

The stay-the-course plan is piloted by my good friend from Mississippi Senator COCHRAN, who approaches the farm bill with the conviction that our work in 1985 was sound and that we should continue with this course while making changes necessary to balance the budget.

The reduction-in-support strategy was outlined by Chairman LUGAR early in the debate, and combines a reduction in target prices with the call for planting flexibility and elimination of set-asides—two points that are a priority in Kansas and much of the Midwest.

The freedom-to-farm concept is endorsed by my good friend and colleague Representative PAT ROBERTS. In typical Kansas fashion, he has taken the bull by the horns. In the Roberts freedom-to-farm plan, budget balancing is done with a cap on farm spending which guarantees farmers less income support but is coupled with full planting flexibility and regulatory relief.

I urge all Senators to take advantage of the August recess and reconnect with the concerns of rural Americans. Like many of my colleagues, I am still evaluating each of these approaches as well as other policy options. But I realize that we must reach agreement in September. In my view, there are certain guiding principles we must adhere to as we pursue that goal.

First, fiscal responsibility. We must achieve a balanced budget and do it in a manner that is fair and equitable to farmers. We have worked hard to balance the budget. The line-item veto was a first step toward that goal. A balanced budget amendment failed by just one vote. We hope we can pick up that vote in the next several months. In September, we will begin work on a plan to balance the Federal budget over the next 7 years. Farmers around the country remind me that they are taxpayers too. And as taxpayers, farmers want a balanced budget. All they ask is that spending cuts are fair and equitable. Everyone will take his or her fair share, whether it be food stamps or farm programs. And let me add that there will be equity in commodity program spending reductions and policy changes. The AG community will face its fair share of spending reductions as we move to fully implement a balanced budget.

Second, unleash our productive capacity. We must allow farmers to decide what and how much to plant each year. Planting restrictions and idling acreage based on budget mandates instead of supply management must end. Through the new markets and new opportunities opened by GATT and NAFTA, we must be able to meet demand. The farm policy that drives the U.S. into the 21st century should not be based on the supply management concepts of the 1930's. A farmer's business decisions should not be based on Government policy, but instead on market signals, agronomic practices and personal choice.

Third, simplicity. Farm programs and environmental regulations should be simpler and more sensible. They should reflect a basic respect for private property rights and the work ethic of the family farmer. For several years now, as I traveled through Kansas and throughout the country, farmers have been telling me the same thing—keep it simple. All farm programs—and especially all regulations—must be simpler and less intrusive. Our efforts to provide regulatory relief for rural America have been blocked by those on the other side of the aisle. I hope that when my colleagues return to their States in August, they will listen to their constituents' pleas to rein in the Federal Government.

American agriculture does not operate in a vacuum. Rural Americans share the Republican conviction that Congress must balance the budget, and that we must provide tax relief, regulatory relief and health care reform. Rural Americans realize that there are important policies outside the farm bill that greatly affect their bottom lines. Mr. President, we are actively working to provide the needed relief that rural America is asking for. And we will not stop. The reconciliation debate in September will focus national attention on issues vital to rural America. This is our opportunity to make real progress.

When it comes to policy for rural America, I can not help but be reminded of the peanuts cartoon, where Lucy pulls the football away from Charlie Brown at the last minute.

Unfortunately, just like Charlie Brown, the American farmer keeps running at the ball and Congress keeps pulling it away. A workable policy for rural America is not achieved by taunting the American farmer. It is achieved by everyone—agriculture, Congress and USDA—playing together on the same team.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no further morning business, morning business is closed.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. DOLE. I call for regular order with respect to the welfare bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare

spending, and reduce welfare dependence, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2280, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. DOLE. I have a modification at the desk. I have a right to modify my amendment, and I ask that it be so modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

So the amendment (No. 2280), as modified, is as follows:

On page 1, line 3, of the bill, after "SECTION 1.", strike all through the end and insert the following:

SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Work Opportunity Act of 1995".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—BLOCK GRANTS FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES

- Sec. 100. References to Social Security Act.
- Sec. 101. Block grants to States.
- Sec. 102. Services provided by charitable, religious, or private organizations.
- Sec. 103. Limitations on use of funds for certain purposes.
- Sec. 104. Continued application of current standards under medicaid program.
- Sec. 105. Census data on grandparents as primary caregivers for their grandchildren.
- Sec. 106. Conforming amendments to the Social Security Act.
- Sec. 107. Conforming amendments to the Food Stamp Act of 1977 and related provisions.
- Sec. 108. Conforming amendments to other laws.
- Sec. 109. Study of effect of welfare reform on grandparents as primary caregivers.
- Sec. 110. Disclosure of receipt of Federal funds.
- Sec. 111. Secretarial submission of legislative proposal for technical and conforming amendments.
- Sec. 112. Effective date; transition rule.

TITLE II—SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME

Subtitle A—Eligibility Restrictions

- Sec. 201. Denial of supplemental security income benefits by reason of disability to drug addicts and alcoholics.
- Sec. 202. Limited eligibility of noncitizens for SSI benefits.
- Sec. 203. Denial of SSI benefits for 10 years to individuals found to have fraudulently misrepresented residence in order to obtain benefits simultaneously in 2 or more States.
- Sec. 204. Denial of SSI benefits for fugitive felons and probation and parole violators.
- Sec. 205. Effective dates; application to current recipients.

Subtitle B—Benefits for Disabled Children

- Sec. 211. Definition and eligibility rules.
- Sec. 212. Eligibility redeterminations and continuing disability reviews.
- Sec. 213. Additional accountability requirements.

Subtitle C—Studies Regarding Supplemental Security Income Program

- Sec. 221. Annual report on the supplemental security income program.