

of the 10,000 visa available under the United States Investor Visa Program; and

"Whereas, other countries, such as Canada have tailored their investor visa programs to attract significant capital investment; and

"Whereas, the California Policy Seminar Brief, Volume 7, Number 13, reported that Canada has attracted over \$3 billion in investment through their Business Migration Program between 1986 and 1990; and

"Whereas, immigrant business investment in Canada resulted in a 30 percent increase in employment in the manufacturing firms that were invested in: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to reduce the current investment threshold under the United States Investor Visa Program to five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) minimum investment and five employees to allow states greater flexibility in focusing investment funds to address specific economic needs; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Director of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service."

POM-669. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 49

"Whereas, California, with 3.3 million veterans in the United States and the number continues to grow as up to 50,000 newly separated service members per year select California as their residence; and

"Whereas, California has historically been underrepresented by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs (USDVA) in that California has only one USDVA employee for each 8,000 veterans while the rest of the nation averages one USDVA employee for each 6,000 veterans; and

"Whereas, this inequity means less staff to revolve the more complex claims of the veterans of this state; and

"Whereas, this inequity is aggravated by the fact that the mix of claims causes California to have a larger compensation share and a smaller pension share than the rest of the nation; and

"Whereas, despite this large population of veterans and their families, the proposed USDVA Field Restructuring Plan would transfer veterans' disability pension benefits processing services from California to Phoenix, Arizona and other states; and

"Whereas, the restructuring proposal will not, under any circumstances, provide a reasonable level of service to California veterans; and

"Whereas, the transfer of disability pension processing activities from the Los Angeles and Oakland USDVA offices to Phoenix reflects restructuring that is driven by budget concerns, and not by concern for veterans' service; and

"Whereas, it is estimated that the servicing of disability pension claims for those veterans whose files will not be in Phoenix reduces the case management effectiveness of not only the county veterans service offices but also the national service organizations, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Employment Development Department of California, and will have a significant impact on cost-avoiding state Medi-Cal

(medicaid) appropriations as they apply to our aging veteran population due to reduced levels of service, timeliness factors, and the required ongoing training that is currently shared by county veterans service officers and the Los Angeles and Oakland regional USDVA offices; and

"Whereas, it is the understanding of the Legislature that the proposed USDVA Field Restructuring Plan is based on old and unreliable data that attacks California's regional USDVA offices as inefficient and overmanaged and these assumptions are not valid today; and

"Whereas, reducing the size of the offices or moving the offices to Phoenix, Arizona or any other state, or otherwise attempting to effectuate the "smaller is better" doctrine in this case will not solve the increasing problems of California more than 3.3 million veterans and their dependents: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly," That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President, the Congress of the United States, and the United States Department of Veterans Affairs to maintain the status quo, and to reconsider the decision to adopt the proposed USDVA Field Restructuring Plan; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 1264. A bill to provide for certain benefits of the Missouri River basin Pick-Sloan project to the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-362).

By Mr. MCCAIN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1973. A bill to provide for the settlement of the Navajo-Hopi land dispute, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-363).

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, with amendments:

S. 1897. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend certain programs relating to the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-364).

By Mr. D'AMATO, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 1317. A bill to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, to enact the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-365).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany the bill (S. 1887) to make improvements in the operation and administration of the Federal courts, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-366).

By Mr. SIMPSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment and an amendment to the title:

S. 1791. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 1996, the rates of disability com-

penetration for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-367).

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. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. HEFLIN):

S. 2059. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to executory contracts and unexpired leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICKLES:

S. 2060. A bill to require the District of Columbia to comply with the 5-year time limit for welfare recipients, to prohibit any future waiver of such limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. NICKLES:

S. 2060. A bill to require the District of Columbia to comply with the 5-year time limit for welfare recipients, to prohibit any future waiver of such limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

WELFARE LEGISLATION

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, today, I am introducing legislation that would reverse President Clinton's recent District of Columbia welfare waiver which exempts the District of Columbia from the 5-year time limit for 10 years. It may shock our colleagues. President Clinton signed the welfare reform bill with a great deal of fanfare and said, "We have ended welfare as we know it." What most people don't know is on the day he signed it, he signed a 10-year waiver for the District of Columbia, so it does not apply. The waiver will apply for 10 years.

I am just amazed that he had the audacity to do that. I am somewhat amazed that a lot of people in the press, and maybe we in Congress, have not said much about it.

Think of that. The cornerstone of the welfare reform bill was a bill with real time limits. I am quoting President Clinton. President Clinton said, "We need to have real welfare reform, we need to end welfare as we know it, we need a bill with real teeth, a bill that has real time limits." What does he do on the same day? He signs the welfare bill. He gives a 10-year waiver, a 10-year exemption to the District of Columbia.

It is interesting to note, he was able to grant the waiver within 14 days to the District of Columbia. He has had over 103 days to grant the waiver that was requested by the State of Wisconsin, which he mentioned in a political address on one of his Saturday morning addresses. He said, "We need welfare reform like the State of Wisconsin. They have real workfare. They have time limits. We need to do it."