have served a lot more people. It has been one of our most successful programs, as I said.

Mr. President, earlier this year, on February 28, 1995, there was an article in the Wall Street Journal. The headline says ''Four Drug Firms Could Gain $1 Billion Under GOP Nutrition-Program Revision.'' What the headline referred to was doing away with the competitive bidding requirement in legislation before the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent this article appear at the end of my statement.

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

(See exhibit No. 1)

Mr. HARKIN. Just to repeat, this amendment is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution stating that whatever we do here we will continue to have competitive bidding in the purchase of infant formula using Federal funds.

I thank the managers of the bill. I thank Senator DOLE for his support and his willingness to accept this amendment.

EXHIBIT

[From the Wall Street Journal, February 28, 1995]

FOUR DRUG FIRMS COULD GAIN $1 BILLION UNDER GOP NUTRITION-PROGRAM REVISION

(By Hilary Stout)

WASHINGTON.—Four pharmaceutical companies stand to gain as much as a billion dollars under a Republican bill that overhauls federal nutrition programs for children and pregnant women.

The companies sell infant formula to the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program, a federal initiative that provides formula as well as milk, beans, rice and other nutritious foods to poor children and to pregnant and breast-feeding women. Since 1989 the companies have been required by law to enter into a competitive bidding process in order to sell formula to WIC, resulting in rebates to the government that are expected to reach $1.1 billion this year.

A bill that cleared the House Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee on a party-line vote last week would turn the WIC program over to states in the form of a ''block grant,'' and with it repeal the cost-containment competitive-bidding measure. An amendment to restore it was defeated by the committee. The legislation now moves to the House floor for consideration.

The four companies, the only domestic makers of infant formula—Ross Laboratories, a unit of Abbott Laboratories; Mead Johnson, a unit of Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.; Wyeth-Ayerst, a unit of American Home Products Corp.; and Carnation Co., a U.S. subsidiary of the Swiss conglomerate Nestle SA—fought the competitive-bidding measure fiercely when it came before Congress in the late 1980s. Until then, they were collecting retail prices for the infant formula they sold to WIC.

Sen. Patrick Leahy of Vermont, the senior Democrat on the Senate Agriculture Committee and the lawmaker who led the effort to enact the cost-containment measures, threatened to fillibuster the bill yesterday if it reaches the Senate. ''It is really obscene,'' Sen. Leahy said. ''The most conservative of people should, if being truthful, like the competitive bidding. . . . It's just rank hypocrisy.''

If the bill reaches the Senate floor, Sen. Leahy continued, ''I've spent 20 years building bipartisan coalitions and working on nutrition programs. If it's necessary to discuss my whole 20 years' worth of experience in real time, I'll do it.''

In 1993, the latest year for which figures are available, the WIC program spent $1.46 billion in infant formula but received $935 million in rebates. That cut the overall cost of providing formula to $525 million, nearly a two-thirds reduction. Moreover, the states, which administer the program, were allowed to use the rebates to add more people to the WIC program.

The action on WIC comes as a liberal-leaning research group, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, released a study questioning the continuing effectiveness of some of the infant-formula rebates. The center's analysis found that in the last year, despite the cost-containment requirements, the cost of infant formula purchased through WIC has almost doubled in many states.

Since last March, the study said, 17 state WIC programs have signed rebate contracts with at least one of the major formula manufacturers. Under those agreements, the average net cost of a 13-ounce can of concentrated infant formula was 60 cents. compared with a 32-cent average price under rebate contracts signed during the previous 15 months, the study said.

The Federal Trade Commission has been investigating the infant formula makers' rebate and pricing practices, and at least one state, Florida, has filed suit against the manufacturers.

Mr. DOLE. We are prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. We are prepared to accept the amendment.

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

The amendment (No. 2680) was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2545

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I will get a unanimous-consent agreement now that it has been cleared on each side.

In the meantime, what is the status of amendment 2545 offered by the Senator from Iowa—the other amendment, numbered 2545?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOLE. I would be prepared to accept that amendment No. 2545 if we vitiate the yeas and nays and have no discussions.

Mr. HARKIN. If the leader will yield, that is very acceptable. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. DOLE. I ask the yeas and nays be vitiated.

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

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2545) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the following amendments be in order tonight, in the following sequence, and that following the conclusion of all debate, the Senate proceed to votes on or in relation to each amendment at 10 a.m., in the order in which they were debated, that there be 10 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form before the first vote and the debate between the remaining stacked votes be limited to 10 minutes equally divided in the usual form, and all votes in the voting sequence after the first vote be limited to the 10 minutes: Wellstone, 2584; Faircloth, 2609; Conrad, 2528; Jeffords, 2581; Dorgan 2535; McCain 2589; Exon 2525; Nickles 2556.

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object, I ask the majority leader if we could add as the next amendment an amendment by Senator DODD, which may or may not be offered? But he would like to be added to the list. Obviously, it will be subject to our ongoing negotiation. But if we could add Senator DODD?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. To the list for tonight?

Mr. DASCHLE. To the list for tonight.

Mr. DOLE. I have no objection to that. That would follow disposition of the Nickles amendment, which is the last one on this list, if we do not have some agreement by then. But I would not be able to enter into a time agreement.

Mr. DASCHLE. That is right, and I do not know that Senator DODD will even be interested in offering the amendment, but it was at his request that we add his name. I think that would satisfy the needs on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader modify the request?

Mr. DOLE. Yes, I modify my request, if in fact the Senator from Connecticut, Senator DODD, wishes to offer an amendment, he be recognized following the disposition of the Nickles amendment No. 2556.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, my view is we are trying to reach an agreement on about four major issues. Hopefully, we will have that determined by the time we complete voting on these tomorrow. If, in fact, we can reach an agreement, I hope all the other amendments would go away, at least nearly every other amendment go away. If we cannot reach agreement, then we would have a cloture vote sometime tomorrow after consultation with the Democratic leader.

It is still my hope to dispose of this bill tomorrow night because we have six appropriations bills to do. We would like to start appropriations bills on

Friday and then complete action on the appropriations bills on the 30th of September. If we can do that, there may be an opportunity for us to have a week's recess.

So I hope all of our colleagues would help us on the appropriations bills. To get to the appropriations bills, we have to finish welfare reform, and we are only going to have one cloture vote. If we do not get cloture, that is it. It will go in the reconciliation and all these amendments that are pending will be pending forever, I guess.

In any event, there will be no more votes tonight and the votes will start at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2584 on behalf of myself and Senator MURRAY.

AMENDMENT NO. 2584

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has called up amendment No. 2584, which is the pending question.

The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

If the Senator will suspend a moment? If those Members who are having discussions in the aisle could please retire to the cloakroom?

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for gaining order in the Chamber.

Mr. President, I will speak for a while and then I really would like to defer to my colleague from Washington, Senator MURRAY. Then I will complete my remarks.

Mr. President, could I have order in the Chamber, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those Members who are still in the aisle, please retire to the cloakroom so the Senator may be heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, last year the Congress made a commitment to fight the epidemic of violence against women and children when we passed the historic Violence Against Women Act. This commitment must not be forgotten as we debate welfare reform. Yet, the bill that we have before us does not contemplate even for 1 minute that many women are on welfare because they have escaped violence in their homes. Some of the studies that have been done show that as many as 60 percent of welfare mothers are women who were battered, women who have left a very dangerous home.

The last thing we want to do is force those women back into those homes. For many of these women, welfare is the only alternative, for some support it is the only alternative, for some public financial support for themselves and their children is the only alternative to a very dangerous home.

Domestic violence is one of the most serious issues our country faces. I wish I did not have to say that on the floor of the Senate, but it is the case. It knows no borders, neither race, gender, geography nor economic status shields someone from domestic violence.

Every 15 seconds a woman is beaten by a husband or a boyfriend every 15 seconds. Over 4,000 women are killed every year by their abuser. Every 6 minutes a woman is forcibly raped. The majority of men who batter women also batter their children. A survey conducted in 1992, Mr. President, found that more than half of battered women stayed with their batterer because they did not feel they could support themselves or their children. We do not want to put women in a situation where they have to stay in an unsafe home where their lives are in jeopardy, where their children's lives are in jeopardy because of a piece of legislation we passed.

Mr. President, this amendment allows an exemption for women who come out of these kinds of homes who have had to deal with this kind of physical violence, and it allows States to exempt people who have been battered—it could be a man; usually it is a woman—or subjected to extreme cruelty from the strict new rules that we have within the welfare system without being penalized for meeting the participation rate.

Mr. President, this amendment allows States to modify or to exempt women from some of the requirements in this bill. Monica Seles, the tennis player who was stabbed took 2 years before she could get back to playing tennis. Just imagine what it would be like for a woman who had been beaten over and over and over and over again and finally left that home with her children. How long does it take her to mend? Do we want to say she has to work or she is out? Two years and she is out? It may take a longer period of time.

This amendment says we ought to establish at the national level some overall standards so that States will exempt from some of the provisions of this piece of legislation women and children who come out of these circumstances.

Mr. President, the term ''battered'' or subjected to ''extreme cruelty'' includes physical acts, sexual abuse, neglect or deprivation of medical care, and extreme mental abuse. But we leave it up to the States to define those terms. But what we are saying is this is an epidemic. We made a commitment last year. We do not want to force a woman and her children because of their economic circumstances back into a brutal situation, back into a home which is not a safe home, but a very dangerous home. We have to provide some protection. That is the reason for this general guideline that we establish at the national level and then allow States to go forward. And it is extremely important that States be allowed to do so. Otherwise, they will be penalized for not reaching their employment goal.

Right now a State has no incentive to exempt a mother who is faced with these kinds of conditions because that State is trying to meet that work participation rate.

This amendment says States ought to be allowed that exemption or modifying it. For example, maybe a mother can meet the 2-year requirement. Maybe she cannot.

It is shocking, I say to my colleagues, because they go into a job training program they have trouble with their abuser. So maybe she cannot do that or maybe she can. Maybe the 5-year requirement does not work. We are talking about women and children who have lived through, if they are lucky enough, to have lived through nightmare circumstances.

So I certainly hope the Senate will have the compassion, and the Senate will have the commitment to women and children to allow this very, very important amendment to pass with this very important exemption.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am very proud to join my colleague from Minnesota, Senator WELLSTONE, in offering this extremely important amendment. And I commend him on his very eloquent statement and appreciate his work on this very difficult and very important issue of battered individuals. He has committed a lot of time and energy to that. I want him to know how much I appreciate that.

We all know that America's poor face many obstacles as they try to get back on their feet and become productive, contributing members of our society. However, the women who have been victims of abuse and the children, frankly, who have witnessed this abuse, or were abused victims themselves, have even more barriers which impede their ability to move on and move up.

I would hope that this Senate steps back from the rhetoric of the past few days and the technical terms that we are using, and think for a few minutes about some of the people that this welfare reform bill is going to very directly affect as we pass it, in particular battered women and children.

These abused women and children have lasting scars that will take many years to heal, and they are often forced to live in fear that their abuser will find them and hurt them once again.

This amendment is important because we must recognize that women on public assistance who were battered confront unique obstacles and circumstances as they make the very difficult move from dependency to self-sufficiency. As we attempt to fix our troubled welfare system and help rebuild America's families, let us not make it harder for these women and their kids to get ahead and put there troubled past behind them.

Domestic violence and the impact that it makes on those who suffer this abuse is a very real and a very serious problem. In my State, a survey of

women on public assistance found that over half reported being physically abused by a spouse or a boyfriend.

Throughout this debate on welfare, I have come to the floor several times to talk about June, who is a welfare recipient in my State, and who is my partner in the Walk-a-Mile Program. That is a program that began in the State of Washington. It has gone across the country. That matches a welfare recipient with an elected legislator. We have talked on the phone. We have shared experiences. I shared mine with her. She has shared hers with me. So that we have gotten to know what it is like to live in each other's shoes. And I will tell you that hearing her story has really enabled me to better understand the everyday challenges of a young mother trying to make it on her own and to take care of two young kids. It has been difficult for June to share some of her stories with me because she was in a very abusive relationship. Her children witnessed their mother being beaten and verbally abused. In fact, June told me her most vivid memory of that time was hearing her frightened 3-year old daughter's pleading voice saying, ''Daddy, are you going to kill my mommy? Please do not kill my mommy.''

That is what this woman came from. And I can tell you as a mother, and as a former preschool teacher, memories like that have an everlasting and dramatic effect on the lives of children who experienced such pain and torment in addition to the emotional trauma that confronts both the woman who suffered abuse and the children who are exposed to it. There are many practical problems which prevent these women from succeeding that we have to consider as we look at this welfare debate.

First, these women who are abused survivors often have problems holding a job.

Second, women who have lived with a batterer often lack skills because their abuser did not allow them to go to work or to attend school.

And third, a woman who has left her abuser often faces the extreme danger of being stalked. And she may not be able to leave her house to go to job training classes or to work. And the same woman who has finally decided that enough is enough may live in fear that her abuser will come after her and to get their children and to take them away. Do we think that this woman is going to be a productive worker? Do we think she is going to leave her kids out of her sight? I can tell you the answer is no. These are difficult problems that these women have to overcome.

This amendment takes those factors into account and offers the flexibility States need to help women who have been abused to successfully improve their lives and that of their children.

We cannot ignore these problems that these women will face, and we have to make some exceptions for them. Believe me, and frankly believe June, my Walk-a-Mile partner. It will be hard enough for these families to make it. But let us not make it impossible.

As Senator WELLSTONE has so eloquently stated, we do not want to force these women back into the home of their abuser because welfare is not available for them.

I urge my colleagues to send the women and children of our Nation the right message: We care about you. We respect you. We want you to succeed.

Please cast your vote in favor of this amendment.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I have much more to say, but I believe my colleague from North Carolina wants to speak now and I will wait and follow or respond to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. I thank the Chair.

I call up my amendment No. 2609, and I ask for its immediate—

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thought my colleague was here to debate my amendment.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. I am sorry. I had an amendment. I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. WELLSTONE. No. I am sorry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

I apologize to my colleague from North Carolina. I thought he was here to debate my amendment, and I did not want to keep him waiting.

Mr. President, let me just read a few examples that I think tell the story. Linda Duane from Edison, NJ.

Linda is a 38-year-old mother of five. Her ex-husband was a police officer. He was abusive toward her. In 1982, the abuse led her and her husband to separate. ''At that time,'' she says, ''domestic violence laws were not set up to protect women; they protected him.'' She was forced to move into her mother's home and she started to receive welfare. She had married right out of high school and never worked outside her home. When her divorce came through she paid back all the welfare payments.

For five years she was alone and on her own, but she did not get any counseling for her previous abuse. She became involved in an even more abusive relationship. She later separated from him but he continued to stalk her. He came to her place of employment and she was subsequently suspended from her job for a week. He hung himself the next week on her porch while her children were inside the house. She lost her job the next day because she was told she needed to receive mental help before she could return to work. She lost her home and ended up in a battered women's shelter and again began to receive benefits. She is currently in transitional housing where she is trying to put her life together. She just finished some college classes and hopes to return to school this fall.

Mr. President, another woman from St. Paul, MN, Fran Stark.

Fran, who I must say is quite a success story, is currently the office manager for TRIO and tutor coordinator for Student Support Services at the University of Minnesota. She married the year after she graduated from high school. But after 16 years of an abusive relationship she divorced her husband. That left her with two children and very few job skills. She went on welfare. She enrolled her son in Head Start and became involved with parent training courses there. She has since enrolled at the University of Minnesota and is almost done with her course work to get her bachelor's degree.

Lisa Yost from Wilmington, DE.

Lisa is a single mother. She has been on welfare since her daughter was born. The father of her child was unemployed and very abusive. After 3 years she could not take it any more. She had him arrested in 1993 and went to a shelter. She went on welfare and started to take her life back. She started school to get her GED. She testified that,

> Without welfare I would not be able to maintain my apartment or provide day care for my child. Food stamps help feed my family and we relied on Medicare while I am attending school. The abuse I suffered lowered my self-esteem which kept me from achieving any goals for myself and my child. Healing took time, counseling and a lot of effort from myself . . . Without the financial assistance of AFDC I would not have been able to get my life back on track.

Mr. President, what this amendment says one more time is let us not have a one size fits all welfare system. Let us at least make some commitment that there will be some compassion built into this piece of legislation.

Again, I say to my colleagues, all you have to do is spend some time with families that have been through this violence.

Monica Seles took 2 years to go back to the tennis court because of what she had to deal with. Imagine what it would be like to be beaten over and over again. How long does it take to heal? What we are saying is that this piece of legislation does not take into account any of these circumstances for women and their children.

What we are saying is that we set at the national level an exemption to the rules. Then we let States decide how to implement this and we make sure that no State, loses sight of this kind of an epidemic that we are faced with in this country and, no State is penalized for making sure that we do not take women who have been receiving some assistance and force them back into violent homes.

If this amendment does not pass, that is precisely what we are doing with this piece of legislation.

Again—and my colleague from Washington did a very fine job of really stating the case—it just takes time. If you

go to visit shelters, many of the women and men that work in the shelters will tell you that over 60 percent of the women who try to find shelters have to be turned away.

You are now on your own. You have been beaten. You suffer from the equivalent of post-traumatic stress syndrome. You are frightened. You are scared. Almost all of your confidence has been beaten out of you or you feel like a failure.

And I again remind my colleagues, every 15 seconds a woman is beaten by a husband or a boyfriend. Over 4,000 women are killed every year by their abuser. Every 6 minutes a woman is forcibly raped and over 60 percent of welfare mothers come from these kinds of abusive situations.

We have to have some exemption. So my amendment specifically says,

> Notwithstanding any other provision of this bill, the applicable administering authority of any specified provision shall exempt from (or modify) the application of such provision to any individual who was battered or subjected to extreme cruelty if the physical, mental, or emotional well-being of the individual would be endangered by the application of such provision.

That is legalese. What we are saying is that a State can establish the criteria of what is abuse or extreme cruelty. But States must not be penalized when they make exceptions for the victims of domestic violence. They do not have to count these victims in their calculation of participation rates.

Mr. President, there was a study of a training program in Chicago that found that 58 percent of its participants were current victims of domestic violence, and an additional 26 percent were past victims.

So what happens, to give an example, when a mother now tries to go into a job training program to move into the work force, but the confidentiality she needs to be safe from her husband is breached, or for her boyfriend who is fiercely possessive and angry because she is now in a job training program. And many women get beaten up because they go into these job training programs. We are going to have to take some kind of an allowance. There has to be some sort of an allowance for these kinds of special circumstances.

Mr. President, do we want to say after 5 years no more assistance and you have got to go back into this kind of home regardless of the circumstances? What happens if a woman cannot find a home? What happens if she cannot go into a job training program, no fault of her own? What happens if her children who were also beaten or who saw their mother beaten over and over and over again and are emotionally scarred and she needs to spend more time at home with those children? What happens, Mr. President, if she has to leave the State to get away from her batterer because she is not safe in that State, which means she has to essentially uproot herself, go to another State, start her life all over again, which makes it much more difficult, we all know, to find a home, to find a job, to get back on your own two feet?

Mr. President, if we were going to say that a young mother under 18 years of age should not automatically assume that she can set up a separate household and receive full support. She should stay with her family. Fine.

But what if she is in an abusive home? What if she herself has been battered? Do we want to force her back into that home? Do we want to say that is the only place she can be?

Mr. President, there are many other examples that I could give. But as we search for solutions that will help women and children escape poverty, we must understand the violence that exists in the lives of many economically vulnerable women and their children. And this whole debate on welfare reform that we have had is just one more glaring example of the lack of awareness, I think on our part, unfortunately, and understanding of domestic violence. The whole community has to be there to support these women and their children. Otherwise, they are not going to have the opportunity to become safe, and then to become strong and independent and healthy families. But the burden cannot just be put on the mother.

It seems to me that this debate is the same old ''it's not my business'' excuse. But it is our business. We must all be involved. Domestic violence is a root cause of violence in our communities, and we must do everything we can to end the cycle of violence. And I will tell you right now, this will not be real welfare reform if it is one-size-fits-all, if we do not at least set some sort of national standard, giving States maximum flexibility to make sure that there is an exemption for women and children who come from such families, or at least some modification.

I say to my colleagues, do not put women and children in a situation where they have no other choice but to go back into a home where their very lives are at risk.

Unfortunately, that is not melodramatic. I know this. I know it from the work that Sheila, my wife, and I do in Minnesota with so many women and children who have been victims of domestic violence. We just lost sight of this.

Last year we passed the Violence Against Women Act. In one short year, has so much changed that we are no longer willing to look at these special concerns and circumstances of the lives of these women and these children?

Mr. President, this is an amendment that deals with the protection of battered individuals. Usually they are women and children; sometimes men. This is an amendment that I think builds into this piece of legislation an extremely important exemption. It is an amendment, if passed, which will be nationally significant because the U.S. Senate will be saying that we understand the magnitude of the problem of domestic violence, of family violence in our Nation, that we understand that in this welfare reform bill there ought to be some sort of allowance set at the national level with States having maximum flexibility so that we do not lose sight of the fact that all too many of these welfare mothers having come from violent homes, having been battered, they may not be able to adhere to all these requirements. And we need to allow for that. We need to have either an exemption or some kind of modification, letting States administer it.

And, Mr. President, if we do not pass this, we are unwittingly going to put many women in a situation where they are going to have to return to that violent home, to that dangerous home, because they have no other alternative. We are cutting them off the welfare. And the welfare was the only alternative they had to that abusive relationship. We cannot go backward in that way.

Mr. President, I do not see anybody here on the floor that seems interested in debating me on this. For tonight, I will take that as a sign of unanimous support. But I leave the floor full of optimism that I will get good bipartisan support for this amendment.

I would yield the floor to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2609

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2609 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, amendment No. 2609 now becomes the pending question before the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I have heard a number of my colleagues remark today that there is no evidence which connects welfare with illegitimacy. And I would say first that not even President Clinton agrees with this. President Clinton believes there is a link between welfare and the collapse of the family.

I ask unanimous consent a list prepared by the Heritage Foundation of 19 recent academic studies on the link between welfare benefits and out-of-wedlock births be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the studies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDIES OF WELFARE AND ILLEGITIMACY

The following is a list of nineteen studies conducted since 1980 on the relationship of welfare to illegitimacy. Fourteen of these studies found a relationship between higher welfare benefits and increased illegitimacy.

1. Bernstam, Mikhail S., ''Malthus and Evolution of the Welfare State: An Essay on the Second Invisible Hand, Parts I and II'', working papers E–88–41, 42, Palo Alto, CA, Hoover Institution, 1988

Research by Mikhail Bernstam of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University shows that childbearing by young unmarried

women may increase by 6 percent in response to a 10 percent increase in monthly welfare benefits; among blacks the increase may be as high as 10 percent.

2. Hill, M. Anne, and O'Neill, June, ''Underclass Behaviors in the United States: Measurement and Analysis of Determinants'', Center for the Study of Business and Government, Baruch College, February 1992

Dr. June O'Neill's research has found that, holding constant a wide range of other variables such as income, parental education, and urban and neighborhood setting, a 50 percent increase in the monthly value of AFDC and Food Stamp benefits led to a 43 percent increase in the number of out-of-wedlock births.

3. Fossett, Mark A., and Kiecolt, K. Jill, ''Mate Availability and Family Structure Among African Americans in U.S. Metropolitan Areas'', Journal of Marriage and Family, Vol. 55, May 1993, pp. 288–302.

This study of black Americans finds that higher welfare benefits lead to lower rates of marriage and higher numbers of children living in single parent homes. In general, an increase in roughly $100 in the average monthly AFDC benefit per recipient child was found to lead to a drop of over 15 percent in births within wedlock among black women aged 20 to 24.

4. Winegarden, C.R., ''AFDC and Illegitimacy Ratios: A Vector-Autoregressive Model'', Applied Economics 20 (1988), pp. 1589–1601.

Research by Dr. C.R. Winegarden of the University of Toledo found that half of the increases in black illegitimacy in recent decades could be attributed to the effects of welfare.

5. Lundberg, Shelly, and Plotnick, Robert D., ''Adolescent Premarital Child Bearing: Do Opportunity Costs Matter?'', discussion paper no. 90–23, Seattle: University of Washington, Institute for Economic Research, 1990.

Research by Shelley Lundberg and Robert D. Plotnick of the University of Washington shows that an increase of roughly $200 per month in welfare benefits per family causes the teenage illegitimate birth rate in a state to increase by 150 percent.

6. Ozawa, Martha N., ''Welfare Policies and Illegitimate Birth Rates Among Adolescents: Analysis of State-by-State Data'', Social Work Research and Abstracts, 14 (1989), pp. 5–11.

Research by Dr. Martha Ozawa of Washington University in St. Louis has found that an increase in AFDC benefit levels of $100 per child per month leads to roughly a 30 percent increase in out-of-wedlock births to women age 19 and under.

7. O'Neill, June, ''Report of Dr. June O'Neill'' (affidavit in lawsuit concerning the New Jersey family cap policy.)

This study using data from a controlled scientific experiment show that the New Jersey ''family cap'' limit on AFDC benefit significantly reduced out-of-wedlock births among mothers on AFDC. The cap was shown to reduce the monthly value of aggregate welfare benefits for an AFDC family by 4 percent and to result in a 19 to 29 percent reduction in the number of illegitimate births to AFDC recipients.

8. An, Chong-Bum, and Haveman, Robert, and Wolfe, Barbara, ''Teen Out-of-Wedlock Births and Welfare Receipt: the Role of Childhood Events and Economic Circumstance'', The Review of Economics and Statistics, May 1993.

This study finds large effects of welfare on illegitimacy. A 20 percent increase in welfare benefit levels across all states would increase the probability of teen out-of-wedlock births by as much as 16 percent. (However, the authors state that these findings should be treated cautiously because they were not proven to be statistically significant.)

9. Murray, Charles, ''Welfare and the Family: The U.S. Experience'', Journal of Labor Economics, Vol. 11, pt. 2, 1993, pp. 224–262.

This study finds positive effect of welfare on illegitimacy.

10. Plotnick, Robert D., ''Welfare and Out-of-Wedlock Childbearing: Evidence from the 1980's'', Journal of Marriage and the Family (August 1990), pp. 735–46.

This study finds positive effect of welfare on illegitimacy.

11. Schultz, Paul T., ''Marital Status and Fertility in the United States'', The Journal of Human Resources, Spring 1994, pp. 637–659.

This study finds higher welfare benefits significantly reduce marriage rates.

12. South, Scott J., and Lloyd Kim M., ''Marriage Markets and Nonmarital Fertility in the United States'' Demography, May 1992, pp. 247–264.

This study finds a positive relationship between welfare and the percentage of births which are out-of-wedlock.

13. Robins, Phillip K and Fronstin, Paul, ''Welfare Benefits and Family Size Decisions of Never-Married Women'', Institute for Research on Poverty: Discussion Paper, DP #1022–93, September 1993.

This study finds that higher welfare benefits lead to more births among never-married women.

14. Jackson, Catherine A. and Klerman, Jacob Alex, ''Welfare, Abortion and Tennage Fertility'', RAND research paper, August 1994.

This study finds higher welfare benefits increase illegitimate births.

STUDIES WHICH FIND NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WELFARE AND ILLEGITIMACY

1. Acs, Gregory, ''The Impact of AFDC on Young Women's Childbearing Decisions'', Institute for Research on Poverty, Discussion Paper #1011–93.

This study finds a small relationship between higher welfare benefits and total births to white women, but no significant relationship between welfare and illegitimate births. The study does, however, show that being raised in a single parent home doubles the probability that a young woman will have a child out-of-wedlock.

2. Duncan, Greg J. and Hoffman, Saul D., ''Welfare Benefits Economic Opportunities and Out-of-Wedlock Births Among Black Tennage Girls'', Demography 27 (1990), pp. 519–35.

This study finds no effect on welfare on illegitimacy.

3. Ellwood, David and Bane, Mary Jo, ''The Impact of AFDC on Family Structure and Living Arrangements'', Harvard University, March, 1984.

This study finds no effect on welfare on illegitimacy.

4. Keefe, David E., ''Governor Reagan, Welfare Reform, and AFDC Fertility'', Social Service Review, June 1983, pp. 235–253.

This study found no link between welfare and illegitimacy.

5. Moffitt, Robert, ''Welfare Effects on Female Headship with Area Effects'' The Journal of Human Resources, Spring 1994, pp. 621–636.

This study does not find that higher welfare benefits lead to higher illegitimacy.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Fourteen of these studies found the relationship between higher welfare benefits and increased illegitimacy. Five studies do not. The most interesting of these is the study by Dr. June O'Neill, Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

This study shows that a 50-percent increase in the monthly value of AFDC and food stamp benefits leads to a 43 percent increase in the number of out-of-wedlock births.

A 50-percent increase in monthly benefits leads to a 43 percent increase in out-of-wedlock births. My pending amendment modifies the provision in the Dole bill which allows welfare funds to be used for cash aid to unmarried teenage mothers. The amendment is designed to disrupt the pattern of out-of-wedlock childbearing that is passing from one generation to the next.

My amendment seeks to stop giving cash aid that rewards multi-generational welfare dependency. I believe the Federal Government should never have been in the business of saying to a 16-year-old girl, ''Have a child out of wedlock and we will mail you a check each month.''

Earlier I offered an amendment which would have prohibited Federal funds to be used for cash aid to unmarried teenage mothers unless a State legislature specifically voted to use Federal funds in that manner.

Under my previous amendment, Federal funds could be used for in-kind benefits or vouchers and State funds could be used for cash. But Federal funds could not be used for cash to teenage mothers unless the legislature of that State so voted to do so.

I think that is a fine amendment. But some people feel that even this is too great a restriction on State flexibility. So I present another amendment which allows Federal cash aid to teenage mothers but only under certain circumstances.

The amendment I am now offering is a modification of the provisions in the Dole bill on giving Federal cash aid to minor mothers.

Let us be clear about what the Dole bill currently does. The bill says you can use Federal funds to give vouchers and in-kind benefits to an unmarried teenage mother, or you can use funds to put the mother in a supervised group home. That is fine, and we all agree. But the Dole bill goes on to say, however, that you can use Federal funds to give cash benefits to unmarried teenage mothers if that teenage mother resides with her parent. If she resides with her parent, she can receive Federal cash benefits.

Let us be very clear what type of household we are putting cash into. In this household, there will be three people: First, the newborn child; second, the unmarried teenage mother of that child; and third, the mother of the teenager, the adult who is the grandmother of the newborn child.

The problem with this scenario is that the adult woman, the mother of the teenager and the grandmother of the new child, the woman upon whom we are counting for adult supervision of the unmarried teenage mother, is very likely to have been or be an unmarried welfare mother herself. It is very likely that this adult mother gave birth to the teenager out of wedlock

some 15 years ago and raised her, at least in part, on welfare. This is the grandmother.

The young teenager, in giving birth out of wedlock, is simply repeating the pattern and model which her mother gave her.

Let me provide the Senate and the public with a few statistics:

A girl who is raised in a single-parent home on welfare is five times more likely to have a child out of wedlock herself than is a girl raised with two parents and receiving no welfare—a girl raised in a single-parent home on welfare is five times more likely than a girl raised in a two-parent family.

Roughly two-thirds of all unwed teenage mothers were raised in broken or single-parent homes—two-thirds of all unwed teenage mothers.

What we have here is a pattern of illegitimacy and a pattern of welfare dependency which passed from one generation to the next. The amendment I am now offering is intended to break up this lethal and growing pattern of multigenerational illegitimacy and multigenerational welfare dependency.

The current amendment follows the same basic rule on teenage mothers as the Dole bill, which says you cannot use Federal funds to give cash aid, a check in the mail, to a teenage mother unless that teenage mother resides with her parents or another adult relative.

My amendment maintains that same basic rule, but adds one limitation. The limitation states that an unmarried teenage mother cannot receive Federal cash aid, a check in the mail, if the parent or adult relative the teenager is living with herself had a child out of wedlock and has recently received aid to families with dependent children. The whole approach here is to break the cycle of children born out of wedlock.

The teenage mother cannot get cash aid, cannot get a check in the mail if she is residing with a parent who herself has had a child out of wedlock and was a welfare mother. The teenager in these circumstances could receive vouchers or federally funded in-kind aid, but she could not get a federally funded check in the mail if she is living with an adult who has had a child out of wedlock and then been a welfare mother herself.

This restriction applies only to Federal funds. A State can use its money to send a check in the mail to anyone it wants. But what we are doing is trying to break the cycle. American communities are being torn apart by multigenerational illegitimacy and multigenerational welfare dependency. In some communities, the out-of-wedlock birth rate is now reaching 80 percent. We need to disrupt this pattern of out-of-wedlock births from one generation to the next.

But instead of disrupting the pattern, the Dole bill reinforces it, even sanctifies it. It pretends the answer to teenage illegitimacy is to have the teenager reside with her mother who, in many cases, was the source of her problem in the first place.

If you vote against this amendment, you are voting to give cash aid to multigenerational welfare households. If you vote against this amendment, you are voting to subsidize and promote multigenerational illegitimacy. If you vote against this amendment, you are voting to continue the very policies that are destroying and ruining lives of young women and children and condoning and promoting multigenerational dependency, illegitimacy, not welfare reform. And what we are here for is to reform welfare.

No society has ever survived the collapse of the family within that society. No nation can survive the death and destruction of its families. Families in America are on the brink of collapse. Let us not push the American family into its grave with this type of welfare program.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition? The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am going to withhold for a moment. I see my friend and colleague from North Dakota with whom I am cosponsoring the next amendment coming onto the floor. It is appropriate that he call up the amendment and begin the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2528

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Connecticut. I call up the Conrad-Lieberman amendment No. 2528.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is now the Conrad amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this amendment promotes a comprehensive strategy to prevent teen pregnancy. If there is one problem I think Senators on both sides of the aisle recognize is right at the center of the problems of this Nation, it is the dramatic increase in teen pregnancy. I have talked to my colleagues before and shown a chart that shows that in 1992 there were more than a half million births to teen mothers, and 71 percent of those births were to unmarried parents. I have also shown my colleagues, in the past, a chart that demonstrates that our Nation's teen birth rate is now more than twice as high as in any other industrialized country.

The Federal Government, we believe, has a responsibility to assist States in developing effective teenage pregnancy prevention strategies, and that will help prevent the cycle of poverty that results.

The Conrad-Lieberman amendment does the following: It provides $300 million, over 7 years, for States to develop adult supervised living arrangements. I call them ''second chance homes.'' They are places where young, unmarried mothers can get the structure and supervision that they need to turn their lives around.

Second, the Conrad-Lieberman amendment retains the requirement added to the Dole bill that teen parents live with their parents or another responsible adult and that they stay in school. There are a lot of things we do not know. But we do know that for a teenage parent to have a chance, it is critically important that they be in an adult-supervised setting and that they stay in school. If there is one thing that is clear, it is that.

Mr. President, the Conrad-Lieberman amendment also establishes a national goal to reduce out-of-wedlock pregnancies to teens by 2 percent a year. It encourages communities to establish their own teenage pregnancy prevention goals. It establishes a national clearinghouse to share what we learned about what works to prevent teenage pregnancy. It establishes a 5 percent set-aside for teen pregnancy prevention strategies to be developed by the States.

Finally, the Conrad-Lieberman amendment calls for the aggressive prosecution of men who have sex with girls under the age of 18.

Mr. President, there is compelling evidence that two things have an enormous impact on long-term welfare dependency: teenage pregnancy and lack of a high school education.

According to the General Accounting Office, in 1992, teen mothers comprised 42 percent of the welfare caseload. We also know that 63 percent of those on welfare for more than 5 years have less than a high school degree.

Mr. President, if you start analyzing the problem of welfare dependency, you have these two factors, and they are very, very clear: teenage pregnancy and lack of a high school education.

If we are really going to reform welfare, we absolutely must confront both of these issues. We must reduce teen pregnancy, and we must require that those teen parents get an education to equip them to care for their children. The Conrad-Lieberman amendment does both.

Mr. President, I want to highlight our provision related to second-chance homes. The second-chance home provision is supported by a significant sector of the religious community, including the U.S. Catholic Conference. Second-chance homes are commonsense responses to the teen pregnancy crisis.

I want to acknowledge the tremendous work of the Progressive Policy Institute, and specifically Kathleen Sylvester, in developing this recommendation. Second-chance houses are innovative, adult-supervised living arrangements that should be available to teens who are unable to live with a parent or other responsible adult. Communities can use second-chance homes to create a structured living environment that provides education and training, early childhood intervention and development, case management, and family counseling.

We have a bipartisan agreement that States should provide adult-supervised living arrangements. The requirement in this bill, however, could unintentionally place teen parents at risk of being forced to live in abusive households.

Mr. President, if we are not going to force young girls with infants of their own to live in households with abusive parents, then we must provide appropriate alternatives to be available.

As currently written, the Republican bill acts as a disincentive to States serving these young girls at all. Why? First, when the authors of the Republican bill added the adult-supervision requirement, they failed to add any funding to make it work. Second, because it costs money to develop structured environments like second-chance homes, States are much more likely to use the very limited funds in the bill for other purposes.

Therefore, the most vulnerable teenage girls with their own children will simply not be served by most States. This is why the U.S. Catholic Conference, Catholic Charities, and the National Council of Churches support my proposal. In fact, last Friday, Catholic Charities sent a letter to every Member of the Senate supporting my approach. Their letter said:

> The first principle in welfare reform must be: ''Do no harm.''

The letter went on to say:

> We support Senator CONRAD's amendment, which not only would require teen mothers to live under adult supervision and continue their education, but it would also provide the resources for second chance homes to make that requirement a reality.

The majority of teenage mothers will live with their parents, with legal guardians, with relatives, or foster parents. In some cases, however, there will be no place for the teen mother and her child to go. That is the reason and that is the purpose for second-chance homes.

Teen mothers are extremely difficult to place in foster care. Most foster families simply do not want them. Go to any foster-care agency and ask them what is the most difficult placement they have. Other than the severely disabled, there is nothing more difficult to place in a foster-care home than a young mother with her own child.

Certainly, none of us want to deny needed aid to a teen mother and her child when no suitable adult is available to look after them. We must provide the means for States and local communities to create structured living environments for these teens. It takes money to develop the kinds of structured settings that will be needed.

The Conrad-Lieberman amendment provides funding for States to develop such settings—these second-chance homes—where teenage mothers can have the attention, the discipline, supervision, and structure that they need in order to have a second chance.

Our Nation simply cannot sustain a system that locks millions of children into a lifetime of poverty because their parents were teenagers when the children were born. Confronting teenage parenthood requires a comprehensive approach, with maximum flexibility for States. That means providing the resources to enable States to prevent teenage pregnancies, including the development of second-chance homes.

During the debate on the Coats amendment earlier today, there was much discussion of the need to capitalize on community resources. Many local institutions and individuals do a remarkable job of instilling positive values in teen mothers and others in need. One of the best examples that I have seen is Covenant House. Covenant House is a Catholic-based charity that provides an excellent model of what second-chance houses can be. When Covenant House takes young mothers under their wing, those mothers seldom experience a second pregnancy until they are ready to provide for that child.

The strategies in the Conrad-Lieberman amendment can provide a significant boost to our national attempt to combat teen pregnancy. I hope our colleagues will support it.

In closing, Mr. President, let me just say that among the most compelling testimony before the Finance Committee was the testimony of Sister Mary Rose McGeady. The sister came before the Finance Committee, and she described to us what they have experienced at Covenant House, taking in hundreds and hundreds of young mothers, unmarried, and their children.

She said over and over, our experience has been if you provide structure, if you provide supervision, if you give these people a vision, that they can lift themselves beyond their current circumstances and have a chance to succeed in life.

If they can make the best of the opportunities that they have, if they see a path through education to make something of their lives, they will not have a second child until they are ready to care for that child.

I wish my colleagues could meet this sister who runs Covenant House, see the sparkle in her eye and see the spring in her step and see the vision that she has of what we can do to really achieve results in combating teen pregnancy.

She has been there. She has been in the trenches. She has fought the fight. She has done it successfully.

We ought to make certain that model is available in every State in this Nation. That would do something serious about combating a problem that I think all of us understand to be one of the critical problems facing this Nation.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from North Dakota for his outstanding statement and for the work that we have done together to fashion this amendment. I am proud to be his cosponsor of it.

Mr. President, there has been considerable talk in this debate about the problem of babies born out of wedlock, particularly babies born out of wedlock to teenage mothers, as well there should be. It has a direct and powerful effect on the welfare caseload.

The fact is that although teenage mothers themselves make up only a small percentage of the welfare caseload today, only 8 percent in 1994, the fact is over half of the mothers on welfare today had their first children when they were teenagers.

The problem of teenage pregnancy is central to the problem of welfare. To state the obvious, but sometimes it is important to do so, this has been constructed as a program of aid for dependent children. More than half of the mothers on welfare have dependent children because they had babies when they were teenagers and there is no father around.

Obviously, we are focusing on this problem of babies being born out of wedlock and babies being born to teenagers out of wedlock because it is a more broadly threatening social catastrophe that is affecting our country.

Take a look at the statistics with regard to prisoners in our jails today and you will find a startling number of them were born to mothers out of wedlock and grew up with no fathers in the house.

In trying in this bill to do something about teenage pregnancy and babies born out of wedlock generally, I think we are trying to do something not only to reform the welfare system but to make ours a safer society, and in the process to save some of these children born to poor teenage mothers, born to a life which in most ways is without hope for the mother and for the child.

Senator CONRAD and I are thinking of fashioning the broadest approach to this problem of teenage pregnancy that will be part of this debate. I hope our colleagues on both sides will look at the details of this proposal and join in trying to create, really, a national crusade against teenage pregnancy.

A national crusade which can be directed by a Federal official which will feature a national clearinghouse so that States and private and philanthropic charitable institutions can share ideas about programs that have to cut the rate of teenage pregnancy. A national campaign which will set national goals and give each State the goal of reducing their teenage pregnancy rate by 2 percent a year. It does not sound like a lot, but today it is skyrocketing in the other direction.

Create a goal of involving 25 percent of the communities in America in teenage pregnancy prevention programs. Then to put some money behind all this to take the existing title 20 program which covers a host of social programs for the poor, and mandate that each State use 5 percent of the money they receive under title 20 for teen pregnancy prevention activities.

It is that critical a problem facing our country. Mr. President, the birth

rate for single teenage parents has tripled since 1960 from 15 to 45 births per 1,000 unmarried girls age 15 to 19.

More than a third of the babies born in America today are born out of wedlock. It is a startling change in sociology in the family and reflects a startling change in values.

We spend a lot of time talking about why it has happened. I will come back to this in a while. Some of it has to do with the messages that the media are sending our kids as they grow up. Some of it clearly has to do with an increasing sense of sexual permissiveness which we see by these stunning numbers is not without its consequences and its victims. Its victims are the poor babies born to poverty with a teenage mother without a father in the House.

What kind of hope can that poor child have to make something decent of his or her life. I think the change in values has had its consequences here.

I fear that the welfare system has all been part of the problem. I do not say it has created the problem. It is much more complicated than that. There is no question in my mind based on reading I have done, based on conversations I have had with young women who have had babies out of wedlock when they were teenagers, that the existence of the welfare system has in some measure facilitated, enabled, made more likely, the birth of babies out of wedlock to teenage girls.

We all pay the price for that consequence. That is why dealing with the problem of teenage pregnancy, dealing with the problem of babies born out of wedlock, has to be a central part of our effort at welfare reform.

Each year about 1 million teenage girls become pregnant and confront the consequence of that pregnancy. About half of those girls have their babies. Half a million babies, roughly 40 percent have abortions, and another 10 percent of those teen mothers miscarry.

Well over 60 percent of the teenage mothers are single. They are not married. For those single mothers who raise their babies, the consequences are obviously grim, particularly if the mother does not have at least a high school education. Of course, many who are below the age of 17 or 18, who have their babies, do not have a high school education.

As William Raspberry, columnist, noted in the Washington Post, children born to parents who had their child born out of wedlock before they finished high school and reached the age of 20 are almost guaranteed a life of poverty. Bearing a child in your teens as a single mother is simply wrong, and our society must give that message to men and women who are responsible for the birth of those babies to single teenage mothers. It is contrary to our values. It is contrary to our interests. It is contrary to the interests of those young women and the children they bear.

Unfortunately, our current welfare policies too often send the opposite message, and that is why they need to be changed. We need to require teenage parents who receive welfare to live at home with their own families or, if that is not appropriate, in adult supervised group homes, some of the Second Chance Homes that Senator CONRAD has described so well, that will be enabled by the amendment that we offer tonight.

In my conversations with young women who gave birth to babies out of wedlock when they were teenagers, and I asked them, ''Why did you do it,'' I must say, first, I was impressed by the overwhelming percentage of these young women I spoke to who said, ''Senator, I love my baby, but I wish I had not had the baby when I was so young.''

I would say, Why did you do it, as you look back at it?

Some said the obvious: ''I did not protect myself when having sex.''

Others said, ''I did it in part because I knew if I had a baby I would be able to go on welfare, and that welfare check would enable me to move out of my house and to become independent.''

Any of us who have raised teenage kids know that they all want to be independent. The idea that these young women would have incorporated a value system, or lack of such, that would lead them to want to have a baby to get the welfare check to move out of their houses, that is a sad commentary on where we are. And that is why it is so critical to require, and send a message, that that is not going to be the way out of the house anymore. If you are a teenage mother and you want welfare, you have to live at home or you have to live in a supervised group home setting, such as the superior Second Chance Homes that Senator CONRAD has described. We ought to require them to stay in school and to take parenting classes. It is no excuse, and it ought not to be an excuse, for young women who have babies to drop out of school.

The amendment that we have proposed tonight builds on this foundation by establishing the national goals that I have talked about and the clearinghouse. Let me briefly discuss these provisions.

I think if we want to make significant progress on this issue, we have to set national goals. That is what Senator CONRAD and I have done in this amendment. We have to be able to measure our progress toward those goals. This amendment establishes that goal, reducing out-of-wedlock teen pregnancy rates by 2 percent a year.

The purpose of the national goal is to galvanize the efforts of the public and private sector to address this problem. As President Clinton said on August 9 when he visited North Carolina, ''Teenage pregnancy is not a problem that we in Government alone can fix.'' How right he was. President Clinton said he is working to get all the leaders of all sectors of our society involved in this fight. I think we, in this welfare reform legislation, can add momentum and support to his effort by establishing clear national goals that both private and public sector organizations can aim at and rally around. We have to put our energy where it is most likely to make a difference in children's lives.

In shaping policies to achieve the goals we are setting out here, I think we have to keep in mind some of the terrible facts about pregnant teenage girls. As Kathleen Sylvester of the Progressive Policy Institute said in a recent Washington Post op-ed, ''Most teenage mothers come from poor, dysfunctional families. Many have been neglected or abused.'' This is the cycle of poverty and dysfunction that continues from generation to generation. Ms. Sylvester reported that as many as two-thirds were victims of rape or sexual abuse at an early age. And, sadly, the abuser was often a member of their household. That is why we are talking about Second Chance Homes tonight. As a consequence, teenage mothers start out extremely vulnerable to the sexual advances of older men.

Mr. President, there was a recent study done by the Alan Guttmacher Institute that produced results that we have discussed here on the floor before, but I found them startling. Bringing together a number of studies, they reported that half of the babies, at least half of the babies born to teenage mothers, were fathered by an adult man. I must say that my vision of this problem was that these children being born to teenage mothers were the result of casual, irresponsible sex with two teenagers. Not so, according to this study—in most cases, in more than half the cases. The younger the mother, according to the study, the greater the age difference between her and the father of the baby.

Among California mothers, in one study of mothers aged 11 to 15—between the ages of 11 to 15—women, young girls, who would carry the baby to birth, 51 percent of them said that the fathers of those babies were adults, were over 18.

There are studies we could go on and on with. But the point is that these are appalling findings, and they cry out to us to try to do something to protect these young women.

When we talked about these statistics a few days ago on the floor, the senior Senator from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, stood and made a point that I found very provocative and also, I think, insightful, which is that, tragically, too often we are dealing here with girls growing up in poor families without a father in the house, and part of what that means is that there is not an older man in the house to protect his daughter from the unwanted advances of another older man, one of the roles—a role so primal that we tend not even to think about it—that the father in an intact family normally will play.

So part of this amendment that Senator CONRAD and I have introduced tries to begin to get at this problem by expressing the sense of the Senate that the States, which are the main enforcers of criminal law in our society, have to look again at laws that we barely ever mention these days that used to be very much a part of our lives and the life of the courts, which is to say laws against statutory rape, to say it is a crime for an adult man to have sex with a woman who is a minor.

Perhaps, again, as part of the sense that consenting people should do whatever they want sexually, the general tone of sexual permissiveness in our society, these laws have either been amended down or out of existence, or if they are in existence, they are rarely enforced today.

I suggest to my colleagues that Senator CONRAD and I include in this appeal to the States raising the question of whether it might not just be one deterrent to an adult man—who, in this case, could well be a sexual predator, an aggressor with a younger woman—to think twice if that man knows that the statutory rape laws are going to be enforced once again in that State.

In trying to put some money behind the general program that we have outlined, I mentioned the use of title XX funds. The amendment would require that 5 percent of the title XX social services block grant be committed by the States to teenage pregnancy prevention programs, and that is not a small sum. That equals $140 million a year to begin to help the States try a multitude of responses to this social disaster that is occurring in our society and that is affecting every one of us, whether we see it or feel it immediately—certainly affecting us in the increasing rate of violent crime among young people.

Mr. President, a second and final word about the idea of a clearinghouse which the amendment would establish at the Department of Health and Human Services.

We are dealing here with a profound, complicated, difficult social problem. There are a lot of ways to go at it—law enforcement, and statutory rape is one. But we need to encourage the widest array of experiments with dealing with this problem at the State level. And the aim there is to then share that program with programs that work with other States and philanthropic and private charitable groups around the country.

The fact is that we are beginning to know something about what works. The Henry Kaiser Foundation several months ago published a monograph that reviewed the effectiveness of 123 sex education curricula programs and their policy implications. Their work was supported by a diverse group of organizations, including the American Enterprise Institute, the Alan Guttmacher Institute, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Population Council. And the study's key findings include the following:

Sex education in school-based health centers do not increase frequency of sexual activity among high school students or reduce the age when they first become sexually active. Some school-based clinics, but not all, actually delayed the age of first sexual activity, and increased contraceptive use resulting in fewer pregnancies.

Programs that are effective focus on three behaviors: One is to protect oneself sexually. The second is abstinence. And the third is how to resist the pressure—peer pressure, or pressure from an individual, a man—to have sex.

To be effective, the school-based sex education programs have to be tailored to the populations they serve.

That was the message of those studies.

Finally, and very critically, the studies concluded that sex education programs should not be value neutral. Those that gave students sexual information and told them to make their own judgments were not effective in changing behavior.

In other words, we have to stop our sense of neutrality, a sense that anything goes in this society, because there are consequences when anything goes, and they are terrible for our society. We have to preach and teach a very clear message. Sexual activity at an early age, activity that results in teenage pregnancy, is simply wrong. It ought not to happen. It is unacceptable. It is a disaster for the mother involved, for the baby involved, and for our society.

That is the kind of information that I believe can be shared through the clearinghouse that would be set up under this amendment.

Mr. President, let me say a final related word, and that is about the role of the media. I think the media has had generally a negative effect on values in our society. And I think they could have an extremely positive effect because their impact on our kids is so powerful.

A growing body of evidence, in my opinion, supports the conclusion that the pervasiveness of sexual messages on television, in the movies, and in music has contributed to the dramatic rise in the number of teenagers having sex, and in turn the rise in teen pregnancies.

Mr. President, I need not belabor this point. But I saw a recent study about the number of sex acts that one can see on an average day watching soap operas, the number of sexual references that one can hear and see in prime time on television, and the number of sexual topics that are discussed, usually not normal behavior, on TV talk shows. I think the cumulative effect of all of that, as Senator MOYNIHAN has said so well, is to define deviancy down to the behavior that was not only not done much in earlier time but certainly not talked about, and hold it up as a kind of standard of normalcy; at worst, something to giggle about. We are paying the price for that. I think it is time that those who put shows on television and who run the networks appreciate it.

The most compelling evidence in this connection is a poll that was taken of children themselves by a group that I believe was called Children Now, a survey of children aged 10 to 16. And when asked the question 62 percent of them said that they believe that what they saw on television encouraged them to have sex earlier than they should have. I hope that those who put those shows on television will begin to think more seriously about the consequences of what they are putting on. It is exactly these concerns that were part of what led Senator CONRAD and I to introduce the amendment on the telecommunications bill that passed with a strong bipartisan support that would call on TV set manufacturers to put in what we call the ''choice chip,'' to let parents choose what their kids will see and that requires TV networks to rate the programs that they put on.

Mr. President, the electronic media have enormous influence, and they could use it for good, and in many cases they have used it for good. One of the best known examples I think is the way the entertainment industry embraced the campaign against drunk drivers through a conscious effort to weave portrayals of designated drivers into a number of TV shows in addition to the outright commercial messages against drunk driving. The entertainment industry and television particularly played a critically important role in helping to reduce the number of alcohol-related fatalities.

There is simply no reason that they could not make a similar commitment on behalf of the campaign against teen pregnancy.

I think another way we can encourage the media to become allies is in the use of direct advertising such as was done in the campaign against drunk driving. And the Maryland State government provides us with an excellent example of the potential that lies in this approach. In 1988 it embarked on what might be called a media blitzkrieg to combat teen pregnancies. The State was saturated with advertisements on television, radio, billboards, buses, as well as videos, brochures, and special lessons that were distributed in schools. More than $7 million was spent on the TV and radio spots alone. In the first 3 years of the campaign, birth rates and abortions dropped. And by 1991 the State reported a 13-percent decrease in teen pregnancies, which in this field is startling, and in this case very encouraging.

The media campaign could not singlehandedly account for those changes. But it is clear to me—and I think most who have looked at this study—that it played a very significant role in that reduction.

Perhaps the best indication of its effectiveness was the fact that in a followup study 94 percent of the students and teachers at five middle schools in Maryland knew about the campaign, and could repeat the campaign slogans verbatim.

So we have a real problem on our hands here, and we are all suffering the consequences of it.

This amendment that Senator CONRAD and I have put forward tonight is a an attempt to put our Nation on the course of an urgent, intense, and comprehensive campaign to cut down the rate of teenage pregnancies.

I thank my colleague from North Dakota for the partnership that we have once again established. It is always a pleasure and an honor to work with Senator CONRAD, particularly, as is normally the case with us, in a good cause.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Vermont, Senator LIEBERMAN, who has been a real leader in the whole challenge of dealing with what is happening with respect to teenage pregnancies.

I, first of all, want to apologize to him. I moved him from Connecticut to Vermont. I was just in Vermont. It is a beautiful place, a wonderful setting, and I am quick to identify Senator LIEBERMAN with places that are pleasant. But in fairness, he belongs in Connecticut. And Connecticut is lucky to have him.

I have enjoyed our partnership on this challenge because I think of teenage pregnancy as really a tragedy for America. It is a tragedy for the children, it is a tragedy for the young women and girls, and it is a tragedy for the entire country.

Mr. President, one in three children being born in America today are born out of wedlock. In some cities in America, two out of three children are being born out of wedlock. Tonight, we are in the Capital City of the United States. In this city, two out of three children born this year are being born out of wedlock.

What chance do they have? What chance do their mothers have? We know, according to the GAO, that 42 percent of the welfare caseload in this country is teenage mothers or girls or women who had babies when they were teenagers. It is central to the problem we face.

I wish to share a couple of vignettes from an example of a second-chance home before I end because I think these vignettes are important. They are real life experiences. This is what is happening to the people about whom we are talking. This is a story about Sherice.

Sherice, now 20, has a 2-year-old daughter and no one to help out. She, too, was trapped early in the cycle of welfare dependency.

Sherice grew up on welfare, and was made responsible for caring for her ten younger siblings by her alcoholic mother. At 17, she dropped out of high school when she became pregnant with her daughter Jamila. She was forced to take her daughter out of the family's overcrowded apartment to live with reluctant relatives. Sherice's options ran out when this living situation also proved inhospitable, and she found herself with no one to turn to and became homeless.

Sherice and Jamila were referred to an American Family Inn in Queens, NY. After obtaining her GED through the on-site high school and completing a 4-month job training apprenticeship in food services, Sherice found a place to live and set out to find a job. With the help of the American Family Inn's employment specialist, Sherice entered the New York Restaurant School with a partial scholarship in order to follow her dream of becoming a chef.

She recently completed her demanding cooking classes and soon will begin an externship in a local catering company. She plans to use the skills she learned to form her own catering company after she graduates in October, 1995.

Mr. President, this is someone who, because of a second-chance home, has her life together, who is a productive member of society because of the structured, supervised setting she was able to experience in a home.

A final vignette.

Elena. Elena is an 18-year-old single mother with a 2-year-old son, Andrew. She has never been married, has never lived independently, and she receives public assistance. She represents a typical mother residing at American Family Inn.

Elena has a fractured and unstable past. She shuffled between her mother and father until age 5, when she was placed in the first of three foster homes due to physical abuse from her mother. At age 14, Elena moved in with her boyfriend and his parents and at age 16, dropped out of high school to give birth to her son. Her relationship with her baby's father deteriorated as he continued and increased his drug use. She left with her son and moved back in with her mother until her stepfather forced her to leave.

Elena had no other choice but to enter the shelter system. Prior to arriving at an American Family Inn in Manhattan, Elena had lived in an emergency assistance center, a short-term shelter and a welfare hotel. The day after she enrolled in the on-site programs, including the alternative high school where she is working toward completing her GED, the licensed day care center where her child is being socialized to the norms of education and the independent living skills workshops where she is learning topics such as parenting, budgeting, nutrition, and family violence prevention.

Elena has also begun intensive job readiness and job training. Each afternoon she fulfills her internship requirement as a teacher's aide in the on-site day care center. She is expected to complete the program in the next several months, move into her own apartment and either find full-time employment or a enroll in a community college to pursue higher education.

This is Elena's statement, and I quote:

> I feel this is a place where I can get my life together. I'm getting my education and learning to work. My mother never cared if I went to school and she never told me about having babies or being a parent. The people here and the programs here are helping me. I'm learning to be a teacher's assistant so that I can go to college and start my own business and get off of public assistance. I needed this chance.

Mr. President, I do not think there is a Member in this Chamber whose heart is so cold that they are not moved by a story like that one—somebody who grew up in an abusive home, had a child at much too early an age, forced into homelessness, and who now, because of a second-chance home, is getting an education, wants to start her own business, wants to get off public assistance and make something of her life.

That is the promise of what we can accomplish by focusing on this critical challenge to America's future. We can make a difference. We can do something that will lead to a different result than a life of poverty and dependence, and we can do it by action tomorrow. That is when the vote will be held.

I urge my colleagues to support the Conrad-Lieberman amendment.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2581

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask to call up amendment 2581 for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment is now the pending question. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am here to try and undo what I think is a very unfortunate area of the bill which attempts to do something which we would all agree with, and that is to reduce the number of illegitimate child births in this country and to hopefully reduce the number of abortions. I think it was one certainly sponsored with all the hopes and dreams of being able to do that. However, I oppose it because I find that it would be most counterproductive and would result in an entitlement being created which would in effect not establish any policy that will really accomplish the goals for which it was conceived. Thus, I have sponsored an amendment to strike the so-called illegitimacy ratio from the welfare bill.

Last night, we heard from Senator DOMENICI and others about how conservative social engineering is no better than liberal social engineering. We all know that Federal strings often do

not produce the desired behavior modification and can even produce unintended negative results. I hope my colleagues will join me in my opposition on those grounds.

Throughout this debate, we have discussed frequently the importance of ending entitlements. It may surprise some of my colleagues to learn that this provision creates a new entitlement and will be funded by the terms ''such sums as necessary.''

Now, CBO has scored the costs at $75 million over the 7 years. I think their estimate may well be very, very conservative. Because of the way I read the provision, I calculate this new entitlement could cost as much as $1.6 billion per year by the year 2000, if all our States reduce their out-of-wedlock birth rates without reporting higher abortion rates.

This gives me pause, especially for reasons I will outline about unreliable statistics.

But let me point out also just to verify that figure, which may seem to be outlandish to start with, the reason for that is that all you have to do is one time go below the 1995 base, and for the rest of the period, providing you do not go back up, you will get this bonus which is in it. And if each State does that, we will have the figure I gave you of about $1.6 billion per year.

The provision entitles States whose proportion of in-State—I emphasize ''in-State''—out-of-wedlock birth rates have decreased without an increase in their State abortion rates to either an additional 5 percent of their block grant if the birth rate has decreased by 1 percent or 10 percent if the birth rate decreases by 2 percent or more. And it only has to do it once providing it stays below the baseline. So if a State's out-of-wedlock births decrease as a proportion of their total births, they can receive as much as 10 percent more than their base cash assistance and child care block grant.

I do not understand why we want to create a new entitlement, especially for States that need the dollars less. In other words, if you have decreased your problem, you end up with more money for perhaps as much as the term of the whole bill, of our period which we are covering here on the budget. We all know that out-of-wedlock birth rates show a strong acceleration with the rate of welfare dependency. If there are more children born to single parents, there will be more need for State and Federal assistance. And that is part of why we are so concerned.

But rather than try to construct, actively work toward, lower out-of-wedlock birthrates, this ratio seems completely backward since it sends more money to States that need it less. And States that for whatever reason experience higher out-of-wedlock birthrates and need it more, they cannot tap into the newly created entitlement.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from Catholic Charities USA in opposition to this illegitimacy ratio. There are some who tried to get this into the pro-life, pro-choice area here. I would just point out—and I will read this letter now into the RECORD because I think it is so helpful in letting everyone know that this is a group which obviously is a pro-life group. This is addressed to Senator DOLE.

Dear Senator DOLE:

Catholic Charities USA is deeply concerned about the proposed illegitimacy ratio bonus being put forward as part of welfare reform legislation in the current Congress. The proposal is another speculative venture being imposed upon the entire country and its poorest families without test, trial, or experiment.

Our fear is that State governments, in a time of drastic funding cuts and escalating human need, will resort to the family cap, teenage mother exclusions, and other drastic measures, all in the illusive hope of garnering additional millions of dollars of funding. (The funding itself will have to be cut from other needed programs or services in our zero-sum budget situation.)

I would emphasize that. There is no provision for the funding in this bill. It will have to come from existing sources otherwise, and it is an entitlement, meaning that it must come. I will continue with the letter.

Those measures, while as yet unproven to cut birth rates, are far more likely to produce increased abortions, as the failed New Jersey family cap experiment already has shown, and to hurt poor children and families. And the proposed illegitimacy ratio bonus contains no penalty for increasing abortion rates in States which experiment with the lives and well-being of their poorest families.

No church community has been as vigorous as our own in support of human life or of sexual abstinence outside of marriage. And no community has as broad experience as our own in Catholic Charities in working with women who are pregnant and unmarried and with their children. We urge you to remove the proposed illegitimacy ratio from the pending legislation in the interest of sound family policy.

Signed by Father Fred Kammer, president of Catholic Charities USA.

I ask unanimous consent that letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

CATHOLIC CHARITIES USA,
Alexandria, VA, September 12, 1995.

Senator ROBERT DOLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: Catholic Charities USA is deeply concerned about the proposed illegitimacy ratio bonus being put forward as part of welfare reform legislation in the current Congress. The proposal is another speculative venture being imposed upon the entire country and its poorest families without test, trial, or experiment.

Our fear is that state governments, in a time of drastic funding cuts and escalating human need, will resort to the family cap, teenage mother exclusions, and other drastic measures, all in the illusive hope of garnering additional millions of dollars of funding. (The funding itself will have to be cut from other needed programs or services in our zero-sum budget situation.) Those measures, while as yet unproven to cut birth rates, are far more likely to produce increased abortions, as the failed New Jersey family cap experiment already has shown, and to hurt poor children and families. And the proposed illegitimacy ratio bonus contains no penalty for increasing abortion rates in states which experiment with the lives and well-being of their poorest families.

No church community has been as vigorous as our own in support of human life or of sexual abstinence outside of marriage. And no community has as broad experience as our own in Catholic Charities in working with women who are pregnant and unmarried and with their children. We urge you to remove the proposed illegitimacy ratio from the pending legislation in the interest of sound family policy.

Sincerely yours,

FR. FRED KAMMER, SJ,
President.

Mr. JEFFORDS. We all know that out-of-wedlock birth rates show a strong correlation with the rate of welfare dependency. If there are more children born to single parents, there will be more need for State and Federal assistance. That is part of why we are so concerned. But rather than try to constructively work toward lower out-of-wedlock birth rates, this ratio seems completely backward.

Mr. President, I also understand, as well as reading the letter from the Catholic Charities, that the Catholic bishops oppose a similar provision in the House. They are concerned, as I am, that rather than effecting positive behavior change by decreasing out-of-wedlock pregnancies, this new entitlement would encourage out-of-wedlock and out-of-State—I emphasize that for your memory later on when we talk about how these things are worked—out-of-State abortions. And I would also add that this may well mean back-room abortions or some of those that we will not be able in any way to take note of in the requirement for statistics here.

Because States do not qualify for the funds by showing an increase in their in-State abortion rates, there are a few ways to influence those numbers. The most obvious is underreporting. According to the Centers for Disease Control, several States currently have inaccurate, incomplete, or even completely estimated abortion rates. I think California is one of those.

So here we are going to establish a baseline which will be used for the length of the bill that will allow States to collect on figures that are totally or may be totally inaccurate. As we might expect, it is difficult to encourage, particularly without a mandate to report, complete reporting of abortions. We will be looking at situations which will already be in being which have had no reporting requirements. That is, that we use a base year of the year 1995, which is almost over with and will be by the time all of this gets into being. So we are setting up a base year here for which we have no reliable statistics whatsoever and using that to determine an entitlement program. Women who receive abortions want to maintain their confidentiality, and abortion providers, particularly in the face of recent violence, may want to

maintain their anonymity. So the current numbers are not accurate. We have no adequate baseline to compare to, and we have no uniform reporting system in place.

If we mandate reporting without providing significant funds for the States to do this, we will be sending an unfunded mandate to the States.

Another way to influence these statistics would be to toughen State requirements for obtaining an abortion. In some States—this is important to remember—in some States as many as 40 percent or more of their in-State abortion rates are from people who reside outside the State. So if you know you are going to maybe get millions or hundreds of millions of dollars here by getting abortions performed across the borders, there is going to be tremendous incentive to accomplish that. Making abortions more difficult to obtain could obviously help to lower the abortion rate. This provision would offer a cash incentive to States for tougher abortion laws possibly resulting in unreported abortions or more abortions out of State or more abortions under improper conditions.

All in all, accurate abortion statistics will be extraordinarily difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. We must struggle with what constitutes an abortion or an induced pregnancy termination. Does the so-called morning-after pill count? What about a routine D & C that may or may not have involved a pregnancy? How will we know if women take a large enough dose of oral contraceptives to induce menstruation? It is an off-label use but expels any pregnancy that may be there and induces menstruation. How are we going to count those? Are we going to require women to report that?

There is currently no standard definition, nor accurate or agreed-upon reporting procedure, especially for what we will have to use as the baseline year.

Currently, States define their terms and define how they report. Some States only report hospital procedures, and public health officials extrapolate the other numbers. In the case of at least one State, the most recent figures available are completely estimated and are not based upon any report. States that currently report high numbers or broadly drawn definitions stand to gain, while States that have been underreporting will have no alternatives but to continue.

We are setting up something here which was well-intentioned I am sure, but is so open to manipulation or intrusion into the personal lives of people that I cannot believe it can be supported by anyone that has examined it, notwithstanding the wonderful intentions.

Mr. President, I believe this new entitlement is illogical and unwieldy. It could potentially cost quite a bit of money, but the criteria for qualification are unclear and difficult to quantify accurately. In this provision, we are attempting the very kind of social engineering that we have railed against and tried to prevent. I hope my colleagues will join me in voting to strike this illegitimacy ratio.

As I said earlier, I know it was well-intentioned, and I would be willing to work with those who are behind it to see if there are other ways that we could reduce teenage pregnancies in particular. I know that from studies that show there are many things that we could do and also enhance our educational system by increasing the school days and more child care, all the kinds of things that can try to bring about the kind of society that does not seem to promote or to enhance the ability for young people to have pregnancies out of wedlock.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor. I do not see anyone present at this time. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise tonight in support of an important element of the Dole welfare reform package. This provision—known as the illegitimacy ratio bonus—will help, I believe, the fight against the chronic problem of illegitimacy without increasing the tragedy of abortion. I urge my colleagues to vote against striking it from the reform package.

We now know, Mr. President, that the dramatic increase in out of wedlock births is a chief cause of welfare dependency and a chief cause of a number of other social pathologies.

Children brought up without the benefit of two parents are six times as likely to be poor and to be poor longer than other children. They are two to three times as likely to have emotional and behavioral problems, more likely to dropout of school, become pregnant as teenagers, abuse drugs, commit crimes, and even commit suicide.

This makes illegitimacy a driving force behind welfare dependency and that is doubly tragic because our welfare system is a significant cause of illegitimacy.

Welfare, as currently constituted, creates a vicious cycle of dependency. Children have babies and turn to the welfare system in a failed attempt to become ''independent.'' Then their babies, in turn, too often end up on welfare.

And illegitimacy has reached epidemic proportions in America. By the end of this decade, 40 percent of all-American births will take place without the benefit of marriage.

Mr. President, I believe we must stop the spread of this epidemic. It is destroying our cities and more importantly, it is destroying far too many lives.

One problem we face in fighting out of wedlock births is that no one here in Washington really knows what constitutes the total solution to the problem. Circumstances in our various States and localities vary too widely for any single one size fits all Washington strategy to succeed in lowering illegitimacy.

Thus, I believe our best course is to encourage the States to implement their own strategies to lower out of wedlock births. This provision, by giving bonuses to States that lower illegitimacy ratios, would do just that.

Mr. President, reducing illegitimacy is just not a function of the welfare system. The States must look beyond welfare reforms; they should pursue educational reforms, tax reforms, such things as enterprise zones and others to create jobs and economic opportunity, things of that sort. They should explore ways to set up counseling centers to encourage, among another things, responsible behavior and discourage out of wedlock births. All of these need to be part of the solution, not just changes in the welfare system. And that is why we think this bonus provision is the right approach, because it will encourage creativity on the part of the States in pursuit of reforms in all of these areas.

Some have expressed concern about the abortion language in this bonus provision. But I just point out the following:

One, this provision does not affect any abortion laws.

Two, it does not take a position, pro or con, on the issue of abortion.

Three, it does not penalize or punish any State in terms of their Federal funding.

Four, it brings about no changes in the requirements as to the reporting of names of individuals having abortions, or anything along that line.

Now, as I have talked to Members of the Senate, both those who are pro-life and pro-choice advocates, I have not found anyone who wants to see the rate of abortions go up. Indeed, pro-choice advocates tell me they want abortions to be safe, legal, and rare. And I believe them. To me, ''rare'' means as many, or fewer, abortions than we have today—not more. Therefore, no one should find this bonus provision objectionable. It is designed to encourage States to experiment with various new strategies to reduce illegitimacy, except the strategy of encouraging more abortions.

I know some think that somehow that would produce new restrictions at the State level and, in some way or another, on abortion. All I can say is this, Mr. President. In this country, the abortion debates have been raised in the State Houses for 20-plus years. If there were going to be restrictions, they would be imposed on the basis of the debates we have already had. I do not believe the potential availability of these bonus dollars—only available if somehow this remarkable increase in

illegitimacy were reduced—would be the final factor in causing a State to take action to change, in any way, or make their abortion laws more restrictive.

In my judgment, this provision gives us a constructive means by which to attack a serious problem. By giving goals to the States, and rewards for meeting those goals, we will encourage them to develop strategies for fighting out of wedlock births. By leaving to the States the formulation of particular rules and programs, we will encourage experimentation in a variety of strategies aimed at addressing a variety of circumstances.

Without increasing abortions, this provision will reduce illegitimacy, and thereby reduce the welfare rolls and increase opportunity for everyone.

I urge my colleagues to vote against striking it from the bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Michigan for his excellent statement, and there is little that I disagree with in what he said.

However, I point out that he has not, in any way, answered any of the questions I raised about how this would work and that the figures I gave were inaccurate. That is, very simply, that if a State, one time, reduces its rates in order to comply with the bill and never does anything more, but holds them where they are, they would be able to get the full 10 percent bonus for the full term of the bill, which could mean as much as—totally, if all the States did it, $1.6 billion a year; and that there is no provision in the bill for that money, other than it is entitlement and therefore it would be taken from other areas in order to fund it. I think that is one area that ought to be remembered.

Secondly, also, the base year—there was no correction in the facts I gave about the fact that there is no accurate data available for the 1995 base year, which would be used for that. Nor was there any contradiction to my statement that by shifting out of wedlock births to other States, or Canada, or wherever else, it would not be possible to reach that ratio with no real decrease in out of wedlock births; nor the fact that there is no definition here for abortion, so that the results of what would happen for a State could well be determined entirely upon abortion definitions, which are nowhere included, and vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

I would like to join my good friend from Michigan in trying to find ways that we could provide workable and appropriate incentives to be able to reduce the out of wedlock births, especially among our young people. But I just urge my colleagues to realize that this one has some serious problems, and I hope they will remove it from the bill with my amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont and I are good friends and are in large agreement on most of this I see, but obviously there are certain things that we do not have full agreement on.

Let me comment on a couple of the points that were made. First and foremost is that before any benefits or bonuses are going to be realized, we really do have to produce something that has not been produced in this country in a long time. That is a decrease in the number of out-of-wedlock births.

Now I think I am probably one of the Members of this Chamber who has voted time after time to make sure we do not spend the taxpayers' money unwisely and have tried very hard here to establish what I think are priorities for spending.

I, too, am concerned whenever we spend money here, even if it is $75 or $80 million here and in a budget of $1.5 trillion.

The reason that I am supporting this so strongly is because I can think of very few spending priorities that we could possibly establish that would be more important to the future of our Nation and would more directly address the problems we confront than the priority of encouraging a nationwide effort to reduce illegitimate births.

I think in the long run there will be more savings than spending because to the extent that we end this problem, we reduce this problem, there will be benefits for many.

Separately, when we set priorities here I do not disagree with the Senator from Vermont when we talk about job training and education and so on. I think this priority is one that Americans across the board agree on ought to be at the top of our list. These dollars only get spent if we succeed in addressing the problem. They do not get spent if we fail.

I think at least in my State most people would say that establishing this type of incentive system is the step in the right direction of trying to bring attention to this problem and trying to give States the kind of encouragement I think they need to change and to adopt a broad set of policies—not just welfare policies but education policies. As I said in my remarks, perhaps changes in tax codes, perhaps inviting private entities to play a greater role in helping teens at risk and so on.

I think this will be the outcome. I hope that our colleagues who have talked, and many, many have talked about the out-of-wedlock birth problem will come to see this.

I do not think anybody has the perfect solution. The reason I so strongly support this one is that it does not dictate to any State what it can or cannot do. If a State does not want to collect the data, if a State does not want to try to deal with the problem, it is not under any mandate to do it. It will not be punished.

If States take up the call, if States join the effort, if States make positive progress, if States actually reduce the rate of illegitimate births, I think a reward of the sort suggested here is a step in a positive way in terms of setting our priorities.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I end by saying that I agree what we should do is have help in the States on ways to change behavior such that we no longer have out-of-wedlock births.

I am afraid what this will do which States are good at, that is, in fact, very innovative in the ability to fiddle with statistics and records and gain billions of dollars. That, the States have always been very, very good at.

AMENDMENT NO. 2625

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Children's Fair Share Amendment, which has been offered by my friend and colleague from Florida, Senator GRAHAM.

As we debate ways to reform our welfare system, we should constantly remind ourselves that what we have before us is more than just words and rhetoric, more than just political points to score, more than just sound bites for the next town meeting. What we have before us in reality, Mr. President, is the quality of life of the children who live in poverty in United States of America.

These children did not make any mistakes, Mr. President. They did not lose a job or miss a house payment or have their marriage crumble around them. By and large, they do not have the capacity to fix the economic problems their families struggle with each day—even if they wanted to and tried.

They were just born poor—or their families became poor. And they are our future, Mr. President.

This amendment is a valuable addition to this debate because it is based on a simple premise which I believe is fair and unassailable. It takes the money we have decided as a nation to spend on poverty programs and it allocates that money to our fifty states based on where poor children actually live.

The only variations from this premise is the inclusion of a small state minimum allocation, and the inclusion of a 50-percent annual transition period.

Otherwise, our Federal dollars go to where poor children live. Funding allocations are updated annually and based on census data reflecting the 3 previous years numbers of children living in poverty.

Mr. President, without this amendment, block grants are frozen in the underlying bill at fiscal year 1994 funding levels. While this advantages high benefit, low growth States, it severely disadvantages low-benefit, high-growth States, like Virginia. I am extremely concerned that the supplemental funding included in the bill, while helpful, will simply not be enough to enable my fast-growing State to responsibly meet the needs of our most vulnerable children.

I served as Governor of Virginia, between January, 1982 and January 1986.

During that time, the Commonwealth increased its AFDC benefit twice—once in 1984 and once in 1985—and it has not increased its AFDC benefit since. Between 1970 and 1994, Virginia's AFDC benefit lost 58 percent in value when adjusted for inflation.

To me, locking in enormous funding disparities between States is bad public policy. It disadvantages poor children in many States, Mr. President, children who deserve a better quality of life, children who should expect to receive one from this Congress.

Mr. President, we can argue welfare reform on ideological grounds. We can argue over how much money we should spend. But Mr. President, when we argue about where that money should go, that is an easy one. It should go to the children.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in opposition to the proposed fair share amendment to change the amount of Federal funds States receive for welfare reform.

I cannot stand here today and vote for a formula that will penalize my State of Maryland in order to reward other States that have been unwilling to help themselves over the past decades.

Our current welfare system says to States that if you are a poor state, we will give you more Federal dollars. We do this through a Federal match. Some States are told that for every dollar you spend, we will give you a dollar. That is what Maryland is told. Other poorer States are told that for every dollar you spend, we will give you two. That may seem unfair, but we have done that because we know some States are less well off. Even under this system, States must still decide just how much they want to spend. Some States, including Maryland, I am proud to say, have placed a high priority on ending poverty.

The amendment before us will take all the Federal dollars we currently spend and give more to States that have a history of little commitment to welfare reform. We do that by taking from States that have made a great effort at ending poverty. This is not an approach that will create welfare reform. Instead we will force States to fight each other for limited resources.

Mr. President, changing the funding formula in a bad bill is a lot like moving around the furniture on the deck of the *Titanic*. We need to do more then that. We need real welfare reform. One step in that direction is to vote this amendment down.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE PARTICIPATION UNDER WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the original Workforce Development Act provisions contained in the bill before us made dramatic changes to the Federal role in job training and vocational education. Initially, I had some serious concerns about the insufficient attention that the bill paid to the importance that community colleges play in the delivery of those services. I had two major concerns. First, that representatives from community colleges should actively participate in the development of the work force education plan. Second, I submitted that the head of the State's community college system should be included as a member of the collaborative process that the Governor must work with while writing the State strategic plan.

Mr. President, today I am pleased to say that due to the cooperation and collaborative efforts of my colleagues on the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, those concerns have been addressed.

Mr. President, I would like to enter into a colloquy with Senator KASSEBAUM to clarify the modifications to the work force training provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, community colleges are one of the major providers of adult job training and postsecondary vocational education in this country. These institutions have close and positive relationships with secondary schools, elected officials, and local business and industry leaders. There are over 1,200 of these institutions, located in every corner of each of our States including over 30 from my home State of Michigan. As you know, these institutions are extremely concerned about their ability to continue to provide high quality education and training services that will be beneficial to the community, in light of the consolidated work force system created by the bill reported out of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

With this in mind, I would like to get a clarification of the role that community colleges will play in the new job training system. I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from Kansas, the chair of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, Senator KASSEBAUM, what role do you envision for these institutions in the new job training system?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. This legislation is clearly intended to provide Federal financial support for the education and training of all segments of the work force in each State. The bill provides States the flexibility to set up structures that best serve their citizens and I expect that States will continue to use the community college as a primary resource, due to their past successes.

Mr. LEVIN. I believe that postsecondary vocational education is a very important aspect for economic growth in our society. Postsecondary vocational programs allow an individual to build on the education he or she received in high school, provide higher level skills, and equip the individual with a foundation for promoting a more constructive future. Because of the advancements of technology, community colleges are a necessary force for training and retraining individuals who could become displaced workers. In Michigan, community colleges are the major educators for high-skilled, high-waged workers. The average annual earnings for an individual with an associate degree is over $5,000 a year higher than that for someone with only a high school diploma.

Because of the importance of postsecondary vocational education, I must ask if this bill will alter the course of postsecondary education? And, if so, how will this bill affect postsecondary vocation education?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. This legislation consolidates programs that have provided support for both secondary and post secondary educational programs. The legislation is designed to expand, improve, and modernize quality vocational education at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. As in current law, however, States will remain free to choose the percentage of funds they will allocate to secondary and postsecondary vocational education.

Mr. LEVIN. The State planning process for the overall strategic plan and the State education plan will guide the State's work force development policy. The major stakeholders should have input into this process. Because of the strong involvement that community colleges have had across the country in providing education and training, community colleges should play a pivotal role in the development of the State work force plan. Is there a role for the community college system in this regard?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. The State work force education plan is to be developed by the elementary and secondary agency of the State. That agency must collaborate with the postsecondary agency of the State, including community colleges. I expect this to be meaningful collaboration, leading to appropriate support for secondary and postsecondary education programs in the State. In addition, State officials responsible for postsecondary education and community colleges are members of the collaborative process the Governor must work with on the State strategic plan.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my colleague from Kansas for her support and attention to this matter.

WELFARE REFORM, LET US TREAD CAREFULLY

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, today, as I stand here in the U.S. Senate, the winds of change swirl around the dome of the Capitol, and surround the body of the House and the Senate. Do not let the winds of change, however, cloud our judgment and prevent us from carrying out our duty to protect life and liberty.

The Republican call to harness these winds of change is refreshing. I agree that there are many issues which need to be addressed. There is a vicious cycle of impoverished parents who raise children in poverty. Those children who do not have adequate access to quality education, which would break the cycle of dependency, continue to spin a wheel of poverty, and

languishing there for the remainder of their lives.

In fiscal year 1994, there were over 5 million families on aid to families with dependent children (AFDC), over 14 million individuals. I ask you how many of those do you surmise were children; 9.5 million children were on AFDC in fiscal year 1994. Two-thirds, two-thirds were children, a truly disturbing number. You will hear these numbers again and again as we debate welfare reform. I reference these figures to impress upon your conscience that we are dealing with individual people and not numbers. We must understand the links of poverty in order to understand and break the chains of poverty. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, you are below the poverty line when income falls below three times the cost of an inexpensive, yet nutritionally adequate food budget for a nonfarm family. For a family of three in 1994 the figure was $12,320. How many of us could provide decent clothing, food and shelter for ourself and two children for $12,320?

We need welfare reform, but we first need to address the root problems of poverty; lack of education, lack of affordable and adequate child care, and access to upward social and economic mobility and stability. A successful society allows its citizens the opportunity to educate themselves, to increase their opportunities and knowledge. It is of no benefit to society to remove welfare recipients and place them into jobs with no upward mobility. Without the prospects of advancement they can only maintain the status quo at best and as history has taught us the cycle possesses a powerful habituation to welfare.

We need to find good jobs for able bodied people in our society. Yes, the United States can assist its poor and offer them a helping hand, but we cannot continue our present pace of entitlement spending. To become competitive with the world market we must educate all in our society. There needs to be interaction between the States and the Federal Government to work in a complementary partnership to solve these problems. Packaging our problems in a nice box and ribbon and passing them onto the States with no accountability and no direction will not make them disappear.

Over these past years in Oregon, the Governor's office, county commissioners, and the Oregon Workforce Quality Council are just a few of the many people who have worked together to enact job training legislation in Oregon, which has been one of the most successful States in the Nation in moving people from welfare dependency to work. Oregon has chosen to link public assistance functions with welfare-to-work services, providing a seamless link amongst the differing human resource agencies. Oregon has made landmark progress with the integration of education, employment and training programs, but the Federal Government also must be a part of restructuring the system. That is why I am pleased to see that my Workflex Partnership Demonstration project has been included in the underlying Dole amendment. This demonstration project allows the Secretaries of Education and Labor to designate up to 6 States in which Federal authority will actually be transferred to the State so that the States may make waivers of Federal law in the job training and education arena. Given the decline in discretionary dollars in the budget, State and local flexibility which promotes performance over paperwork is an integral ingredient for success. Mr. President, we are making progress in Oregon and I do not wish to be set back in our efforts.

What about the States which are not as progressive as Oregon? How do we ensure they care for their poor? I agree with the underlying performance measures in the Dole amendment which sets Federal standards in the form of performance-based outcomes and provides States guidance not mandates. This will provide an incentive to States to be innovative in their State programs by rewarding them with a performance bonus. There are those who argue that it is perverse to reward those States which reduce the number of people on their welfare roles, but I think it just as perverse to reward those States who do nothing to reduce their welfare roles. In all areas, our Federal system penalizes States that are progressive and reduces them to the standards of the lowest common denominator. Our citizens expect better, they deserve better.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear that I am committed to working with all interested parties in reforming our welfare system. I believe those that can work should work. As chairman of the Appropriations Committee I have directly experienced the struggle we face to allocate funds for our complex array of domestic programs. This discretionary funding pays for the operation of all three branches of the Government. It pays for the roads and bridges of our transportation infrastructure, the loans that go to provide public housing, student loan assistance and small business assistance, our national parks, and many more purposes which have nearly universal support. These funds have been drastically diminishing over the years, while the entitlement programs have grown. These entitlement programs put further pressure on the Appropriations Committee to make difficult funding decisions. While entitlement programs continue to grow, less and less will be available for discretionary programs.

Our commitment to bettering the standard of living for those in poverty must not waiver. The Federal Government should encourage not impede innovation and creativity in the States and private sector. I look forward to working with my colleagues to fashion a bipartisan solution that addresses these goals.

AMENDMENT NO. 2488

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, unfortunately, because of a lack of time yesterday, I was unable to give my entire statement regarding Senator BREAUX's partnership amendment. I feel strongly on this issue and would like to have my entire statement on the importance of maintenance of effort submitted for the record. I know that earlier today, a modification was accepted on this issue. While I strongly preferred adoption of the Breaux amendment, I am glad to see some, meaningful progress on this key point.

Anyone who argues for welfare reform talks a lot about responsibility. This Senator does, too. Welfare should not be a hand-out for people in search of a free lunch and a way to avoid work. Welfare reform should change the rules to turn government help into something that steps in for just as long as it takes to get a job or back into the workforce.

But welfare is also about the responsibility of states and the Federal Government to be honest partners. States and the Federal Government have always shared the responsibility for the poorest families and children who exist everywhere in America. Unfortunately, the bill before the Senate is an invitation to States to back out of their end of that responsibility. When that happens, when States are released from their financial role in welfare, some tragic results may be in sight.

One reason debating welfare reform is so frustrating is that we find ourselves immersed in terms and language that do not exactly roll off the tongue. It is also a topic where it is far too tempting to simplify life, and attempt to divide the country between good people and bad people. But we all know that is not how life works. And we should know and acknowledge on this Senate floor that a welfare reform bill should deal honestly with the realities of America—not just the stereotypes or the examples that do offend all of us.

I say that because this amendment raises an issue that does not leap into a sound-bite. It tries to preserve a concept called ''maintenance of effort'' that is clumsy in wording but very clear when it comes to responsibility for welfare's future. The purpose of this amendment is to continue a genuine division of labor among the states and the Federal Government for poor families and children. It tries to prevent an abdication by State governments from their role in keeping a safety net under children and deserving parents.

A welfare reform bill should free up states from needless bureaucracy and micro managing, no question about it. But welfare reform should not egg on states to back out of their commitment to their poor families and children. This amendment is the answer. It very clearly says to states, ''you keep your end of the bargain, and the Federal Government will keep its end.''

As a former Governor, I sincerely doubt that the Governors who might like the welfare bill before us just the way it is—- which frees them from the obligation they have always had—would ever propose the same deal when they help communities in their States. Matching requirements, cost-sharing, burden-sharing, whatever you want to call it—this is a basic part of making sure that responsibility is spread around for government's functions.

The majority leader introduced some modifications to the Republican welfare package just before the recess, and one involves the claim that he added a ''maintenance-of-effort'' provision. It is very weak, too weak—we can and we must do better.

The majority leader's so-called compromise lasts for exactly 3 years, and asks States to put 75 percent of a portion of their AFDC spending in 1994 back into their future welfare reform system.

In fact, the Dole provision adds up to asking all states to invest $10 billion a year for just the first 3 years, with no basic matching requirements whatsoever for the last 2 years on this bill. This leaves a gaping hole in the state's share if compared to the current arrangement across the country. The result could be that $30 billion disappears from the safety net for families and children.

What is worse is the cleverness attempted in how a state's share is calculated. The Dole bill would allow states to ''count'' State spending on a whole bunch of programs simply mentioned in this bill—states would be able to get credit essentially for their spending on food stamps, SSI, and other programs that help low-income people toward meeting the requirement; that means that money for programs not specifically directed to financing basic welfare for children could easily count towards the so-called ''maintenance of effort.'' Again, this is an invitation to States to back out of keeping up their basic, historical responsibility for children.

Remember, it is the children who are two out of every three people who get basic welfare. It will be the children who will be hurt when states back out of their spending on welfare because Congress passed a bill that invites them to do just that.

Our amendment does not ask States to raise a penny more for welfare. Federal-state partnerships and matching arrangements are common sense—they promote accountability, and they are used to finance Medicaid, highways, clean water efforts, and education programs. And on this topic of welfare, here is a bill that now says Uncle Sam will write the billion dollar checks, but Governors can write all rules. If that means backing out of the States' responsibility for poor families and children, be our guest.

Right now, State revenues represent about 45 percent of the resources spent in America on welfare. If the Federal Government is about to send almost $17 billion a year to States in a block grant with tremendous flexibility, we should ask States to contribute their fair share. This is the way to promote fiscal accountability and responsibility.

Mr. President, we should simply correct this part of the bill with the BREAUX amendment—an amendment that requires States to maintain their historical responsibility for millions of children and families.

The stakes are high and serious. We know that when children are abandoned, the future of the rest of America is dimmed.

In other words, there are real consequences to rejecting this amendment. Without States maintaining this investment, there will not be enough money—not nearly enough—for child care for parents to move to work or for the job placement and training that some parents need to get into real jobs. A few years from now, we will be on this floor wondering how a bill packaged with such bold promises of change and reform resulted in so little—and perhaps we will be here trying to repair the damage of backing the country out of an honest, direct commitment to children.

The Breaux amendment calls for the preservation of a solid, honest Federal-State partnership for the long-term. We must change the welfare system and the rules. We are all ready to be tougher about who gets welfare. That means giving States much greater flexibility. But it is irresponsible to send checks to states accompanied with an invitation to back out of their own commitment to families and children.

Personally, I believe that taxpayers are willing to help feed and shelter the children who are not the ones to blame for their parents' unemployment or poverty. Surveys even show that 71 percent of Americans believe needy families should get benefits as long as they work. Time and time again, it is clear that work and responsibility are what the public cares about. They are not asking us to solve problems with slogans and gimmicks.

Real reform is what we should deliver. Let us be serious about welfare reform, let us be honest, and let us deal in the real world of America. We should make some necessary changes to the Dole bill to ensure that every parent who can work, does. We should keep needy children in our hearts, and keep compassion for them in this bill. And we should preserve the basic idea that states must do their part.

This should be a bipartisan amendment, and it deserves support. This is exactly when and where the political rhetoric should be put aside, and where the bill should be changed to continue into the future a true partnership between states and the Federal Government that will help determine what kind of country we will be.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, since there are no further Senators planning to offer their amendments tonight, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

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

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the skyrocketing Federal debt, now soaring toward $5 trillion, has been fueled for a generation now by bureaucratic hot air—and it is sort of like the weather—everybody talks about it but almost nobody did much about it until immediately after the elections in November 1994.

But when the new 104th Congress convened this past January, the U.S. House of Representatives quickly approved a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. On the Senate side, all but one of the 54 Republicans supported the balanced budget amendment—that was the good news.

The bad news was that only 13 Democrats supported it—which killed hopes for a balanced budget amendment for the time being. Since a two-thirds vote—67 Senators, if all Senator's are present—is necessary to approve a constitutional amendment, the proposed Senate amendment failed by one vote. There will be another vote either this year or in 1996.

Here is today's bad debt boxscore:

As of the close of business Tuesday, September 12, the federal debt—down to the penny—stood at exactly $4,964,465,905,748.40 or $18,845.20 for every man, woman, and child on a per capita basis.

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, earlier this year, Congress overwhelmingly passed the Congressional Accountability Act which was signed into law by the President. The purpose of the act was to clarify that we cannot pass laws applying to the private sector that do not apply to us as well.

After many years of pursuing this legislative initiative, I was pleased with the final outcome of the act.

A concern has been raised that the welfare bill before us today is not clear on the issue of congressional coverage.

If the leader would indulge me, I would like to enter into a colloquy addressing this concern.

Mr. Leader, is it the intent of the legislation in section 453(a) of title 9, the child support enforcement title of the bill, to include Senators and Congressmen in the definition of ''any governmental entity''?

Mr. DOLE. That is correct.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Are committees of the House of Representatives, the Senate, and joint committees included in