

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] proposes amendments numbered 2297 through 2301, en bloc.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2297

(Purpose: To allow the National Park Service's American Battlefield Protection Program to enter into cooperative agreements)

At the appropriate place, insert: "Notwithstanding other provisions of law, the National Park Service's American Battlefield Protection Program may enter into cooperative agreements, grants, contracts, or other generally accepted means of financial assistance with federal, state, local, and tribal governments; other public entities; educational institutions; and private, non-profit organizations for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, and protecting historic battlefields and associated sites."

AMENDMENT NO. 2298

On page 55, line 13 strike "." and insert "or".

On page 55, line 14 insert the following:

"(3) fail to reach a mutual agreement that addresses the concerns of affected parties within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act."

AMENDMENT NO. 2299

On page 114, line 9, strike \$1,600,000 and insert \$4,000,000.

On page 115, line 1, after "funds" insert the word "generally".

AMENDMENT NO. 2300

On page 103, on line 25 strike "." and insert the following: ", unless the relevant agencies of the Department of Interior and/or Agriculture follow appropriate reprogramming guidelines. Provided further: if no funds are provided for the AmeriCorps program by the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill, then none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for the AmeriCorps program."

AMENDMENT NO. 2301

(Purpose: To require certain Federal agencies to prepare and submit to Congress rankings of the proposals of such agencies for land acquisition)

On page 136, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 330. (a)(1) The head of each agency referred to in paragraph (2) shall submit to the President each year, through the head of the department having jurisdiction over the agency, a land acquisition ranking for the agency concerned for the fiscal year beginning after the date of the submittal of the report.

(2) The heads of agencies referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) The Director of the National Park Service in the case of the National Park Service.

(B) The Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the case of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

(C) The Director of the Bureau of Land Management in the case of the Bureau of Land Management.

(D) The Chief of the Forest Service in the case of the Forest Service.

(3) In this section, the term "land acquisition ranking", in the case of a Federal agency, means a statement of the order of precedence of the land acquisition proposals of the agency, including a statement of the order of precedence of such proposals for each organizational unit of the agency.

(b) The President shall include the land acquisition rankings for a fiscal year that are submitted to the President under subsection (a)(1) in the supporting information submitted to Congress with the budget for that fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

(c)(1) The head of the agency concerned shall determine the order of precedence of land acquisitions proposals under subsection (a)(1) in accordance with criteria that the Secretary of the Department having jurisdiction over the agency shall prescribe.

(2) The criteria prescribed under paragraph (1) shall provide for a determination of the order of precedence of land acquisition proposals through consideration of—

(A) the natural resources located on the land covered by the acquisition proposals;

(B) the degree to which such resources are threatened;

(C) the length of time required for the acquisition of the land;

(D) the extent, if any, to which an increase in the cost of the land covered by the proposals makes timely completion of the acquisition advisable;

(E) the extent of public support for the acquisition of the land; and

(F) such other matters as the Secretary concerned shall prescribe.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the first amendment, No. 2297, is presented on behalf of Senator JEFFORDS from Vermont. It has to do with the National Park Service, American Battlefield Protection Program, the use of cooperative agreements.

The next three amendments are offered on behalf of the other Senator from the State of Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], and myself: One, No. 2298, modifying Lummi Indian language; the second, No. 2299, modifying Columbia Basin Ecosystem Project language; the third, No. 2300, modifying AmeriCorps language modification; and the fifth amendment, No. 2301, is from the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], on land acquisition priority list requirement.

None of these amendments changes the total amounts of appropriations within the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 2297 through 2301) were agreed to, en bloc.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO BILLY J. WILLIAMS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, former Alabama State Representative Billy J. Williams passed away in Bridgeport, AL, on July 20.

He served as a representative in the State legislature from 1967 to 1974. He was also a former Jackson County Commissioner, chairman of the Jackson Economic Development Authority, chairman of the Bridgeport Utilities Board, a member of the Democratic Executive Committee, and a member of the board of directors of Colonial Bank. He was a member of the Rocky Springs Church of Christ, Bridgeport Lodge F and AM, the Scottish Rite, and Alhambra Shrine Temple.

Billy Williams was an outstanding public servant who made many contributions to his community and State over the years. He will be sorely missed by those fortunate enough to have known him. I extend my sincerest condolences to his wife Maurin and their entire family in the wake of this loss.

WELFARE REFORM: COMMON SENSE SOLUTIONS TO THE WELFARE CRISIS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, when the Senate returns from recess, it will begin the process of fundamentally changing our Nation's welfare system. While this is one of the most important things we should do this year, I believe we must acknowledge, as Bill Bennett has said, that most of our problems are cultural, and "cultural problems demand cultural solutions." In other words, the problems that we seek to influence at the margins with governmental programs can only be permanently and effectively dealt with by changing our culture.

After trillions of dollars spent on welfare, it is obvious that Federal dollars alone will not solve the problems. All over this country, people need to be involved on a personal level to make the kinds of changes that will reverse the devastating social trends that have taken hold of so much of our land. We desperately need to overhaul our Nation's welfare system, yes. But, change in Federal policy alone will not resolve the underlying causes of this crisis. It cannot be solved without individual commitment and personal responsibility. Everyone has to be willing to answer to his or her own behavior and decisions.

The challenge is to help those people with no hope to a new life of responsibility, productivity and happiness.

THE INEFFECTIVE, COSTLY FEDERAL WELFARE BUREAUCRACY MUST END

As we work toward effective welfare reform, I believe it would benefit the Senate to first recognize publicly the failure of the current system. We cannot expect different results if we continue to do the same things.

It has become painfully clear that we cannot solve our welfare problems by expanding the bloated and detached Federal bureaucracy or by increasing Federal dollars with entitlement status. Since President Johnson declared his "War on Poverty," the Federal Government, under federally designed programs, has spent more than \$5 trillion on welfare programs. But, during this time, the poverty rate has increased from 14.7 to 15.3 percent.

The average monthly number of children receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) benefits has increased from 3 million in 1965 to over 9 million in 1992. That increase occurred as the total number of children in the United States decreased by 5.5 percent.

This means, at a minimum, the Great Society system has not worked; and, at worst, it has actually contributed to the problem by discouraging work, penalizing marriage, and destroying personal responsibility and, oftentimes, self-worth.

Limited success in reforming welfare has occurred when States and localities have been given the opportunity "to go their own way." Under a State work-based initiative in Wisconsin, for example, individuals have been diverted from ever getting on welfare, and under a local initiative in Riverside, CA, individuals on welfare are staying in jobs permanently. In both Wisconsin and Riverside, welfare rolls have been reduced. Additionally, in Wisconsin, unemployed, non-custodial parents not meeting their child support obligations are required to actively look for work or work in a public or private sector job, or they are faced with jail time.

Since States are designing programs that work and since the Federal Government has clearly failed, the administration and design of most welfare related programs should fall under State and local control. Arizona's efforts at reform are a good example of why reform is needed. Arizona applied in July of last year to implement a new State welfare program, EMPOWER. It is based on work, responsibility, and accountability. It took the Department of Health and Human Services bureaucracy a full year to approve the waiver. What State wants to waste its time and resources preparing a waiver request knowing full well that the Federal Government might put up roadblocks or simply not act on it for years?

That is why block grants to States make sense. By allowing States to design their own programs, decisions will be more localized, and the costs of the Federal bureaucracy will be avoided. I support proposals to block grant AFDC, child care, and job training programs, and perhaps, to block grant additional programs, such as food stamps.

This having been said about block grants, there are two fundamental driving forces behind welfare dependency that require some Federal commitment: nonwork and nonmarriage.

While I am totally skeptical about Government's ability to legislate cultural solutions, I do believe that certain fundamental principles are worth reinforcing. In other words, as long as Federal tax funds are being used, they should be spent in a positive, not a negative way. For example, it is wrong for Federal policy to penalize work and marriage. Instead, work and marriage should be rewarded because they are integral to the fabric of our society.

Nonwork and illegitimacy are key underlying causes of our welfare crisis and, even with the effective elimination of the Federal welfare bureaucracy, they will remain as its legacy if we choose not to address them. Responsibility is integral to a successful life—so Federal tax funds should be given only to those willing to work and willing to raise children responsibly. People will never get out of the dependency cycle if Federal funds reinforce destructive behavior.

WORK

Everybody knows that incentives to work are one integral component of any successful welfare solution.

Let us deal with the facts: To escape poverty and get off welfare, able-bodied individuals must enter and stay in the workforce. As Teddy Roosevelt said, "The first requisite of a good citizen in this Republic of ours is that he shall be able and willing to pull his own weight."

Let us look at another cold, hard fact: The JOBS program that passed as a part of the Family Support Act of 1988 is not moving welfare recipients into work. Less than 10 percent of welfare recipients now participate in the JOBS Program. In fact, the JOBS Program does not require work, but simply participation in a job readiness program.

Once again: the Federal solution has been a failure. States can probably do better. States should be given the flexibility to determine how they will increase the number of welfare recipients engaged in work—and I mean real work. A number of studies, including a study recently released by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC), indicate that getting a welfare recipient into work is more likely than any other factor—more than training or education for example—to result in the recipient leaving welfare for good.

And so, in my view, requiring States to adhere to tough definitions of work and to meet realistic, but tough, work participation rates will help States move toward what should be their primary goal: self-sufficiency among all their citizens.

S. 1120 provides a beginning toward these goals. Under S. 1120, welfare recipients must enter work no later than 2 years after receiving their first welfare payment. By the year 2000, 50 percent of a State's welfare caseload, with no exemptions, will be required to work. I am pleased that an agreement has been reached to add to S. 1120 a re-

quirement that States must lower welfare benefits on a pro rata basis for individuals who fail to show up for required work. I will continue to work for a bill that will bring more individuals into the workforce.

ILLEGITIMACY

Our Nation's illegitimacy rate has increased from 10.7 percent in 1970 to nearly 30 percent in 1991. Eighty-nine percent of children receiving AFDC benefits now live in homes in which no father is present.

As the senior Senator from New York, who has worked on these issues for 30 years, said this week, if we do not do something to reverse this trend we may simply not make it as a society. And, as the senior Senator from Texas and others have said as well, to do anything less than radically change the system that has created this trend would be suicidal for our country. Clearly, the issue of illegitimacy is not a partisan issue, and it is one that demands immediate attention.

We must appreciate the role that the breakdown of the family, that fatherless families, have played in our societal and cultural decline. This is not really even a debatable point. The facts support the devastating reality. According to a 1995 U.S. Census Bureau report, the one-parent family is six times more likely to live in poverty than the two-parent family. And, according to a study conducted in 1990 by June O'Neill—now director of the Congressional Budget Office, a young male is twice as likely to engage in criminal behavior if he is raised without a father.

Robert Lerman of the Urban Institute stated it well in an op-ed in the Washington Post on Monday. He says that even the best set of employment and training programs will still leave children in one-parent families living "near the edge." Mr. Lerman goes on to explain that growing up in a family with only one parent "increases the child's risk of dropping out of school, becoming an unmarried parent and having trouble getting and holding a job." As the op-ed clearly states, the engagement of fathers in parenting is the most important factor in helping people leave the welfare rolls and escape poverty.

I will, therefore, support measures to combat illegitimacy, including an amendment to provide incentives to States for reducing illegitimacy rates. I will also support initiatives to limit increases in cash assistance for mothers having additional children while on welfare. If the rules of welfare are stated clearly to a mom from the beginning, and if allowances are made for noncash essentials like diapers and other items, then I do not believe such a welfare rule is unfair. In the end, if such a rule reduces out-of-wedlock births, it may turn out to be more fair than most other aspects of welfare.

PRIVATE SECTOR SOLUTIONS

Although most State solutions to welfare are more effective than Federal

solutions, no Government program can replace private sector charities and civic contributions. States can do it better than the Federal bureaucracy, but communities and individuals will ultimately have to solve this crisis. For instance, if given \$10,000 to spend on a welfare program of their choice, most Americans would choose to contribute to the local homeless shelter or Salvation Army over some Government welfare program because they know the private sector will be more effective.

During this welfare debate, it is my hope that we can discuss ways to end what John Goodman of the National Center for Policy Analysis has called, the "Federal Government's monopoly on welfare tax dollars." I support the provision of S. 1120 that allows States to contract with private charitable organizations—including religious organizations—to meet the needs of recipients within their State.

I also believe that allowing taxpayers to claim a credit on their Federal tax returns for dollars or hours donated to a qualified charity will give taxpayers the opportunity to decide how their welfare tax dollars are spent and will promote private sector involvement. I will support efforts to establish such a tax credit; I will also support efforts to change sections of the Tax Code that provide disincentives to marriage.

Mr. President, I would ask my friends on both sides of the aisle to recognize the urgency of our task. I respect the intentions of those who disagree with our proposals for more fundamental reform. But the bureaucratic responses to the problem have failed. It is time for something else. The status quo of the past 30 years will no longer suffice. As candidate for President Clinton said, "we must end welfare as we know it."

The most compassionate thing we can do for those on welfare is to get them off of welfare. The measure of our success will not be by how many people we cover, but how few we need to cover. Our current system has the effect of enslaving human beings to lives of dependency. Mr. President, let us end the bureaucratic welfare state; let us create an opportunity society.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? CONSIDER THE ARITHMETIC

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on that November evening in 1972 when I first was elected to the Senate, I made a private commitment that I would never fail to see a young person, or a group of young people, who wanted to see me.

It has proved enormously beneficial to me because I have been inspired by the more than 60,000 young people with whom I have visited during the nearly 23 years I have been in the Senate.

Most of them have been concerned about the enormity of the Federal debt that Congress has run up for the coming generations to pay. These young people and I almost always discuss the

fact that under the U.S. Constitution, no President can spend a dime of Federal money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by both the House and Senate of the United States.

That is why I began making these daily reports to the Senate on February 22, 1992. I wanted to make a matter of daily record of the precise size of the Federal debt which as of yesterday, Monday, August 7, stood at \$4,946,673,660,276.63 or \$18,777.66 for every man, woman, and child in America on a per capita basis.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today as Chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to express my great disappointment that the Senate was unable last week to complete work on S. 908, the State Department Authorization bill. Perhaps "unable" is not quite accurate, Mr. President; "prevented" is closer to the truth. We were prevented from voting on the bill—in fact, prevented even from reaching more than a handful of the ninety or so amendments to it—by the obstinacy of the Democrat minority in the Senate.

I strongly believe that S. 908 is more than just a simple authorization bill; it is a litmus test for our willingness to change, our willingness to heed the mandate we received last November to save money, cut bureaucracy, and make government more responsive to both the taxpayer and the times. S. 908 was the first authorization measure this Congress to reach the floor within required budget targets. Moreover, the bill proposed to reduce dramatically bureaucratic overlap and duplication of effort among several agencies by bringing those agencies and much of their personnel under one roof in the State Department. This reorganization of our foreign policy apparatus, a reorganization supported by five former Secretaries of State, would save over \$3.66 billion over four years.

But despite the savings, despite the streamlining, despite the benefits to the exercise of our foreign policy, the forces arrayed against the bill joined to form an unholy alliance with one objective: stop the legislation. I think this fact was most clearly illustrated by this statement from an A.I.D. internal memo brought to light while the bill was still in its formulative stage:

The strategy is "delay, postpone, obfuscate, derail"—if we derail, we can kill the merger. . . . Official word is we don't care if there is a State authorization this year.

From the very beginning, despite repeated invitations from the Chairman, the administration refused to even meet to discuss the bill or participate in the drafting of it. There was no compromise, no constructive criticism, no alternatives—nothing. Instead, they stonewalled, obstructed, thwarted and delayed. Secretary Christopher, who had earlier championed a plan ex-

tremely similar to that envisioned by S. 908, was muzzled by the White House and suddenly opposed the idea. The only active interest they evinced was to engage in a distortion campaign. They claimed that folding the agencies into State would mean agency programs would be run by State employees with no experience in the fields, while failing to mention the fact that the bill also provided for the large-scale transfer of agency staff to ensure continuity. They labelled supporters of the cost-savings provisions in the bill "isolationists," overlooking the fact that we've asked every other department and agency to tighten its belt. They contacted countless private groups that benefit directly (and monetarily) from AID programs and forecasted doom and gloom in an effort to generate lobbying against the bill. They said the President had an alternative plan far superior to the bill, but never produced one—the first time in my memory that the White House had failed to do so. It became clear that, like much of what this administration says, it is only paying lip service to his pledges to "reinvent government."

When it became clear that the bill was destined to leave the committee and go to the floor, the focus of the administration's efforts shifted to make sure that the Senators in the minority toed the administration line. Two attempts to invoke cloture—not to stop debate but to limit it to a manageable 30 hours—failed along strictly party lines. Only the distinguished ranking minority member, Senator PELL, indicated that getting a final vote, either up or down, was more important than obstructionism. Dozens of amendments materialized, many aimed at nothing less than delay.

Mr. President, I am amazed at how quickly the Democrats have forgotten their own words; how quick they are not to practice what they preach. For example, there was this statement in the last Congress from Senator HARKIN, who voted against cloture on S. 908:

Well, it was obvious that after chewing up about 7 or 10 days of the August break that the Republicans simply were just going to talk it [the bill being debated] to death. They were going to offer amendments, talk on and on, and drag the whole process out and never reach any real, meaningful votes on [the] bill . . . the Republicans say no . . . [w]e will not take the keys that we hold to gridlock and unlock that padlock and open the door. . . .

Madam President, I have served in the Congress now for 20 years. I have seen a lot of fights in the House and in the Senate, some pretty tough ones; I have seen some pretty tough debates and pretty tough issues. . . . But in my 20 years in this Congress I have never seen anything like exists today. This attitude of gridlock, of stopping everything . . . that we have to stop things because perhaps the only way to take over is to tear it down. . . .

No, I have never seen anything like this in 20 years; the sort of the mean spiritedness, the antagonisms, the inability to give either side their proper due and to let legislation move. There is nothing wrong with people to want to amend and change, everyone should