

State senate, with dedication and devotion, and his constituents returned him to office at every election since he was first elected in 1972. At the time of his death, John had the fourth longest tenure among lawmakers currently serving in the Wisconsin Legislature.

John was a lifelong resident of Milwaukee, graduating from Don Bosco High School in 1963. He earned a bachelor of education degree in 1968 at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, and following that, taught history and social studies at Milwaukee Area Technical College prior to his service in the legislature.

A committed and passionate advocate for Wisconsin's families, John may be best remembered as the father of Wisconsin's family and medical leave law, which allows people to take time off from their job to provide assistance to a family member needing care, from newborns to an elderly relative—a law that helped pave the way for the Federal family leave law that was enacted in 1993.

His commitment to families in need went well beyond the family leave law. John was vice chair of the Senate Aging Committee when I chaired that body, and I saw first-hand his steadfast and effective support of long-term care reforms that help people with disabilities of all ages remain in their own homes with their families.

John was also vitally concerned with housing policy, serving on the board of Wisconsin's Housing and Economic Development Authority for 10 years. I had the pleasure of working with John in this area as well when we coauthored Wisconsin's Housing Trust Fund, to provide flexible help to families in need of decent, affordable housing.

John would have been 50 years old this Friday. But even though he did not live to celebrate that anniversary, he left Wisconsin an impressive legacy.

Today, thousands are able to take time from work to care for a family member without the fear of losing that job. Other families are finally able to afford a decent home. Wisconsin families, who otherwise might be forced apart because of a long-term disability, are able to remain together, and individuals needing long-term care, who otherwise might be forced to seek services in an institution, are able to remain in their homes. All because of John Plewa. Wisconsin families have lost one of their foremost champions, and I know they join in offering their sympathy to the friends and colleagues John leaves behind, to his staff, and most especially to John's wife Susan and their two sons.

We will miss him.

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 Senators 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 Monday, September 18, the Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at exactly \$4,963,468,747,991.22 or \$18,841.41 for every man, woman, and child on a per capita basis.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 9:30, the Senate is to go to the previous order. There is at least one other speaker, possibly two, so could we have a division of time so that everyone will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 4 minutes; I believe the Senator from Connecticut would like to speak for 4 minutes, and the Senator from Wyoming would like to speak for 4 minutes, and have the time adjusted at 9:30 to accommodate this request.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, I was unable to hear the entire consent request. Could the Senator restate it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would extend morning business beyond 9:30.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I am constrained to object to that. We made it very clear last night what the times were. We have Senators who have rearranged schedules to be here.

Mr. DORGAN. I withdraw my request, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would it be possible to give 2 minutes to each of the three speakers?

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I request each of the three be allocated 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I intend to vote for the welfare reform bill

today. It is not a perfect piece of legislation, but it does advance some of the issues that I think need to be advanced and begin some new directions that I think are necessary.

There is no disagreement in this Chamber about the proposition that the current welfare system does not work very well. There ought not be any disagreement in this Chamber either about the fact that when we change our welfare system, we ought to make sure we protect America's children.

There is a stereotype about welfare that is fundamentally inaccurate, that welfare is a woman who has 16 kids because it is profitable to have children; that welfare is some able-bodied person lying in a Lazy Boy recliner drinking beer, watching color television, and who is essentially slothful, indolent, and unwilling to work.

The fact is, that is not the statistical welfare recipient. The size of the average welfare family is almost identical to the size of the average American family.

Two-thirds of the people on welfare are kids under 16 years of age. As we go about trying to figure out how to change the system, we have to understand our obligation to protect children. We also need to provide the right incentives and to provide some hope to those who are hopeless, to extend a hand of help to those who are helpless, but also to say to them that welfare is temporary. We extend the hand of help because you need it, and it is to help you get up and out, to go get a job and be productive and be able to care for yourself.

These are the kinds of incentives we want to be included in this welfare reform bill. We have accomplished some of those goals, some of those goals we have not.

The Senator from Connecticut, who is going to speak for a couple of minutes, put a very important provision in this bill dealing with child care. That is enormously important and will allow a number of us to vote for this legislation. As I said, this bill is not perfect. I am concerned about the notion of block granting money, of wrapping up money and sending it to the States and saying, "By the way, here is some money you didn't collect. Go ahead and spend it."

I am concerned about a number of other things in the bill, but I do think it advances the welfare reform debate as it leaves the Senate. I do not know whether I will vote for it when it comes back from conference. I hope it will come out of conference as a good welfare reform bill, as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I rise in support of the welfare proposal that will be before us today. We have talked about it a very long time. Obviously, there are different views about how it should be implemented but, most of all, it is the first opportunity

we have had in a very long time to make some changes, to make some of the kinds of changes that the American people asked us to make in November and, indeed, have been asking us to make for some time.

It is the first opportunity in a long time to make some of the kinds of changes that most of us have known needed to be made for a long time in the welfare program. Most everyone agrees that we need a program in this country to help people who need help and help them back into the workplace. The program as it now exists has not accomplished that. Indeed, the program we now have has not accomplished the basic things we think it should accomplish.

The provisions of this welfare proposal will allow us to encourage people back to work, to put in some incentives to go back to work, and to deal very properly with the notion of child care, with extending health benefits to single-parent families so that that parent can work.

We have done this in our own Wyoming Legislature. We recognized some time ago that if the option was to take a minimum wage job and lose those benefits, then the better thing to do was stay on welfare. We have to change that. We do have to make some changes if we expect different results, and too often we all talk expansively about change; we want to make change; we are all for change; but when the time comes, we really resist change. We simply cannot expect the results to be different unless we do some changing, and one of the principal, most important changes here is to allow the States to have more flexibility, to allow the States to be the laboratory for developing and testing and creating programs that, indeed, deliver the kinds of programs needed.

I urge my fellow Senators to vote in support of this welfare bill today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, just very briefly regarding the welfare reform proposal, this is a substantially improved product from what the other body, the House of Representatives, has passed. It is certainly improved over what was originally proposed by the majority leader in the areas of child care, maintenance of effort, and a number of other areas that have been included as part of this proposal. My concern is, of course, that this may be the best it ever gets and that as we go to conference, as historically happens, you find some sort of middle ground between what the Senate has done and what the House of Representatives has done.

If that is the case, this bill will come back to us from conference in a very weakened position. And so while I think there will be a substantial vote

for the proposal today, having spoken now with a number of our colleagues, particularly on this side, Madam President, it should not be construed, if the vote is a strong vote for the Senate proposal, that this is some indication of a willingness to support whatever comes back from conference.

In order to have intelligent welfare reform, you have to make investments. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], who, as I mentioned at the outset of this debate, knows more about welfare reform than most of us will ever know about the issue, has warned that if we do not make these investments, we are going to be looking down the road at a tragic situation.

It is not enough just give the issue back to the States. The problems exist primarily at the local level, the city and town level. I do not know how many States are necessarily going to allocate resources in those parts of their own jurisdiction where the problems persist the most.

Having said all of that, Madam President, I do not disagree with what my colleagues have generally said this morning, that this is a far better bill than what the other body has passed, a far better bill than was initially proposed and offered here in the Senate.

But I would still say that we have a long way to go before this bill becomes the kind of proposal that not only saves money, but allows people to go from welfare to work and protects the 10 million children who could be adversely affected by these decisions.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Morning business is closed.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 9:30 having arrived, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1976, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

(1) Brown modified amendment No. 2688 (to committee amendment beginning on page 83, line 4, through page 84, line 2), to prohibit the use of funds for salaries and expenses of Department of Agriculture employees who carry out a price support or production adjustment program for peanuts.

(2) Bryan-Bumpers amendment No. 2691, to eliminate funding to carry out the Market Promotion Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 2691

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 15 minutes for debate under the Bryan amendment No. 2691 equally divided. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume. It is my intent to speak a few minutes in opposition to the Bryan amendment, to put in context the decision we will make at 9:45.

This is an amendment that does not seek to modify or simply reduce the funding for the Market Promotion Program. It is designed to kill the program, eliminate all funding under this legislation for this program in the next fiscal year. I think that would be a big mistake, Mr. President, and here is why.

The Foreign Agriculture Service undertook a study of this program in response to requests from the Congress and determined that for every \$1 that we invest in this Market Promotion Program promoting U.S. agriculture commodities and foodstuffs that are exported in the international marketplace, \$16 is generated in additional agriculture imports.

At a time when we are trying to compete more aggressively in the international market because of the opening up of new markets under the GATT Uruguay Round Agreement, we are trying to do a better job and use all the resources that we can muster to help ensure that we maintain a competitive edge and that we work with our farmers and ranchers and food processors to try to enlarge our share of markets. This is going to have just the opposite effect.

So I am hopeful that the Senate will vote against this amendment. I urge all Senators to carefully consider this. This is a proven, tested, workable, and effective program, and we have the facts to prove it. We debated this issue for an hour last night and laid all the facts out on both sides. I hope the Senators this morning will reject this amendment soundly.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if there is no one seeking to address the Senate in support of the amendment, I am going to suggest that the time during the quorum, which I am going to call, be charged to the proponents of the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the time be so charged.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. 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.

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

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