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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 712, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 972. DENIAL OF MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL BENEFITS TO NONCUSTODIAL PARENTS WHO ARE DELINQUENT IN PAYING CHILD SUPPORT.

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a non-custodial parent who is more than 2 months delinquent in paying child support shall not be eligible to receive any means-tested Federal benefits.

(b) EXCEPTION.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to an unemployed non-custodial parent who is more then 2 months delinquent in paying child support if such parent—

(A) enters into a schedule of repayment for past due child support with the entity that issued the underlying child support order; and

(B) meets all of the terms of repayment specified in the schedule of repayment as enforced by the appropriate disbursing entity.

(2) 2-YEAR EXCLUSION.—(A) A non-custodial parent who becomes delinquent in child support a second time or any subsequent time shall not be eligible to receive any means-tested Federal benefits for a 2-year period beginning on the date that such parent failed to meet such terms.

(B) At the end of that two-year period, paragraph (A) shall once again apply to that individual.

(c) MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL BENEFITS.—For purposes of this section, the term ''means-tested Federal benefits'' means benefits under any program of assistance, funded in whole or in part, by the Federal Government, for which eligibility for benefits is based on need.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I believe this amendment is quite straightforward. It basically says that, if a noncustodial parent is delinquent on child support payments and gets into arrears extending beyond 2 months, that individual, that deadbeat dad or deadbeat mom, as the case may be, will not be entitled to means-tested Federal benefits.

I think it is very important that we do this. I do not think we should be in the business of giving benefits to people who are neglecting their children. Many families go on welfare because noncustodial parents are not paying their child support.

What we do in this amendment is we give people a second chance. We say if they agree to sign a schedule and commit themselves to the repayment of the arrears and continue the payments on time, then they can get these benefits. But if they fail again, they will have to wait 2 years before they get a chance at those benefits again.

I hope we will have broad support for this amendment.

Only about 18 percent of all cases result in child support collections across this Nation.

And we have to remember we have 9.5 million children counting on AFDC for support. We could really take people out of poverty quickly if the deadbeat parent, be it a mom or a dad—usually it is a dad but sometimes it is a mom—came through with their child support payments.

This amendment is just another way for us to stand up and be counted and say: Look, you are not going to be entitled to get job training, vocational training, food stamps, SSI, housing assistance, and the other means-tested Federal benefits if you are behind on those child support payments. But we are ready to help you. If you will sign a schedule of payments and you live up to that schedule, we will make an exception.

It is interesting to note that America's children are owed more than $34 billion in unpaid child support. Talk about lowering the cost of welfare, collecting unpaid support would be one of the quickest ways to do it. Welfare caseloads could be reduced by one-third if families could rely on even $300 a month, or less, of child support. Mr. President, $300 a month would add up to more than $3,000 a year.

So my amendment would crack down on the deadbeat dads or the deadbeat moms, and basically say you have to pay support or you are not going to get the Federal assistance you would otherwise be entitled to.

So, Mr. President, I do not think I need to continue this dialog with my colleagues. I think at this point I can rest on what I have said. I think the Boxer amendment sends a tough message that we will have little tolerance for people who fail to meet their child support commitments. And we should be tough on these people because they jeopardize the health and well-being of their children by failing to pay support, and they are making the taxpayers pay money that they, in fact, owe to these children. So I rest my case on this amendment. I look forward to its being voted upon.

I ask my friend from Oklahoma and my friend from New York, is it necessary to ask for the yeas and nays at this time, because I certainly would like to have a vote on the amendment?

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I will be happy to respond to my colleague from California. Certainly she has a right to request the yeas and nays. I will support that effort.

I have a couple of comments. I had not seen the amendment. I may well support the thrust of it. Others may as well. We are going to have a couple of rollcall votes in the morning and then have some debate over Senator MOYNIHAN's proposal, have the rollcall vote on his, and we may have several other rollcall votes. It will certainly be the Senator's opportunity, if she wishes to ask for the yeas and nays tomorrow. And that will also give her the opportunity to modify the amendment if it would make it more agreeable and more acceptable. That would be my recommendation. But, certainly, if she wishes to ask for the yeas and nays tonight she has that opportunity.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend for his honest answer. I appreciate it. I will withhold because I do believe this is an excellent amendment and if there are small technical problems I will be happy to work with my friends to straighten them out.

So I will withhold, but I look forward to voting on this as soon as I can and I will be back in the morning to debate that, discuss it, at what time my colleague thinks is appropriate.

Mr. NICKLES. I appreciate my colleague from California doing that.

Mr. President, I know of no other Senators having amendments, and my colleague from New York as well. I suggest the absence of a quorum. It will be my intention that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow morning shortly. But I will withhold for that for the moment. 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. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

HONORING LOWELL C. KRUSE AS RECIPIENT OF THE HOPE AWARD

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, today I would like to congratulate a Missourian who has dedicated his life to helping others. He has spent his entire career in the medical field, not as a doctor, but as someone just as dedicated and just as committed to service. Mr. Kruse is soon to accept the Hope Award, the highest honor bestowed by the Multiple Sclerosis Society. He has served as a hospital administrator, vice president, and president; but throughout, Mr. Kruse has never forgotten those who are less fortunate.

Mr. Kruse was born on February 9, 1944, in the small midwestern town of Lake City, IA. He earned a bachelor's degree in business administration and psychology from Augustana College in Sioux City, SD, and went on to earn his master's degree in hospital administration from the University of Minnesota. Mr. Kruse started his career first as an assistant administrator at the St. Barnabas Hospital in Minneapolis, MN, then became an associate administrator at the Metropolitan Medical Center in Minneapolis where he remained for 7 years serving as the vice president of community operations.

In 1977, Mr. Kruse assumed the responsibilities as president and CEO of the Park Ridge Hospital and Nursing Home in Rochester, NY, and later president and CEO of Upstate Health System, Inc. in Rochester. In 1984, Mr. Kruse returned to his roots in the Midwest, serving as the president and CEO

of Heartland Health System in St. Joseph, MO, for the past 10 years.

While Mr. Kruse has continued to strive for success, he has never turned his back on others in his community. In New York, he was a member of the Greater Rochester Area Citizens League Board, the United Way, and the board of directors of the Rochester Area Career Educational Council. In Missouri, he has served as chairman of the St. Joseph Development Corp., as well as chairman of the St. Joseph Chamber of Commerce, and is currently a fellow at the American College of Health Care Executives. These are just a few of the many contributions Mr. Kruse has made to fulfill his commitment and dedication to the communities in which he has lived.

Mr. Kruse has been the recipient of numerous awards for his devotion to community service. In 1970, he was listed as one the outstanding young men in America. In 1976, Mr. Kruse was awarded a Distinguished Service Award and honored as one of 10 outstanding young Minnesotans. In 1992, Mr. Kruse received the Midland Empire Arthritis Center's William E. Hillyard Jr. Humanitarian Award.

Throughout his career, Mr. Kruse has dedicated his life to helping and inspiring those around him. It is clear from his achievements that he is truly committed to making a difference in the lives of many. Mr. Kruse is a great humanitarian who has given his time graciously, caring for those who have been stricken by life threatening diseases. I am grateful for his service and commend him for his dedication to helping others, not just in Missouri, but across America.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. PELL, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1219. A bill to reform the financing of Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1220. A bill to provide that Members of Congress shall not be paid during Federal Government shutdowns; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 1221. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Legal Services Corporation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. FAIRCLOTH:

S. 1222. A bill to prevent the creation of an international bailout fund within the International Monetary Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ROBB):

S. Res. 167. A resolution congratulating Cal Ripken, Jr. on the occasion of his breaking the Major League Baseball record for the highest total number of consecutive games played; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LOTT:

S. Con. Res. 26. A concurrent resolution to authorize the Newington-Cropsey Foundation to erect on the Capitol Grounds and present to Congress and the people of the United States a monument dedicated to the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. PELL, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1219. A bill to reform the refinancing of Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleagues, Senator FEINGOLD and Senator THOMPSON, to introduce the Senate Campaign Finance Reform Act of 1995. This bill, if enacted, would dramatically change American political campaigns.

This legislation is intended to help restore the public's faith in the Congress and the electoral system; to reaffirm that elections are won and lost in a competition of ideas and character, not fundraising. Toward that end, we hope to level the playing field between challengers and incumbents.

Again, I want to note, this bill is about placing ideas over dollars. While my Democrat cosponsors may disagree, I believe that Republicans won majorities in Congress last year because the American people understood and supported our ideas for changing the American Government, not because we excelled at the money chase. We want to make sure that decisions about who governs America—decisions that are so profound in their consequences for current and future generations of Americans—will be made by voters who have a fair understanding of those consequences.

Campaigns, of course, cost money. This bill recognizes that fact. It does not end campaign spending, but limits it in a manner that forces candidates to rely more on their message than their money.

Mr. President, poll after poll reveals the public's loss of faith in the Congress. One of the reasons this has occurred is that the public believes—rightly or wrongly—that special interests control the political and electoral system. In order to limit the ability of special interests to control the process, and to change the perception that money controls politics, we must enact campaign finance reform.

A recent USA Today-CNN Gallup poll revealed that 83 percent of Americans want campaign finance reform enacted. According to the same poll, the only two issues that the public feels are more important than campaign finance reform are balancing the Federal budget and reforming welfare. To the surprise of many, the poll showed that changing Medicare and cutting taxes has less support than did campaign finance reform.

Mr. President, I would like to outline what the bill does:

Spending Limits and Benefits: Senate campaign spending limits would be based on each State's voting-age population, ranging from a high of over $8 million in a large State like California to a low of $1.5 million in a smaller State like Wyoming. Candidates that voluntarily comply with spending limits would receive:

Free Broadcast Time—Candidates would be entitled to 30 minutes of free broadcast time.

Broadcast Discounts—Broadcasters would be required to sell advertising to a complying candidate at 50 percent of the lowest unit rate.

Reduced Postage Rates—Candidates would be able to send up to two pieces of mail to each voting-age resident at the lowest 3d-class nonprofit bulk rate.

New Variable Contribution Limit—If a candidate's opponent does not agree to the spending limits or exceeds the limits, the complying candidate's individual contribution limit is raised from $1,000 to $2,000 and the complying candidate's spending ceiling is raised by 20 percent.

On the issue of Personal Funds: Complying candidates cannot spend more than $250,000 from their personal funds. Candidates who spend more than that amount are considered in violation of this act and therefore qualify for none of this Act's benefits.

Also candidates are required to raise 60 percent of campaign funds from individuals residing in the candidate's home State.

There is a ban on political action committee contributions. In case a PAC ban is ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, backup limits on PAC contributions are also included. In such an instance, PAC contribution limits would be lowered from $5,000 to the individual contribution limit. Additionally, candidates could receive no more than 20 percent of their contributions from PAC's.

All franked mass mailings banned in year of campaign.