say there will be no vouchers. And you call that reform?

Mr. President, in the Senate, I introduced an amendment, and it was accepted. It said in all too many cases, too many of these women have been victims of domestic violence, they have been battered, and welfare is the only alternative for too many women to a very abusive and dangerous situation at home. So every State will be required to have services for these women and not force people off the rolls if, in fact, there needs to be additional support.

It took Monica Seles 2 years to play tennis again after she was attacked. Imagine what it would be like to be beaten up over and over again. That amendment was knocked out in the conference—no national requirement, no protection. Maybe it will be done in the States and maybe it won't.

Mr. President, I had a safety valve amendment. It was defeated. Senator KERRY from Massachusetts had another one which was watered down, but important. It was knocked out in conference committee. It said, why don't we at least look at what we have done,

and if in fact there is more poverty and hunger, then we will take corrective action in 2 years. That was knocked out in conference committee. You call that reform?

Mr. President, let me be crystal clear. You focus on work, you focus on job training, you focus on education, you focus on making sure that families can make a transition from welfare to work, and that is great. Eliminating services for legal immigrants, draconian cuts in food nutrition programs for children and the elderly, deep cuts in assistance for children with disabilities—none of this has anything to do with reform. This is done in the name of deficit reduction.

When I had an amendment on the floor that dealt with all of the breaks that go to some of the oil companies, or tobacco companies, or pharmaceutical companies, that was defeated. When we had a budget that called for \$12 billion more than the Pentagon wanted and we tried to eliminate that, that was defeated. But now when it comes to poor children in America, who clearly are invisible here in Washington, DC—at least in the Congress—faceless and voiceless, how generous we are with their suffering. And you dare to call that reform? You dare to say that, in the name of children, when you are passing a piece of legislation that every single study says will increase poverty and hunger among children. Vote for it for political reasons, but you can't get away with calling it reform. It is reverse reform. It is reformatory, it is punitive, it is harsh, it is extreme. It targets the most vulnerable citizens in America—poor children.

Mr. President, in this insurance reform bill we are going to be dealing with, late last night someone inserted a 2-year monopoly patent extension for an anti-arthritis drug, a special interest gift to one drug company, because then you don't have the generic drugs. Late last night, someone put this into the insurance reform bill. There you go. There is some welfare for a pharmaceutical company. But they are the heavy hitters. They have the lobbyists. They are well-connected. We do just fine by them. But for these poor children, who very few Members of the Senate even know, we are all too generous with their suffering.

Mr. President, I had an amendment that was passed by a 99-to-0 vote that said the Senate shall not take any action that shall create more hunger or homelessness among children. Now we are slashing \$28 billion in food nutrition programs with the harshest effect being on children in America. Can my colleagues reconcile that for me? I would love to debate someone on this. I doubt whether there will be debate on it, because the evidence is clear.

Mr. President, President Clinton said yesterday that he will sign the bill, and he said that he will work hard, I presume next Congress, to correct what he thinks is wrong. He pointed out that these draconian cuts in food nutrition

programs and in assistance to legal immigrants are wrong, they have nothing to do with reform. He is absolutely right.

Personally, it is difficult for me to say, well, with the exception of these draconian cuts in food assistance programs for children and the elderly, with the exception of these draconian cuts for children with disabilities, and draconian cuts for legal immigrants, this is a pretty good bill otherwise. I can't make that argument. But I will work with the President because, clearly, this is going to pass, and, quite clearly, corrective action is going to have to be taken next Congress.

But, for myself, Mr. President, I am a Senator from the great State of Minnesota. As Senator Hubert Humphrey said, the test case for a society or government is how we treat people in the twilight of their lives—the elderly; how we treat people at the dawn of their lives—the children; and how we treat people in the shadow of their lives—the poor, and those that are struggling with disabilities. We have failed that test miserably with this piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I come from a State that I think leads the Nation in its commitment to children and its commitment to fairness and its commitment to opportunity. As a Senator from Minnesota that is up for reelection this year, there can be one zillion attack ads—and there already have been many, and there will be many more—and I will not vote for legislation that impoverishes more children in America. That is not the right thing to do. That is not a Minnesota vote.

Mr. President, in my next term as a U.S. Senator from Minnesota, I am going to embark on a poverty tour in our country. I am going to bring television with me, and I am going to bring media with me, and I am going to visit these children. I am going to visit some of these poor, elderly people. I am going to visit these families. I am going to visit these legal immigrants. I am going to have my Nation focus its attention, and I am going to have my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, focus their attention on these vulnerable citizens. And, if in fact we see the harshness, the additional poverty, and the additional malnutrition, which is exactly what is going to happen, I am going to bring all those pictures and all of those voices and all of those faces and all of those children and all of those elderly people back to the floor of the U.S. Senate, and we will correct the terrible mistake we are making in this legislation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997 CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3603) a bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of July 30, 1996.)

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I present for the Senate's approval today the conference report on H.R. 3603, the fiscal year 1997 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

The conference agreement provides total appropriations of \$53.3 billion. This is \$10 billion less than the fiscal year 1996 enacted level and \$5 billion less than the level requested by the President. It is \$1 billion less than the total appropriations recommended by the Senate-passed bill and \$228 million more than the level recommended by the House bill.

Including congressional budget scorekeeping adjustments and prior-year spending actions, this conference agreement provides total discretionary spending for fiscal year 1997 of \$12.96 billion in budget authority and \$13.34 billion in outlays. These amounts are within the subcommittee's discretionary spending allocations.

The committee of conference on this bill considered 147 amendments in disagreement between the two Houses. I believe it is a credit to the all members of this subcommittee who served as conferees on the part of the Senate and to the House Members who served on the conference committee that we were able to resolve our differences and reach a conference agreement 6 days after the Senate passed the bill. I would like to thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. BUMPERS; the chairman of the House subcommittee who chaired the conference, the Congressman from New Mexico, Mr. SKEEN; the ranking member of the House subcommittee, the Congressman from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN; as well as all House and Senate members of the conference committee for their support and cooperation in this regard.

It is with a great deal of pride that I can say this Appropriations Subcommittee has done its work, completing action on this appropriations bill to assure that funding for those agencies it covers is in place before the start of the new fiscal year. Senate adoption of this conference report today is the final step necessary to allow this measure to be sent to the President for signature into law. We have every indication that the bill will be signed by the President.

Approximately \$40.4 billion, close to 76 percent of the total new budget au-

thority provided, is provided for domestic food programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These include food stamps; commodity assistance; the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children; and the school lunch and breakfast programs. This is \$58 million below the House bill level and \$906 million below the Senate level. The difference from the Senate recommended level is principally due to the fact that the Senate receded to the House on the amount for the Food Stamp Program contingency reserve which was \$900 million below the Senate bill level.

For agriculture programs, the conference report recommends a total of \$7.5 billion, \$104 million more than the House-recommended level and \$19 million more than the Senate bill level. This amount includes \$1.1 billion for agricultural research and education, \$426 million for extension activities, \$438 million for the Animal Plant Health and Inspection Service, \$574 million—the full budget request level—for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, \$746 million for the Farm Service Agency, and \$64 million for the Office of Risk Assessment.

For conservation programs, the conference report recommends \$770 million, \$2 million more than the House bill level and \$20 million less than the level recommended by the Senate.

For rural economic and community development programs, the bill recommends \$2 billion, \$136 million more than the House level and \$108 million less than the Senate bill level. Included in this amount is \$556.9 million for the Rural Utilities Assistance Program, which combines funding for rural water and waste disposal loans and grants and solid waste management grants. This represents an increase of \$79 million over the 1996 level. The bill also provides a total loan level of \$3.5 billion for rural housing loan programs, the same as the level approved by the House and Senate, and \$519 million over the 1996 level.

For foreign assistance and related programs of the Department of Agriculture, the bill recommends \$131 million for the Foreign Agricultural Service, including \$27.5 million for the Cooperator Program; a total program level of \$1.1 billion for the Public Law 480 Food for Peace Program, including a program level of \$240.8 million for title I, \$837 million for title II, and \$29.5 million for title III.

Mr. President, this bill provides funding for many essential programs, programs which enhance and support the productivity of our agricultural sector, which provide essential services to the small and rural communities of this Nation, which conserve and protect our natural resources, and which provide needed food assistance, not only to those abroad but to assure no American goes hungry. Many of these programs are worthy of additional funding. However, we are also working to reduce the overall costs of Government

and to assure efficiencies in the operation of Government programs. This bill is consistent with our overall budgetary and policy goals.

Mr. President, the conference report we present to the Senate today reflects a mutually satisfactory resolution of the differences between the two Houses. It does so in a manner which reflects the funding requirements of the many programs and activities covered by the bill within the limited resources available.

I recommend its adoption by my colleagues.

REGARDING THE CENTER FOR APPLIED
AQUACULTURE IN HAWAII

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, over the years, the Congress has been supportive of utilizing Hawaii's unique environment to develop important science-based aquaculture technology and to demonstrate and provide that technology to the U.S. aquaculture industry. With initial construction funding for Hawaii's Center for Applied Aquaculture in 1988 and subsequent installations in 1994 and 1995, enough money has been appropriated in the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service's buildings and facilities account to complete construction of a full-fledged aquaculture research and precommercialization facility in the Hawaiian Islands.

The dynamic proposal for the Center for Applied Aquaculture has grown to demonstrate the importance of a core research facility together with satellite facilities, including grow-out ponds to demonstrate new technology on a larger than laboratory precommercialization scale, protected quarantine facilities to ensure the all-important maintenance of disease free fish stock, and a hatchery to supply fry to the research and demonstration components.

Hawaii's island geography and the physical limitations of the core research facility dictate the establishment of the essential satellite demonstration, quarantine and hatchery facilities on neighboring islands. There would be no question about building these integral components if the core research site could accommodate them properly. However, with no further appropriation and with the support of the Agriculture Department for the satellite components, all of this can still be accomplished in Hawaii. I would hope that my colleagues, Chairman COCHRAN and Senator BUMPERS, could support this vision of Hawaii's Center for Applied Aquaculture, which will not only provide for a total package of groundbreaking aquaculture technology that can be demonstrated at a level to make it viable for private commercial investment, but will also give the Federal Government the highest and best use of its investment over the last 8 years.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with my colleague from Hawaii and recommend that the Department favorably consider the Center for Applied Aquaculture's plans to establish a complete

aquaculture research and precommercialization facility in Hawaii.

Mr. BUMPERS. I would like to associate myself with Senator COCHRAN's comments on this matter and urge the Department to respond positively to the Center for Applied Aquaculture's proposal for a core aquaculture technology development facility together with integral satellite facilities to demonstrate those technologies for the benefit of U.S. aquaculture industry.

Mr. INOUE. I very much appreciate my colleagues' interest and support for enhancing the U.S. aquaculture industry by developing, testing, and transferring science-based technology to the commercial aquaculture sector.

HORTICULTURAL AND WATER MANAGEMENT RESEARCH LABORATORY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would like to ask the ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies about a facility important to U.S. agricultural research and the State of California. The President's budget request included \$22 million for construction of a Horticultural and Water Management Research Laboratory at Palier, CA. This facility will be operated by the Agricultural Research Service [ARS], the research arm of the Department of Agriculture.

This facility will contribute greatly to solutions for many of the problems facing our farmers and others reliant on proper management of our natural resources. The facility will conduct critically important research on water management, postharvest quality, insect control and quarantine operations. All these functions are becoming increasingly important as we all try to balance the needs of water users, environmental protection, and the maintenance of a safe and abundant food supply. Currently, this research is housed in inadequate and inappropriate space, with many researchers using parked trailers as office and laboratory facilities. I agree with the President that this facility must be completed as soon as possible in order to upgrade our Nation's research capabilities and continue to make our farmers competitive in growing world markets.

I would like to know if the Senator can share with me the views of the conferees of the pending appropriations bill regarding this important project.

Mr. BUMPERS. I would like to respond to the Senator from California by stating that I and the other conferees are very aware of this budget item and agree that construction should commence at the earliest possible date.

I am happy to report that the Senate bill included \$11 million for this facility. I wish we could have provided the full amount requested by the Senator from California, but our allocation, being severely reduced from the previous year, prevented us from meeting her full request. Unfortunately, the

House provided no funding for this project.

As the Senator knows, once construction begins, any delays in project completion eventually result in greater cost. There were a number of ARS facility projects nearing completion that could be completed in fiscal year 1997. Accordingly, the conferees decided to complete those projects before allocating funds for new facilities in order to better manage our limited resources.

There was discussion about the merits of the Palier laboratory during House and Senate conference negotiations. It is intended that by completing ongoing projects, which will be no longer the subject of future appropriations, we will be able to provide higher levels of funding for other priority needs. If we can provide full funding for the Palier facility next year, it will serve the double benefits of assisting the U.S. agricultural industry and helping us use our fiscal resources more efficiently.

Although it is impossible now to know what our allocation will be for fiscal year 1998, it is clear that if provided adequate resources, it would be to everyone's advantage to provide full funding for the Palier laboratory in the fiscal year 1998 appropriations bill.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator for his explanation and I look forward to working with him again next year on this important project.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senate is considering the conference report accompanying H.R. 3603, the agriculture, rural development and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997.

The conference agreement provides \$52.3 billion in new budget authority [BA] and \$44.9 billion in new outlays to fund most of the programs of the Department of Agriculture and other related agencies. All of the funding in this bill is for nondefense purposes.

When outlays from prior-year appropriations and other adjustments are taken into account, the final bill totals \$55.3 billion in BA and \$54.2 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1997. Including mandatory savings, the subcommittee is \$158 million in BA and \$71 million in outlays below its 602(b) allocation.

The final conference agreement includes legislative changes in mandatory programs totaling \$505 million and \$484 million in outlays. The savings from these provisions are then used to pay for discretionary spending in the bill.

The majority of these mandatory savings come from provisions limiting the standard deduction under the Food Stamp Program. CBO scores these savings at \$345 million in both BA and outlays for fiscal year 1997.

The Senate will soon take up the conference report on the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996—the long-awaited welfare reform bill—that has gained bipartisan support and a commitment from the President to sign this bill into law.

This historic measure includes identical savings from freezing the food stamp standard deduction. By counting these savings in both bills, which are expected to be signed by the President, we give up additional deficit reduction by the amount of the duplicate mandatory savings.

These mandatory savings assist the subcommittee in completing the appropriations bill well within its current 602(b) allocation. For discretionary spending, the final bill is \$991 million in BA and \$774 million in outlays below the President's budget request. The final bill is \$159 million in BA above the House-passed bill, and \$9 million in outlays below the House-passed bill. The conference agreement is \$884 million in BA and \$694 million in outlays below the 1996 level.

I am pleased that the conferees retained the language I requested requiring competitive bidding for WIC infant formula. This provision will ensure that in these times of tight budgets we maximize the benefits we get from the dollars we spend on this important program.

It is estimated that up to one quarter of the WIC caseload—1.5 million children and pregnant women—is served as a result of the \$1 billion in savings generated from competitive bidding for infant formula.

I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman for including this provision in the bill and retaining the language in conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Senate Budget Committee scoring of the final bill be printed in the RECORD.

AGRICULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE: SPENDING TOTALS—
CONFERENCE REPORT
(Fiscal year 1997, dollars in millions)

	Budget authority	Outlays
Nondefense discretionary:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed		\$3,853
H.R. 3603, conference report	\$12,960	9,487
Scorekeeping adjustment		
Subtotal nondefense discretionary	12,960	13,340
Mandatory:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	497	3,533
H.R. 3603, conference report	39,385	35,435
Adjustment to conform mandatory programs with Budget		
Resolution assumptions	2,418	1,845
Subtotal mandatory	42,300	40,813
Adjusted bill total	55,260	54,153
Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary		
Nondefense discretionary	13,118	13,411
Violent crime reduction trust fund		
Mandatory	42,300	40,813
Total allocation	55,418	54,224
Adjusted bill total compared to Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary		
Nondefense discretionary	-158	-71
Violent crime reduction trust fund		
Mandatory		
Total allocation	-158	-71

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions. Prepared by SBC Majority Staff, July 31, 1996, 06:50 p.m.

MEDGUIDE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I want to engage the Senator from Mississippi, Senator COCHRAN, the chairman of the

Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, about his understanding of the provision included in the conference report of the fiscal year 1997 Agriculture appropriations bill relating to the FDA's proposed medguide regulation.

Am I correct in saying that the conferees retained the language in the conference report that was adopted by the full Senate last week?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, Senator. This conference report retains the language, as adopted by the Senate, that prevents further finalization or implementation of the medguide regulation.

Mr. COATS. At this point, I would like to make sure I understand that this provision does not preclude the FDA from using its existing authority to require, on a drug-by-drug basis, the provision of written information prepared by the manufacturer to consumers about prescription drugs that pose a serious risk.

We have been informed by the FDA that it will only be required to use its existing authority to require patient information for a very limited number of products.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is the committee's understanding, as well. The committee believes that the FDA's current authority to require written patient information is essential for certain prescription drugs, on a drug-by-drug basis, in cases where they pose a serious risk to the patient if used inappropriately.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Chairman for clarifying this and appreciate his leadership and assistance in helping us craft a compromise that is acceptable to the committee and to the FDA.

MEDICATION GUIDES

Mr. KENNEDY. The provision we are enacting on medication guides places certain limitations on the FDA regarding its pending medication guide regulation as it pertains to voluntary information provided by pharmacists. However, as you know, there was another part of the pending FDA regulation that was not intended to be affected by this provision. That was the FDA's intention to require FDA-approved patient leaflets for drugs that pose a serious and significant public health risk. Those would be drugs that cannot be used appropriately without specific written information provided to the patient. Although the instances in which such leaflets would be required would be very small—no more than three or four per year—it is critical that FDA have the flexibility to use regulations to ensure that these drugs can be safely used, as was specifically provided for in the House language of H.R. 3603 as well as in the Senate report accompanying H.R. 3603 which stated "this provision is not to be construed as prohibiting the FDA from using its existing authority or regulatory authority to require as part of the manufacturers' approved product labeling the dispensing of written information inserts to consumers on a case-by-case basis

with select prescription drugs to meet certain patient safety requirements."

Mr. BUMPERS. Your understanding is correct. As we noted in the Senate report accompanying H.R. 3603 at the time, the provision covering the voluntary medication leaflet program was not to be construed as applying in any way to the FDA's use of its existing authority to require patient leaflets for drugs that can cause severe birth defects, have serious adverse reactions when used with other drugs, and similar instances that pose a serious and significant public health risk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of yesterday, the 31st of July, 1996, the Senate having received the conference report on H.R. 3603, the agriculture appropriations bill, the conference report is agreed to, and the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

The conference report was agreed to.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK OPPORTUNITY RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, at the request of the minority, they desire one block of time, instead of rotation, between 12 and 1. I checked with our side. We are willing to do that provided that, for instance, they go from 12 to 1 and then from 1:15 to 2:15 we have a block of time. We assume that while this is the welfare bill that the minority intends to speak on a related subject—the economy and the current economic news. And we would like from 1:15 to 2:15 to speak to that same subject. I will control that 1 hour and be here myself with other Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that we proceed now to Senator BOND, 10 minutes; Senator KOHL, 3 minutes; if Senator HUTCHISON arrives, she takes 7; if not, we rotate and have a Democrat; then at the hour of 12 o'clock the Democrats have 1 hour under the control of whomever they designate for discussion on the floor of the Senate; and, then at 1:15 the Republicans have 1 hour until 2:15. That means there are 15 minutes in between. Let us just say we will fill that in with Senators who desire to speak. I propose that as a consent request.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

I begin by expressing my sincere thanks and appreciation to the managers of the bill, particularly to my good friend, the Budget Committee chairman, the Senator from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI. The fact that

we have this measure before us today reflects not only all the practice we have had in passing welfare bills but reflects the great skill, the compassion, and the wisdom that he has exercised throughout this process. I think all of us are deeply indebted to the tremendous skill he has shown in keeping us on track to bring us to this day.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BOND. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask whatever time I use be added to his time.

Does the Senator recall the hours spent in the Budget Committee putting together the first balanced budget resolution in 30 years, and then the floor debate which lasted for the entire time allowed, and then all of the amendments at the end? We did them all with 1 minute intervening, and then a reconciliation bill. We did all that was required to get a balanced budget.

Mr. BOND. I recall it as it if were yesterday.

Mr. DOMENICI. I also managed them both, and I spent more hours on the floor of the Senate and more votes occurred than any period in modern history of the Senate. I might say from time to time—you would agree, would you not—that we had thought perhaps that work was all in vain, at least for this year, but, as a matter of fact, in only a year, we have welfare reform doing away with the 60 years when people have been imprisoned by this system. It was all worthwhile.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I say that I well remember that. It only heightened my admiration for the Senator from New Mexico. It was a wonderful experience which I hope not to have to go through again but it was only because of his skill, good humor, wisdom, and kind judgment that we were able to accomplish that work. And it is truly a credit to his ability and his leadership.

Mr. President, today the Senate will take another historic step in trying to curb the size of Government and provide for new approaches to help families in poverty. I am enthusiastic about this welfare reform legislation which we will pass today because it will basically take control from the impersonal inefficient Washington welfare bureaucracies and the dead hand of Congress and return that to State and local governments who are closer to the people, giving them the freedom to implement new ways to fight poverty.

There can be no doubt that the current system is a failure. That should be the one thing that is agreed upon by Republicans, Democrats, liberals, conservatives, and anyone else who is concerned about their fellow man today. It is cruel to adults who are treated like numbers when they need public assistance. It is even crueler to the children because it encourages a lifetime of dependency and they are raised in an atmosphere without hope. The current system discourages work but it encourages illegitimacy. The current welfare