

George Washington, Peyton Randolph, George Mason, Richard Henry Lee, and others, take the first steps toward freedom. In the House of Burgesses, on the streets of Colonial Williamsburg, in a local tavern, the group draws up Virginia's plans to boycott English goods.

We hear Washington's words, "How far their attention to our rights and privileges is to be awakened or alarmed by starving their trade and manufacturers remains to be tried." The viewers of "The American Promise" see our Founding Fathers starting a rebellion that will gather strength for 7 more years before the Declaration of Independence is written.

Although we sometimes think of our freedoms as a Nation being won at Concord, Bunker Hill or Yorktown, these freedoms were also the result of years of meetings and debate and consensus building. This serves as a true reminder of the communal instincts that helped create our great Nation.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues and viewers across the Nation to watch this important program. "The American Promise" reminds us what is right about America—and challenges us all to be good citizens always working to make our Nation stronger and greater. ●

●Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, would the Senator from Missouri, the chairman of the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee, yield a few moments for me to address an issue of great importance to the people of Hawaii and the Pacific?

Mr. BOND. I would be happy to yield to the junior Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I am concerned that the disaster needs of the Pacific are not being adequately addressed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA]. In particular, I am concerned that FEMA lacks adequate staffing for its Pacific Area Office, located in Honolulu, to address fully this mitigation, training, and emergency response needs of this large and diverse area.

As the Senator from Missouri knows, FEMA's Region IX, based in San Francisco, is currently responsible for administering emergency management assistance programs and responding to disasters throughout the Pacific—including American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated State of Micronesia, the Republic of Palau, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands—as well as in California, Arizona, and Nevada. It is by far the largest of FEMA's regions, covering an area greater in size than the U.S. mainland. But the current grouping of Hawaii and the Pacific Islands within Region IX results in the Pacific islands receiving less than adequate attention.

The Pacific insular states are seven different jurisdictions that are culturally, economically, and politically distinct from mainland states. The estimated 110 FEMA employees who staff the San Francisco office are too re-

lative, both geographically and culturally, to provide the full range of disaster-related assistance to the unique Pacific insular states. Quite understandably, they are preoccupied by the vast emergency needs of the populations who live closer at hand, in California, Nevada, and Arizona.

The Republic of Palau, for example, is 5,500 miles from San Francisco—a 2-day journey from the continental U.S. by jet. Moreover, when FEMA officials finally arrive at the scene of a disaster that has occurred in the Pacific, they must contend with major differences in language, facilities, food, climate, and communications not to mention the idiosyncrasies of local political systems and administrative practices.

The establishment of the Pacific Area Office in Honolulu 2 years ago vastly improved FEMA's ability to respond quickly to disasters in the central and South Pacific, if only because the facility is located thousands of miles closer to potential disaster sites. And, while the office has made a serious effort to maintain ongoing contact with the more remote insular jurisdictions, it is seriously limited in its ability to provide critical training, technical assistance, and hazard mitigation services that could significantly minimize loss of life and property.

So, given the foregoing, I might ask the Senator from Missouri if he would consider the Pacific's emergency needs when the pending measure goes to conference.

Mr. BOND. What is the Senator from Hawaii's specific request?

Mr. AKAKA. After extensive consultation with emergency management officials and representatives of the Pacific insular states, I have determined that the service limitations I have described can only be overcome by augmenting the Pacific Area Office with a minimum of twelve (12) additional permanent staff. Of these, six, (6) are needed in the Pacific Area Office itself to support preparedness training, planning, mitigation, and logistical functions, and six (6) others are required as permanent liaison officers assigned to, and physically based in, each of FEMA's insular Pacific jurisdictions.

Mr. BOND. So the Senator from Hawaii requests assistance in securing conference report language directing FEMA to assign 12 FTEE to the Pacific Area Office?

Mr. AKAKA. That is my request. The vital assistance provided by such staff could save millions of dollars in property and economic activity, not to mention human lives. I would underscore the fact that I am not proposing the establishment of a new regional office, only that the existing satellite office in Hawaii be provided with the resources to meet the full range of our emergency management obligations in the Pacific.

Ms. MIKULSKI. If I may interject. My colleagues may recall that as chairman of the VA, HUD, and Inde-

pendent Agencies Subcommittee in the 102d Congress, I supported the original establishment of the Pacific Area Office. At that time, the subcommittee set aside \$500,000 in the Senate report accompanying the FY92 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill for this initiative.

The subcommittee's action reflected a concern that a permanent FEMA presence was needed in the Pacific. Until the office was opened in Honolulu in 1993, the agency had no forward-based staff or facilities in these jurisdictions; instead, all disaster activities were conducted directly from FEMA's Region IX office, located in San Francisco, thousands of miles from these jurisdictions.

While the creation of this office has clearly improved FEMA's ability to deal with the many disasters that occur in the Pacific, the agency still falls short of fully providing for the emergency needs of our citizens and friends in the Pacific. I think we need to consider seriously making the Pacific Area Office a full-service office, one that can provide robust mitigation, training, and emergency response services in a timely, appropriate fashion.

So, I would support the Senator from Hawaii's request that we consider taking this matter up in conference.

Mr. AKAKA. The Senator from Maryland has ably summarized the essence of this issue. I appreciate her comments as well as her key role in originally establishing the Pacific Area Office.

Mr. BOND. I also appreciate my colleague from Maryland's helpful comments on this issue. Given her support, and in view of the unique circumstances that exist in the Pacific, I would be pleased to consider seriously the Senator from Hawaii's request to raise this issue in conference. The Senator from Hawaii should, however, bear in mind that any efforts we make, if any, must be made in the context of FEMA's overall budget.

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the managers of the bill for their thoughtful consideration of this matter. Any accommodation that can be achieved in conference regarding the emergency management needs of the Pacific would be very much appreciated. I yield the floor. ●

#### RECOGNITION OF BERNARD L. BARELA

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of the retirement of Bernard L. Barela, District Director for the Albuquerque District after 34 years with the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. Barela is a native of New Mexico whose family has been here for over 200 years. His mother, sister, and numerous family members still reside in the New Mexico area.

Mr. Barela served in the U.S. Navy from 1957 to 1959. Upon receiving an honorable discharge he returned to Albuquerque where he was a civilian employee.

Mr. Barela began his IRS career as a grade 3 mail clerk in the Phoenix District Office on 1961. He then became an office call interviewer in Phoenix until 1966.

After that he transferred to Las Vegas as a revenue officer until 1969 whereupon he became revenue officer group manager in San Bernardino, CA. In 1971, he moved to San Diego as chief of office branch and was selected as one of the first grade 13 group managers in collection in the Los Angeles District.

Mr. Barela moved to the field branch chief position in 1972 in San Diego and in 1973 marked his first return to Albuquerque as a collection and taxpayer service division chief. 1973 also marked another promotion for Mr. Barela as the collection division chief in New Orleans District. Mr. Barela served as executive assistant, to assistant regional commissioner, central region office in Cincinnati from 1975 to 1981.

In 1981, Mr. Barela entered the executive ranks of IRS, where he has served in several positions of increasing responsibility. Mr. Barela's first executive assignment was an assistant director, returns and processing in Washington, DC, during 1981. In 1985 Mr. Barela became the assistant director, service center in Atlanta. In 1989, Mr. Barela became assistant District Director in Fort Lauderdale where he assisted during the recovery after Hurricane Andrew. In 1993, Mr. Barela returned home to Albuquerque as the District Director, the highest State office with the IRS. ●

#### PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

● Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I rise to address H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995, a bill to reform the Nation's welfare system.

H.R. 4 is a radical departure in Federal welfare policy. This bill would end a 60-year-old Federal entitlement to poor families with children under the Aid to Families With Dependent Children Program [AFDC]. In the place of AFDC, the Senate bill would create a Federal welfare block grant that will give almost \$17 billion annually to State governments over the next 7 years to provide cash assistance, child care, job training, and other services to our Nation's poor. The States will have nearly complete flexibility to design and carry out these programs. The Federal Government requires only that the States impose a 5-year lifetime limit on welfare benefits and begin moving welfare recipients to work as rapidly as possible between now and the year 2000.

Opponents of H.R. 4 have talked extensively about this bill's flaws. It is said that the Federal money contained in the H.R. 4 is insufficient to meet the work requirements. We are told that funds for child care will make it impossible to care for the children of welfare recipients who go to work. Others have argued that States will cut welfare dramatically and set off a reverse bidding

war as States reduce and eliminate benefits to avoid becoming welfare magnates.

Mr. President, I supported amendments to this legislation that address many of these concerns. I voted for Senator DODD's amendment that would have provided an additional \$6 billion in Federal child care subsidies. We reached a compromise to increase Federal child care spending by some \$3 billion. The Senate also agreed to require the States to continue spending at least 80 percent of their 1994 welfare dollars. I believe these amendments have significantly improved H.R. 4 and increased the likelihood that it will succeed in reducing welfare dependence.

The Senate also took up an amendment offered by Senator DOMENICI on the issue of limiting welfare benefit increases for women who have additional children while on welfare. When H.R. 4 emerged from the Finance Committee it allowed States to impose the so-called family cap but did not require it. The Dole substitute amendment made this policy mandatory. The Domenici amendment reinstated the state option on the family cap.

New Jersey, Georgia, and several other states have imposed family caps based on the premise that increases in benefits for new births encourage illegitimacy. My instincts tell me this is probably true and, at the State level, I would have voted for this experiment. At this point, however, there is simply no firm analytical evidence to support it. A Rutgers University study published earlier this year found that the New Jersey family cap had no effect on illegitimacy rates and may have increased the State's abortion rate. Until the States have accumulated enough experience with the family cap to show it is effective in reducing illegitimacy, I believe it should remain a State option but should not be mandated by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I voted for the Dole substitute amendment to H.R. 4. I understand the concerns expressed by those who fear this legislation will not do enough to protect children whose parents have reached the end of their welfare time limits. If this bill becomes law, I believe its effects on the well-being of children should be monitored carefully. Further steps will likely be needed by Congress and the States to assure that children are adequately cared for.

Mr. President, H.R. 4 is unlikely to be the last word in welfare reform. The problems we are trying to address in this legislation—welfare dependency and the illegitimacy, violence, and drug abuse that it engenders—are probably the most complex, troubling, and intractable problems facing American society. Anyone who believes that they have the single set of reforms to solve these problems is wrong. As UCLA sociologist James Q. Wilson argued late last year in an essay entitled, "A New Approach to Welfare Reform: Humil-

ity," what is really needed is the kind of State-based experimentation that might yield innovations that could be replicated by other States. I voted for H.R. 4 because I believe it offers the best opportunity to encourage this kind of experimentation. It is my hope that the conference between the Senate and the House will produce a compromise that I can also support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the essay by James Q. Wilson be printed in the RECORD.

The essay follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Thursday,  
December 29, 1994]

FIRM FOUNDATIONS: A NEW APPROACH TO  
WELFARE REFORM: HUMILITY  
(By James Q. Wilson)

We are entering the last years of the 20th century with every reason to rejoice and little inclination to do so, despite widespread prosperity, a generally healthy economy, the absence of any immediate foreign threat, and extraordinary progress in civil rights, personal health and school enrollment. Despite all this and more, we feel that there is something profoundly wrong with our society.

That communal life is thought to be deficient in many respects, plagued by crime, drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, WELFARE dependency and the countless instabilities of daily life. What these problems have in common in the eyes of most Americans is that they result from the weakening of the family.

Having arrived at something approaching a consensus, we must now face the fact that we don't know what to do about the problem. The American people are well ahead of their leaders in this regard. They doubt very much that government can do much of anything at all. They are not optimistic that any other institution can do much better, and they are skeptical that there will be a spontaneous regeneration of decency, commitment and personal responsibility.

I do not know what to do either. But I think we can find out, at least to the degree that feeble human reason is capable of understanding some of the most profound features of our condition.

The great debate is whether, how and at what cost we can change lives. If not the lives of this generation, then of the next. There are three ways of framing the problem.

First, the structural perspective: Owing to natural social forces, the good manufacturing jobs that once existed in inner-city areas have moved to the periphery, leaving behind decent men and women who are struggling to get by without work that once conferred both respect and money. Their place is now taken by street-wise young men who find no meaningful work, have abandoned the search for work, and scorn indeed the ethic of work.

Second is the rationalist perspective: Welfare benefits, including not only aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), but also Medicaid, subsidized housing and Food Stamps, have become sufficiently generous as to make the formation of stable two-parent families either irrational or unnecessary. These benefits have induced young women wanting babies and a home of their own to acquire both at public expense, and have convinced young men, who need very little convincing on this score, that sexual conquest need not entail any personal responsibilities.

Third is the cultural perspective: Child rearing and family life as traditionally understood can no longer compete with or