welfare reform, which are not properly addressed by the Dole bill.

The Democratic plan addresses the problem of teenage pregnancy by including grants to States for design and implementation of teen pregnancy prevention programs. I will not go into more detail right now, but it is extremely important.

Paternity establishment is in our bill. We cannot let these men escape their responsibility, as they very often do. Child support enforcement is in our legislation.

Also, I want to talk a little bit about the provision in our legislation dealing with food assistance reform—food stamps—major provisions. We have one strengthening compliance, reducing fraud and abuse. It is an effort to clamp down on the egregious abuses of the program. The Work First Program provides the following:

The Secretary of Agriculture may establish specific authorization periods so that stores have to reapply to continue to accept food stamp coupons and may establish time periods during which stores have their authorization revoked or, having had their application for authorization denied, will be ineligible. Stores may be required to provide written verification of eligibility. The Secretary shall be required to issue regulations allowing the suspension of a store from participation in the program after the store is initially found to have committed violations.

Now they commit violations and, in effect, thumb their noses at the authorities because nobody can stop them from taking food stamps. Our bill changes this.

Stores that are disqualified from the WIC Program shall be disqualified from participation in the Food-Stamp program for the same period of time. Retail stores are disqualified permanently from the Food-Stamp Program for submitting false applications. There are other things that are important to strengthen this provision: enhancing electronic benefit transfer, strengthening requirements, and penalties. There are a number of things that really make this legislation more important.

I want to close by talking about a couple of things, in effect, to set the record straight. People who oppose this amendment charge that the Work First plan is weak on work. This claim comes from the same people who only a short time ago approved and reported a plan out of committee with no participation requirements.

So I say in response to that charge that their plan was not even about workers; it was about shoveling people from one program to another with no emphasis on work, with no emphasis, no work requirement at all, and now they have dropped their participation requirements and instead have adopted our work standards, the standards in this amendment pending before this body. So try to explain to me how the Democrat plan is weak on work when the underlying Dole amendment picks up our plan.

There is also a charge that the Democratic substitute is weak on State innovation. The Democrat Work First plan provides States unprecedented flexibility. The States set benefit levels. States set allowable asset limits. States set income. Disregard policies. States design their own work programs. In fact, there is a lot of similarity here between the Democratic and Republican plans. So why do they charge Work First as being weak on State innovation? It simply is not true.

Another charge: The Democrat plan is weak on savings.

Mr. President, the Democratic Work First plan saves over $20 billion. It is not weak on savings. The Breaux-Mikulski plan saves as much as the Republican plan, or as close. But it also does not include a $23 billion unfunded mandate to the States; that the States are going to rue the day that this underlying legislation passes. They will rue the day. As the Conference of Mayors said, this will be the ''mother of all unfunded mandates.'' The Democratic plan will result in deficit reduction without unfunded mandates to the States.

Let me close by saying, yes, we should change the present way welfare is handled. But we should not throw the baby out with the bathwater. We have to do a better job of being compassionate but also have a bit of wisdom in what we are doing with so-called welfare reform.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, may I first thank the Senator from Nevada for a careful and a thoughtful and, to this Senator, a wholly persuasive argument.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SENATOR EDUARDO MATARAZZO SUPLICY OF BRAZIL

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, by a happy circumstance, we have a visitor on the floor today, Senator Eduardo Suplicy of the Brazilian Senate, who is the author of legislation in that Senate which will establish a guaranteed national income in Brazil and is now in debate in that assembly. It is a matter that has been discussed on this floor today. So it is very serendipitous indeed.

RECESS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate might stand in recess for 1 minute in order to welcome our colleague from Brazil, Senator Eduardo Suplicy.

[Applause]

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:12 p.m., recessed until 6:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. DEWINE].

RECESS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for a period of 20 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:15 p.m., recessed until 6:33 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. DEWINE].

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, a recent paper by the Progressive Policy Institute leveled three criticisms at the Republican welfare reform plan. It is to generate short-term budget savings, the first charge leveled; to satisfy GOP Governors' demands for flexibility; and, lastly, to avoid making tough decisions.

Now, obviously, that last statement is most ludicrous that the Progressive Policy Institute leveled against us because we have seen the Federal Government fail on welfare reform. You know, there was a massive effort made in 1988 at the Federal level to move people from welfare to work, to save the taxpayers money. We have seen 3.1 million more people on welfare now than before we passed our so-called welfare reform plan in 1988.

In the meantime, we have seen States like Missouri, my State of Iowa, the States of Wisconsin, Michigan, Massachusetts, New Jersey—and I suppose there are a lot of others that ought to be named—reform welfare in a very ambitious way and in an ambitious way that we have not had the guts or the will to do here in Washington, DC, at the congressional level. And we have seen through State action people move from welfare to work and saving the taxpayers money. In my own State of Iowa we have 2,000 less people on welfare than 3 years ago when we passed the welfare reform plan. We have seen our monthly checks go from an average of $360 down to $340. And we have seen the highest percentage of any State in the Nation of people who are on welfare moving to work, at 35 percent.

So can you believe it, Mr. President, that the Progressive Policy Institute would level a charge that we are trying to avoid making tough decisions when we have failed at tough decisions or we