

Congressional Record -- Senate

Thursday, September 12, 1991;  
(Legislative day of Tuesday, September 10, 1991)

102nd Cong. 1st Sess.

137 Cong Rec S 12848

REFERENCE: Vol. 137 No. 125

TITLE: LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1992

SPEAKER: Mr. BUMPERS; Mr. BYRD; Mr. COCHRAN; Mr. DOLE; Mr. GRAHAM; Mr.  
GRAMM;  
Mr. GRASSLEY; Mr. HARKIN; Mr. HATCH; Mr. HATFIELD; Mr. HELMS; Mr.  
KASTEN; Mr.  
MACK; Mr. MOYNIHAN; Mr. SANFORD; Mr. SARBANES; Mr. SIMON; Mr. SPECTER;  
Mr. WIRTH

.....

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the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 1114

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, shortly I will send an amendment to the desk  
which proposes to take \$10 million the National Institutes of Health  
has targeted for two different national sex surveys this year and use  
that money -- instead of wasting it as NIH proposes -- to fund title XX  
of the Adolescent Family Life Act. Title XX, as I understand it, has  
been authorized but it has not been funded. This amendment will provide  
Senators with a clear choice between right and wrong.

With that preface, I send this amendment to the desk and ask that it be  
stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to laying aside the pending  
committee amendment?

Mr. HELMS. It was my understanding from the manager of the bill that  
there was no amendment pending, but if one is pending, I ask unanimous  
consent that it be laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is  
so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Helms] proposes an amendment numbered 1114.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 25, line 8, strike the period and insert the following: ": PROVIDED, HOWEVER, That funds made available under this heading to conduct the SHARP survey of adult sexual behavior and the American Teenage Survey of adolescent sexual behavior shall instead be expended, at the same outlay rate, to carry out title XX of the Public Health Service Act.".

Mr. HELMS. I thank the clerk for his courtesy.

Mr. President, let me reiterate that this amendment will give Senators a choice between two very different proposals. Senators can, on the one hand -- if they support this amendment -- vote to support title XX, which happens to be the only federally funded sex education program that counsels our children to abstain from having sexual relations until they are married. This is the only Federal program that does that, and it is not being funded under this bill.

What is being funded -- and I want to take the money away from it -- is NIH's proposal for national sex surveys. I am going to get into that in some detail and some of it is going to sound a little bit raw. But I think the record needs to be clear about what is happening on the one hand and what is not happening on the other in the expenditure of the American taxpayers' money.

The NIH funds these sex surveys -- the real purpose of which is to "cook the books," so to speak, in terms of presenting "scientific facts" -- in order to do what? To legitimize homosexual lifestyles of course.

Mr. President, let me just say that I am sick and tired of pandering to the homosexuals in this country. If anybody wants me to go into detail of why, I will be glad to do that.

[\*S12861] The pending amendment presents a clear choice, therefore, between support for sexual restraint among our young people or, on the other hand, support for homosexuality and sexual decadence. That is as clear as I can make it.

Mr. President, the sexual liberation crowd is pushing our children into the mode of having sex at younger and younger ages as they move their sex education agenda into the elementary schools. Of course, the liberal free sex agenda is often camouflaged as so-called AIDS education. But the intent and purpose, the effects, are the same -- to desensitize children at younger and younger ages to immoral sexual lifestyles.

That is why the teenage pregnancy rate is growing. That is why it will continue to grow as long as the Federal Government uses the taxpayers' money to support programs to tell kids that having sex is OK as long as it is so-called safe sex.

I say baloney.

By funding these so-called sex education programs in the schools -- which really amount to little more than how-to sex clinics -- we are essentially telling our young people that promiscuity is just fine as long as they are, to use the liberals' phrase, "contraceptively prepared" for it.

The legislation before us, Mr. President, the underlying legislation, effectively kills title XX -- the only Federal program that makes a stab at telling kids, "Don't do it. Wait until you are married."

The pending bill, if this amendment is not passed, will kill title XX because, as I say, title XX has been authorized but the Appropriations Committee provided no money to fund it.

Title XX of the Public Health Service Act is called the Adolescent Family Life Program, and the homosexuals hate it, and the free sex crowd hates it because, as I said earlier, it is the only voice of reason and morality in the sex education debate. That is why it is the one Federal sex education program that is not being funded under this bill. I say to you, Mr. President, this is an outrage.

The Title XX Program's message -- the program that is not being funded under this appropriations bill now pending -- is that it is healthier -- physically, psychologically, and from an economic standpoint -- to forego sexual relations until marriage. And, Mr. President, that message is anathema to the crowd, for example, that went out to my house in Arlington, VA, last week and stretched a big canvas condom over the top of it. They do not like me and I do not like them.

I am not going to support them. I do not want to take any of their legitimate rights away from them, but neither do I want to give them preferential treatment.

Mr. President, the "sex liberation" crowd also hates the fact that the \$10 million Adolescent Family Life Program's resounding success makes the abject failure of the liberals' \$140 million title X so-called Family Planning Program stand out. You do not need to take my word for it. For example, a former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Activities at the Department of Health and Human Resources said last year that the Adolescent Family Life Program -- which the bill now pending will kill if my amendment is not passed --

\*\*\* has demonstrated declines in pregnancies, abortion, and birth rates over the last 3 years, and evaluation of the pregnancy rates of eighth grade female program participants against a matched comparison group shows that 5 percent of program participants became sexually active by the end of the school year compared to 15 percent in the other group.

By contrast, Mr. President, millions of tax dollars have been wasted during the past two decades under the liberals' Title X Program on the

premise -- and it is false -- that the best way to present teenage pregnancy is to provide children with free and ready access to contraceptives. Well, let us look at the results. They speak for themselves.

After 20 years, more teenagers than ever are getting pregnant and having abortions, and I might add at a catastrophic rate. Planned Parenthood admits this. They admit that very few sexually active teenagers have not used contraceptives. Indeed, the universal availability of contraceptives, and the courses showing our teenagers how to have sex so they can use them, has encouraged, not quelled, the explosive rise in teenage sexual activity.

What the Nation has seen is greater pregnancy rates and, of course, greater abortion rates to eliminate -- I guess Planned Parenthood would call them "accidents."

Mr. President, Planned Parenthood claims that in 1987 there were 200,000 fewer births of babies to teenagers than in 1970 as a result of title X funding. But they neglected to tell us the facts that totally negate their self-serving report.

For example, Planned Parenthood -- which grabs at Federal funds every time you turn around -- just happened to overlook telling us the fact that there were 400,000 fewer adolescents in 1987 than in 1970. They also failed to mention that even with 400,000 fewer teens, there were still 250,000 more abortions performed on teenagers in 1987 than in 1970. They just overlooked these few minor details. It was not intentional. If anyone believes that, they will believe anything.

But Planned Parenthood also failed, Mr. President, to report that the teenage pregnancy rate in 1987 showed a large increase compared to 1970, or that the number of illegitimate births to unmarried teenagers increased -- what do you guess -- 53.5 percent during that period of time.

So the bottom line on Planned Parenthood's statistics, Mr. President, is that all of the problem rates went up into the stratosphere except for the overall teenage birth rate -- which Planned Parenthood kept down by increasing the teenage abortion rate. In other words kill the babies, and then you do not have so many births. That is the way Planned Parenthood works. That is the reason I object to even a dime of the taxpayer's money being given to Planned Parenthood.

I do not think it is logical to expect Planned Parenthood -- which is a multimillion-dollar corporation that makes millions of dollars every year performing abortions on pregnant teenage girls -- to do an enthusiastic job of discouraging teenage girls from getting pregnant. Planned Parenthood's own statistics show that this flawed arrangement between Planned Parenthood and the Federal Government has not and will not work.

Mr. President, the simple fact that the pregnancy rate -- as opposed to the birth rate -- has not gone down after 20 years is testimony enough to the failure of the policies supporting the Title X Program. It is also an indictment of those who have such a devil-may-care attitude about the emotional and physical well-being of our Nation's youth that

they would presume to continue a failed program, even as they seek to eliminate the only program that really works -- title XX, the Adolescent Family Life Program. That is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. President, I want to take a moment to look at the national sex surveys that my amendment, now pending at the desk, would defund -- that is, take the money away from them so that the money can be shifted to the successful Title XX Program.

As I said before, the American public should understand that the real purpose behind the current sex survey proposals is not to stop the spread of AIDS. The real purpose is to compile supposedly scientific facts, if you will, to support the leftwing liberal argument that homosexuality is a normal, acceptable lifestyle; they would have us believe that it is not abnormal.

I say baloney. They have their rights, but that does not discount the fact that they are perverted and that is what they want to cover up. However, despite their sexual perversion, they demand the rest of us respect their lifestyle.

As long as I am able to stand on the floor of the U.S. Senate, I am never going to yield to that sort of thing, because it is not just another lifestyle. It is sodomy.

In any case, these purportedly scientific Government surveys will be cited time and time again in attempts to destigmatize homosexuality by portraying it as normal, just another lifestyle.

However, if the very homosexual practices that currently account for 80 to 90 percent of the Nation's AIDS cases are given free license in this country, then we should be prepared [\*S12862] for an increase, not a decrease, in the number of AIDS cases.

I know enough about the history of AIDS in this country to recall that the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, GA, can pinpoint the first case of AIDS that came into this country. It was brought in by a male airline attendant, and he started the spread of AIDS.

I was condemned by some newspaper editor because I stood where I stand today, and I said, "If the homosexuals will stop doing what they are doing, we can get AIDS under control." But we cannot, and we will not, get AIDS under control as long as there is a trend toward giving the homosexual community rights that they do not deserve, and Federal dollars that the American taxpayers should not be required to cough up.

In short, the results of the proposed Federal sex surveys will be used to legitimize the very behavior that accounts for the overwhelming majority of AIDS cases in this country.

From a scientific perspective, Mr. President, sex surveys -- by their very nature -- are neither objective nor scientific because, on average, 40 to 60 percent of the people asked to participate in them will refuse. I would refuse as would most everyone else in this Chamber.

However, the Centers for Disease Control say that any refusal rate higher than 15 percent for participating in any survey will skew a survey's result a minimum of 50 percent.

Mr. President, the participation rates for sex surveys are so low because most Americans' natural modesty keeps them from voluntarily answering questions about how often they engage in relations, with whom, their preferences for sexual partners, and which sex acts they prefer. If you can believe it, all of that is in the surveys in embarrassing detail.

(Mr. WELLSTONE assumed the chair.)

Mr. HELMS. Therefore, the inherent scientific flaw in any so-called sex survey is that only people with a desire to share the graphic details of their sexual intimacies, whether real or imagined, will even participate in such survey.

Such a limited group of participants -- who are anything but modest -- will have profound biases in favor of loose or perverted sexual behavior and, thus, can never be said to be scientifically representative of mainstream sexual behavior.

For example, Mr. President, what kind of parent is going to allow his or her teenage child to answer the following questions from the NIH's proposed teenage sex survey?

Here are some of the questions, and I hope I will not offend anybody watching on television or in the galleries or elsewhere, but I said at the outset that in order to try to make my case, I was going to have to be a little bit graphic in my remarks here today.

Here's one of the questions the liberal's want to ask our children in the 7th to 12th grades.

Have you ever rubbed another man's penis to sexually excite him?

And the next one I hate to say in front of the Senate pages, but it needs to be said. Another question, and these are just two examples of hundreds of questions each child will be asked.

Have you ever had your partner's penis up your rectum?

Now, come on, Mr. President. How degrading can we be in the awarding of the American taxpayers' money? Are we going to pay for garbage like that? For that matter, what kind of parent would answer such questions himself or herself, let alone allow his or her child to answer them?

Nevertheless, the questions from the proposed teenage sex survey go on and on in graphic detail about all kinds of sexual acts, many, if not most of them, perverted. So any parent who would allow his or her child to read these questions, let alone answer them, raises questions about the parent. I do not believe many fit parents would do it.

The shocking nature of these questions make it obvious why 40 to 60 percent of Americans traditionally refuse to participate in this kind of survey. Yet we are being asked to fund this and call it scientific,

when it in fact is not scientific. It is utter debasement is what it is. And we are sending the research bill to the American taxpayers -- and I jolly well think the taxpayers resent it.

Mr. President, the inherently flawed scientific methodology of these kinds of surveys does not deter the avidly prohomosexual members of the scientific community, not by a longshot; no, sir. They know that sexual deviates and perverts and homosexuals will be disproportionately represented in every sex survey. In fact, that is what they are counting on. They want to buttress their political and social arguments that homosexuality is not deviant behavior by citing such supposedly "scientific" -- and again, I want to put "scientific" in quotes, because there is not anything scientific about it; it is a ploy -- such "scientific" federally fund surveys, to say that 1 in 10 or 1 in 5 people in the population are homosexuals, and that is just not so.

Such deception and misrepresentation have been endemic in these surveys from the very beginning, starting with Alfred Kinsey's original sex survey back in the 1940's -- the survey that is the original source for the often-cited statistic that 1 in 10 people -- 1 out of every 10 people -- is homosexual.

Mr. Kinsey knew before he started what he wanted his survey to prove. So he never publicized the fact that he surveyed mostly homosexuals, prisoners, and college students, an obviously nonrepresentative sample of the general American public.

Despite this fact, Dr. Kinsey passed his findings off as being representative of the population as a whole, not just of the crowd -- what is the word -- subset, that he chose to interview.

Mr. President, the community of these sex survey "scientists" has itself acknowledged the real purpose behind Kinsey's deception. Just a few years ago as part of a National Research Council report, the so-called sex "scientists" stated that Alfred Kinsey's, and let me quote:

\*\*\* claim for the legitimacy of science in the area of sexuality was an attempt to change the rules of the game that defined what conduct was normal and what was abnormal.

So you see, Mr. President, sex surveys from the very beginning have been a fraud; a fraud. The American taxpayers, directly and indirectly, have usually been required to pay for them.

But these sex surveys have not -- have not -- been concerned with legitimate scientific inquiry as much as they have been concerned with a blatant attempt to sway public attitudes in order to liberalize opinions and laws regarding homosexuality, pedophilia, anal and oral sex, sex education, teenage pregnancy, and all down the line. And this tradition of fraudulence continues to this day.

For instance, the Federal Government's supposedly objective investigators for the proposed SHARP survey of adult sexual behavior are anything but unbiased. These are the Government's proposed investigators, hired and paid for by the American taxpayer.

Let me tell you a little bit about them. One of the three investigators is a fellow named Stuart Michaels, a former chairman of the American Sociological Association's Lesbian and Gay Caucus. Do not try to tell me that he is objective. Do not try to tell John Q. Public that he is objective.

Another one of the investigators is John Gagnon, who has been an adviser or board member of various organizations, among them the National Organization for the Repeal of Marijuana Laws, the National Sex and Drug Forum, and the Institute for the Advancement of Human Sexuality. Let me read you a quote from Mr. Gagnon's 1977 book, titled "Human Sexualities." I am quoting directly from the book.

The horror with which society views the adult who has sexual contact with young children is lessened when one examines the behavior of other mammals. Sexual activity between adult and immature mammals is common and appears to be biologically normal.

That fellow does not have all four wheels on the ground. His elevator does not go to the top. He is nuts. And yet, he is regarded as a scientific expert. Do not tell John Q. Public that he is.

Yet, this is the kind of guy that the American taxpayers are being required [\*S12863] to fund at the same time the U.S. Senate proposes to cut off program funding for the only Federal project that is successfully teaching young people to be moral and clean until they get married, and then to have sex.

Mr. Gagnon may be right, Mr. President, but not in the way he thinks. Most Americans, I think, would agree with my observation that any adult who has sexual contact with a child or children is indeed an animal and ought to be treated as such.

Mr. President, with people of this caliber conducting these surveys, the results of the surveys can never be trusted because it is a brainwashing job to deceive us into believing -- if we are willing to stand still for it -- that homosexuality is just another lifestyle, and that it is a so-called "hate" crime to be critical of homosexuality. But if it is a crime, open up the prison doors, because I am going to continue to commit that crime.

The question is inevitable: Why does the NIH propose wasting money on people and projects like this? I will tell you why. It is because the surveys are part and parcel of the homosexual movement's agenda to legitimize their sexual behavior and thereby gain public acceptance.

Mr. President, Dr. Sullivan, the Secretary of Health and Human Resources, deserves to be commended -- and I sure do commend him -- for recognizing the absurdity of the NIH proposal to spend \$18 million -- \$7.1 million this year alone -- on a national sex survey of American teenagers. Even though Secretary Sullivan has promised to cancel this project, \$7.1 million for it is already in this year's budget.

The House of Representatives, believe it or not, added an amendment to the reauthorization bill for the National Institutes of Health that requires NIH to start a study of adolescent health, including teenage sexual practices. So despite Secretary Sullivan's efforts, the teenage



sex survey is still being pushed by the same old crowd for the same old reason. And I hope Secretary Sullivan stands his ground.

Now, I am not through yet, Mr. President. NIH proposes spending yet another \$3 million of the American taxpayers' money this year on a sex survey of adults. This is evidently the same so-called SHARP survey of adult sexual behavior that the Office of Management and Budget and the House Appropriations Committee defunded in 1989, and bless their hearts for doing it.

Nevertheless, on page 115 of the Senate committee report on the pending bill, the committee states that the appropriation for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development includes "the requested amount for the proposed SHARP survey of adult sexual behavior."

The fact is, Mr. President, despite the noble efforts of the administration to stop both of these surveys -- to stop this nonsense, period -- funding for both sex surveys is still contained in the pending appropriations bill.

So I will conclude as I began. The pending amendment presents Senators with a clear choice. Senators can either support title XX -- which counsels children to abstain from sex outside of marriage -- or, on the other hand, Senators can support the NIH homosexually biased sex surveys. Senators can either support a sexually responsible family life program or they can choose to support the continued onslaught of homosexuality and general sexual decadence that I am convinced is undermining the very moral fabric of the Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. Will the Senator forbear for just one moment?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Yes.

Mr. HELMS. I need to modify my amendment, and since the yeas and nays have not been obtained, I think that is in order. I send the modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify the amendment. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 1114) as modified, is as follows:

On page 25, line 8, strike the figure before the period and insert the following: "\$523,826,000: PROVIDED, HOWEVER, That funds made available under this heading to conduct the SHARP survey of adult sexual behavior and the American Teenage Survey of adolescent sexual behavior shall instead be expended, at the same outlay rate, to carry out title XX of the Public Health Service Act.".

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I am going to speak briefly on this matter, and I hope to be able to keep control of my sense of humor. I know this is a very nerve-racking matter, and I know that when people get nervous about these matters, doctors tend to get nervous about these people. But I will not say anything more on that score.

I would say that the question involved here is an appropriation in the fiscal year 1992 Labor-HHS appropriation bill for the National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development. Of the appropriated \$523 million for the Institute, a very small sum is to be used for a series of surveys of human reproductive patterns. That is how, in case people do not know this, children come about; as a consequence of reproductive behavior. That is not instantly evident to children, and they are often misled about this until later in their lives. But a time comes when ever they as young persons learn about these matters. And the race goes on in that way.

Only very recently in our history have we learned to study the human species through sample surveys so that you get a sense not just of what you know but also of the whole universe involved. It is much newer than we perhaps realize.

The technique of the survey was developed at Columbia University in the 1930's by a very distinguished professor, an emigre, one of those great Jewish scholars from Frankfurt who came to our country, Paul Lazarsfeld. He and his students went to Elmira in upstate New York -- Elmira is on the southern tier where Mark Twain wrote "Huckleberry Finn," as a matter of fact -- and did a study of public opinion and sampling. The mathematics of sampling that he developed and their book on Elmira was published in about 1938, I think. The next thing you know we have polls that can tell you with an accuracy of plus or minus 2 percent, who is going to be the next President of the United States. Read about them, hear about them. All of this came out of that work.

But there is another side of polling which in ways is more interesting, which is to poll a sample of people and learn about characteristics of the whole population in matters that may be more important than who are you going to vote for.

One of the places where this technique, this technology, this social science, this mathematical science has been most developed is at the University of Chicago in the National Opinion Research Center. I first came upon the center when the very distinguished American scholar Peter Rossi, now at the University of Massachusetts, was head of the NORC. One of his associates there was Father Andrew Greeley who was, and is, a Catholic priest and a sociologist. He was interested in religious beliefs and practices, and much of Greeley's very distinguished work, particularly on American Catholics, was done at the NORC, as it is described. They are wonderful people. They do great work, and they have been doing it now, I would think, for half a century. Indeed they have taught the world.

I do not want to get into any disagreement with others, but I think they are probably the best in the country and that means the best in the world, or at least they are of that rank which has no better, no superior group.

NORC for some years has done work in family formation and patterns. They, of course, are much involved with the census and the demography of our country. And they embody that great proposition, Mr. President, a distinguished scholar in his own right, that demography is destiny. If you want to know where things are going, look at who is being born, look who died, what the population is doing -- who comes forward?

Demography is destiny. NORC studies our destiny for us through demography. [\*S12864] It helps to know some of these things.

We have had some surprising disturbances in the advent, for example, of the AIDS epidemic, which appeared in the 1980's. It is clearly an epidemic. How long it will run we do not know. Whether it will become endemic we cannot say, although epidemics break. Study of the species can tell you that, otherwise the black plague would have wiped out Europe altogether in the 14th century.

One thing that is not surprising, for example, however, is that the birth rate in the United States goes down and down and down. Every census since the 1800's has shown a decline in the birth rate. We are just about on the level of a sustainable rate of reproduction, of maintenance. You need about 2.1 births per female to maintain a population. That is not surprising. It is consistent, anyway.

However, we have had one event in the past 30 years that has knocked our socks off with respect to our population, and that is the rise of out-of-wedlock births. It is unprecedented for our population.

As the distinguished report of what is called the Rockefeller Commission -- published recently by our very good friend and able colleague from West Virginia -- noted, in the last 30 years the illegitimacy ratio in our country has gone from 5 percent to over 25 percent. It is, in fact, 26 percent, one child in four born out of wedlock. We have no precedent in our experience for this.

It is not just 1 in 4; this varies greatly by population group, by city. Here in the District of Columbia, 73 percent of black births are illegitimate. In other parts of the country it is higher. Other parts lower.

It is not the same thing everywhere. If it were the same thing everywhere we would know one thing. But when we find it is different we think -- what makes the difference?

Yesterday on the floor our beloved and irascible senior Senator from Alaska was describing the problem of cancer of the prostate for which he was successfully treated this summer. He was being very open about things you used to never talk about. Imagine a U.S. Senator coming to the floor and talking about cancer of the prostate? You did not mention cancer. You certainly did not mention the prostate. He talked about both, very ably and very wisely. He said watch yourselves fellows, have a doctor watch you.

He said in males who survive to age 80, we will find about 70 percent will have cancer of the prostate.

He then went on to observe that this ailment, frequently a fatal illness, is almost unknown among Asian males in Asia. But when they come to the United States they acquire an incidence not different from the rest of the population. Which of course argues that this is obviously an environmentally specific ailment. We learn things like that.

I have learned here in our country that there is a great difference in the rates of illegitimacy from the States with the highest to those States with the lowest. We have the highest rate of illegitimacy in the District of Columbia, which is 62 percent of all births. When we know that about the births, do not expect anything from the school system, or so I believe. This goes all the way down to Utah where it is at 12 percent.

It happens that the national rate is 26 percent and that is just the rate of North Carolina; one child in four in North Carolina. In my State of New York, 30 percent, 3 in 10.

As I said, Mr. President, this breaks down differently in groups. In our country today altogether, 24 percent of white births and 67 percent of black births are out of wedlock, are illegitimate. There is no other moment in our history with this incidence.

Mr. President, I will ask unanimous consent that these tables be printed in the Record so we might know what we are dealing with.

I say once again, we do not know what hit us; what happened. I will publish in this week's issue of America magazine the information that this subject of welfare we have been talking about is obviously simply a dependent variable -- can I use that word -- on the issue of illegitimacy.

We now have the numbers. I would like to have them included in the Record at this point: that of the children born in the period 1967 to 1969, 16 percent of the white and 72 percent of those black children were on welfare before they reached age 18, almost a quarter of our population, which fits that almost a quarter were illegitimate. The numbers have been rising.

We project children born in 1980, the ratio will be 22 percent for white and 83 percent for black, which again corresponds. It is a little bit higher than the illegitimacy ratios, which figures. But illegitimacy is a sentence in this regard. We do not know what is going on. Something new has happened.

When we see something new like this going on, it is very important to ask is it going on anywhere else?

I have to say it is going on in Canada; The same quadrupling, quintupling of illegitimacy in one generation. It is going on in Great Britain, places we have a certain connection with.

But again, we find that it varies. I have a list of tables, Mr. President, entitled "Percent of Births to Unmarried Women in Selected Countries, 1985," and the highest rate was Panama with 72 percent. The United States had 22 then. We are at 26 percent now. This goes up and

up. We have Austria higher than us, immediately higher; France immediately lower. Guess who is at the bottom, Mr. President? Japan with 1 percent.

Maybe the diet, and maybe the climate, and maybe the climate of opinion of morals of acceptance, and so forth, is the cause, but I say that something has happened and it is of great importance to us that we find out; that we begin to ask what is happening.

My good friend from North Carolina, where 26 percent of all births are out-of-wedlock, which makes it the typical American State seems to think that the surveys we are talking about are mostly concerned with bizarre practices. I do not want to disappoint any potential readers, but I have to say that all those bizarre practices were surveyed 40 years ago. That has been done, Mr. President.

What has not been done is the study of how it has come about that so many of our children are born to single parents and in consequence face lives in which all the odds are against them. Individually, they are always winners, but as a class, the odds are against them.

They will be on welfare. Being on welfare, Mr. President, is not being poor. Being on welfare is to be a pauper, a ward of the State, bereft of income, property, even rights. That is what a quarter of our children are being born into; three-quarters of some of our children.

Would it be really out of the question that we might ask how come? What happened? How come it is so much more? It is five times greater in one generation.

We are talking about the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development which has a appropriation of \$523,826,000.

Mr. President, I want to say something about this child development. I have been 30 years in this city, from before the creation of this institute, asking what is happening to illegitimacy. Why is it going up and up and up? And I have never had 5 cents' worth of information out of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. They have never asked the question to my knowledge, or never certainly have they come up with the answers they would share with anybody. Millions of dollars have gone off somewhere, but not to this central question.

Ask them down to meetings and they come to meetings. But ask about this subject and they do not know anything about it. It is a taboo subject, Mr. President. Taboo. If you find anything out about this subject you might get in trouble, so keep your professional life secure and let the children go to hell. That is what we are doing.

Never ask any embarrassing questions and let those little children suffer and die out there. They are dying every day in the streets of the cities, but do not find out about them because somebody might say, why did [\*S12865] you ask that question? Because the children are dying.

We are not alone. We always learn something. I know the distinguished Presiding Officer shares my view that when you have a problem in our country, it is always interesting to ask how are they doing in Canada

on this? We learn something. Sometimes we find they are doing better, often worse.

Canada has the same problem. What is going on? A lot of things we know. The age of menarche has dropped below 12 years, the median age. In New York City not long ago a 10-year-old gave birth. That is a biological change that obviously is different from about 150 years ago. The oldest series we have comes from, I think, Norway where the median age of menarche was 17 years, 5 months. So we learn things like that.

Mr. President, I want it recorded, that I have had the privilege of talking to Professor Gagnon and Ed Laumann, of the NORC project. Both able, careful, respected workers in their field. Dr. Gagnon graduated from the University of Chicago, and is now a professor in the department of sociology at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. We, for a trivial sum, might now begin to get, just begin to get a little hold, a little purchase, as we say in the Navy, on this subject.

Let one point, Mr. President, be clear. We have had a great many studies of the reproductive patterns of females. Naturally enough. And we know a lot about that. But what we do not have and what we will get in this work from the National Opinion Research Center is a study of the reproductive patterns of males. It being pretty well established that human reproduction is a male-female phenomenon. It is that missing male that haunts our cities and haunts our biological data. We do not know how those males behave, and we need to. This is an effort that will find out.

We are going to hold hearings on this subject in the Committee on Finance, the Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy. We will ask the National Institute to come and tell us what they do not know. And they will come and tell us not much but at least they are willing to have others find out for them.

I hope, Mr. President, as we talk about education, as we talk about child health, as we talk about welfare, we might be willing to learn where so many of the problems begin, which is the status of the child at birth.

I cannot believe we are going to adopt this amendment. It is embarrassing. It would be best if we said as little about it and went on to our other matters. Our distinguished managers of the bill, no doubt, will share our view on this matter.

I see my able friend from the State of Washington has risen. I do not want to keep him.

So, Mr. President, I yield the floor, asking that the article in America and the associated tables be printed, and saying, once again, that the survey in mind will study male reproductive behavior as well as female and we will know more about ourselves and may possibly be able to do a little better for our children. Thank you, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From America, Sept. 14, 1991]

## SOCIAL JUSTICE IN THE NEXT CENTURY

(By Daniel Patrick Moynihan)\*

CETESIMUS annus, Pope, John Paul II's encyclical on social justice was proclaimed May 1, 1991, the feast of St. Joseph the Worker and the 100th anniversary of RERUM NOVARUM. This encyclical of Pope Leo XIII first set forth the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on the subject of the rights of workers.

\*Daniel Patrick Moynihan is the Democratic Senator from New York. This article is adopted from a paper presented at an April 29 conference sponsored by the Graduate School of Social Service of Fordham University to mark the University's sesquicentennial year and the 500th anniversary of the birth of St. Ignatius Loyola. The author acknowledges with gratitude the able assistance of Paul Offner.

Looking back at Leo's work it becomes clear how great a distance Western, and not just Western, society has moved in the period. At the close of the 19th century there was a seemingly unreconcilable conflict in Europe and the United States between the doctrines of laissez-faire capitalism on the one hand, and state socialism or some mode of collectivism on the other. Economics was the ONLY issue. (War, for example, had evidently become obsolescent.)

In this atmosphere the church set forth what can be seen as a sensible middle ground where most industrial democracies would eventually settle. By middle ground I do not mean splitting the difference. Rather, Leo XIII, asserting the rights of private property, even so set forth a radical doctrine of workers' rights that extended to a "just wage," and most especially, the "natural human right" to form private associations, including trade unions. Many proposed measures, the limitation of working hours, special treatment for children and women, Sunday rest, and such, seem routine at this remove. But they were hardly such at the time. Still, the important event was the extension of the concept of rights to the marketplace, Labor, it was decreed, was not a commodity.

As John Paul II puts it, RERUM NOVARUM pointed the way to reforms under which "society and the State ... both assume responsibility, especially for protecting the worker from the nightmare of unemployment." Responsibility, that is, for a general level of well-being that we have learned to call the welfare state. It is notable, then, that the present Pope goes on to a sharp exchange with this "so-called Welfare State."

"In recent years the range of such intervention has vastly expanded, to the point of creating a new type of State, the so-called 'Welfare State.' This has happened in some countries in order to respond better to many needs and demands, by remedying forms of poverty and deprivation unworthy of the human person. However, excesses and abuses, especially in recent years, have provoked very hard criticisms of the Welfare State, dubbed the 'Social Assistance State.' Malfunctions and

defects in the Social Assistance State are the result of an inadequate understanding of the tasks proper to the State. Here again THE PRINCIPLE OF SUBSIDIARITY must be respected: a community of a higher order should not interfere in the internal life of a community of a lower order, depriving the latter of its functions, but rather should support it in case of need and help to coordinate its activity with the activities of the rest of society, always with a view to the common good."

"By intervening directly and depriving society of its responsibility, the SOCIAL ASSISTANCE STATE LEADS TO A LOSS OF HUMAN ENERGIES and an inordinate increase of public agencies, which are dominated more by bureaucratic ways of thinking than by concern for serving their clients, and which are accompanied by an enormous increase in spending" (emphasis in original).

Michael Novak, who holds the George Frederick Jewett Chair in Religion and Public Policy at the American Enterprise Institute, has responded with great enthusiasm. In an article in The Washington Post (5/7/91), "Wisdom from the Pope," he writes that John Paul ... offers the papacy's strongest language ever about limitations on state power. It includes a trenchant but fair criticism of the human losses involved in the 'welfare state' and even more in the 'social assistance state.' No neo-liberal or neo-conservative ever made the case more profoundly and with so resounding a ring of truth. The pope emphasizes the human side -- or better, the anti-human side -- of bureaucratic 'social assistance.' He all but uses the phrase 'the little platoons' of society."

How's that? The Pope a conservative in the Burkean mode? This suggestion did not escape the notice of Harvey Cox of the Harvard Divinity School. Indeed, it provoked him to something like anger, which is not at all like him. Writing in New York Newsday shortly after, Professor Cox is dismissive equally of the "triumphalist" commentary by "the American Enterprise Institute's resident theologian" and of the encyclical itself. "Unfortunately, his years in Rome have not sharpened Karol Wojtyla's pen. He succeeds in being pretentious, provincial and pedestrian at the same time. He credits his predecessor Leo XIII with exerting 'far-reaching influence' on the birth of Social Security, pensions and health insurance. But don't the labor unions and citizens' movements that, like Al Smith, could probably not even pronounce the word 'encyclical' properly get a little credit too? Did Franklin Delano Roosevelt read RERUM NOVARUM? ... Do we need someone who is carried around on a palanquin by Swiss Guards to tell us this? The conservative theologians who complain that liberals too often borrow their ideas from the secular realm must be wincing in embarrassment about the derivative quality of this ho-hum document.

"But let us be more generous. What is exhausted is not the Pope but the social encyclical genre itself, with its improbable claims to universal validity and its consequent temptation to resort to bland truisms.

"My hope is that CENTESIMUS ANNUS marks not only the 100th anniversary of papal social teaching but the end of the chapter in Christian history."



Professor Cox has a point about the medium. Encyclicals have the quality of an imperial decree. Americans do not instantly take to such modes of address, although he should be careful about patronizing Al Smith. There is not the least evidence that the Governor had difficulty pronouncing the word. We have it on the authority of a not inconsiderable theologian, Reinhold Niebuhr, that when this subject arose [\*S12866] during the 1928 Presidential campaign, Smith simply asked: "Will someone tell me what the hell a Papal Encyclical is?"

Format apart, there continues to be a real problem of English translation. Thus the new encyclical observes: "RERUM NOVARUM criticizes two social and economic systems: socialism and liberalism." Three decades ago, in BEYOND THE MELTING POT, referring to RERUM NOVARUM and the message of Catholic social teaching, Nathan Glazer and I wrote: "Catholic spokesmen have used the term 'liberal' to refer to laissez-faire economics of the Manchester School, and have generously denounced same." The result, we continued, had been total confusion among the Catholic laity who had to assume that in denouncing "liberalism" Rome was anathematizing the New Deal. And here again we have the same usage. Misusage. No wonder Harvey Cox got mad. The term "liberalism" means something although different in American English today, and has done so for generations. A correction is in order. If not a correction, then surely an explanation.

## II

That being said, CENTESIMUS ANNUS could turn to to be as seminal a statement as its predecessor. RERUM NOVARUM concentrated on issues of the workplace, as did social policy in the United States in the years that followed. Labor, declared the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914, is not a "commodity." Workers, declared the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, must be paid a minimum wage. Minorities, declared the Civil Rights Act of 1964, could not be discriminated against in employment.

Again, these may seem routine matters today. They were anything but when the issues first arose. The dislocations associated with industrialization were absolutely baffling when they first appeared. What was unemployment? Why did it happen? Who was responsible? An era of fierce doctrinal argumental preceded the era in which a consensus of sorts was reached. Note particularly that along the way we began to learn to measure the things we were arguing about. Two events were of particular note. First came the establishment in 1920 of the National Bureau of Economic Research that began the systematic, quantitative analysis of the business cycle. Next, the Employment Act of 1946 established the Council of Economic Advisors and the annual Economic Report of the President to the Congress with the quantitative analysis of employment. There is no sense in which unemployment is a problem of the past. But we know how to measure it, and within limits we know what to do about it. It is to the problem of our age.

FIGURE 1. WELFARE DEPENDENCY RATES OF CHILDREN BY RACE PROPORTION OF CHILDREN

RECEIVING A.F.D.C. PRIOR TO AGE 18 1967-69 (ACTUAL)

White15.7

Black72.3

But now a new issue has arisen. The issue of dependency, the growing number of children born to single parents and dependent during childhood on, well, "the Social Assistance State." In 1965 in America, I published the first data that suggested that we might be moving into such an era, one in which destitution in childhood, relatively independent of economic forces, would be our principal social problem ("A Family Policy for the Nation," America, 9/18/65). This was, I believe, a new proposition. I think it important that it arose in the context of research on the "earlier" problems of unemployment, wages and hours, and suchlike matters. In brief, the policy planning staff of the U.S. Department of Labor came upon indications that the connection between child welfare and the workplace was breaking up. Earlier, when unemployment had dropped, new welfare cases dropped. No longer. Seemingly, dependence was an independent variable, possible out of control.

This seemed especially so among minorities, a proposition I took to President Lyndon B. Johnson, who said as much in an address at Howard University in 1965. The President's analysis, however, was rejected. People said it wasn't so, and we could not prove otherwise. In truth, nothing much had yet happened. We had these indicators, but no more. And so we had to wait for the answer, or at least an approximate answer. We now have it. We were right.

Specifically, we now know that of children born in the years 1967-69, some 22.1 percent were dependent on welfare (Aid to Families With Dependent Children) [A.F.D.C.] before reaching age 18. This breaks down to 15.7 percent for white children; 72.3 percent for black children. In his 1965 address at Howard, President Johnson had stated: "Probably a majority of all Negro children receive federally-aided public assistance sometime during their childhood." This was from my first draft of his address. So much for the charge that we were being alarmist. (See Figure One.)

This is as far as our longitudinal data take us. We KNOW about the life experience of that cohort in its first 18 years, those years having now passed. What about the cohorts that followed? We don't finally know, but we can make an educated guess. The data tell us that children under the age of 8 were, on average, 36.8 percent more likely to have been on A.F.D.C. in the 1970's than their predecessors in the 1960's. If we assume that this same increase will show up for the whole of the 18 years (0-17), then we can project rates for children born as late as 1980. This gives us a white rate of 22.2 percent, and a black rate of 82.9 percent. (The latter would seem too high, and is of course only a projection. Still, we face the daunting possibility that five in six minority children are destitute and on welfare by age 18. See Figure Two.)

This surely raises the issue of social justice; if, that is, it can be shown that such destitution in childhood is, in the main, a debilitating event. Not for each individual, but generally speaking for a class of individuals. Lawrence M. Mead of New York University believes this to be so. In THE NEW DEPENDENCE POLITICS he writes: "The inequalities that stem from the workplace are now trivial in comparison to those stemming from family structure. What matters for success is

not whether your father was rich or poor but whether you had a father at all."

### III

Now this would appear to be a new social condition. Nearly one third -- 30.2 percent -- of all children are paupers before attaining their majority. Not a pretty word; but not a pretty condition. That is in fact what it means to be on "welfare." No income of your own and virtually no possessions. This rise in dependency has been paralleled, preceded may be the better term, with a rise in out-of-wedlock births. For 1988 the overall ratio was 25.7 percent, which breaks down into 17.8 percent for white births and 63.5 percent for nonwhite. There are now health districts in New York City where more than 80 percent of live births are out of wedlock.

There has also been a rise in asocial behavior. by the 1980's it was common to hear of "children having children." In the 1990's we begin to hear of children murdering children, as firearms have moved into urban neighborhoods and down the age scale. This, too, was forecast. In the 1965 article in America I wrote:

"From the wild Irish slums of the 19th-century Eastern seaboard, to the riot-torn suburbs of Los Angeles, there is one unmistakable lesson in American history: A community that allows a large number of young men to grow up in broken families, dominated by women, never acquiring any stable relationship to male authority, never acquiring any rational expectations about the future -- that community asks for an gets chaos. Crime, violence, unrest, disorder -- most particularly the furious, unrestrained lashing out at the whole social structure -- that is not only to be expected; it is very near to inevitable. And it is richly deserved."

This year, in a superb preface to BEYOND RHETORIC: A NEW AMERICAN AGENDA FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, the Final Report of the National Commission on Children, its distinguished chairman Senator John D. Rockefeller IV wrote: "Too many of today's children and adolescents will reach adulthood unhealthy, illiterate, unemployable, lacking moral direction and a vision of a secure future. This is a personal tragedy for the young people involved and a staggering loss for the nation as a whole. We must begin today to place children and their families at the top of the national agenda... Many young people believe they have little to lose by dropping out of school, having a baby as an unmarried teenager, using and selling dangerous drugs, and committing crimes. When they lack a sense of hope and the opportunity to get a good job, support a family and become a part of mainstream adult society, teenagers are frequently not motivated to avoid dangerous or self-destructive behaviors. These youth can see few compelling reasons to avoid or delay activities that provide immediate gratification. Unfortunately, their actions often make their expectations a self-fulfilling prophecy."

Note the shift in terms. We are not talking about unemployment here. We are talking of children who come of age "unemployable." We are not talking of the blameless victims of impersonal market forces. We are talking of adolescents "lacking moral direction." We are not talking of

the need for social security programs; we are talking of the youth who have no "vision of a secure future."

It would be fair to say that our analysis of 1965 has finally been accepted. But it would be equally fair to ask whether it is as yet agreed that we are dealing with something NEW. The National Commission Report is long -- 519 pages -- on prescriptions for expanded government programs, but short on analysis. Warily, the report does tell us that matters are worsening. "In 1960 only 5 percent of all births in the United States were to unmarried mothers; in 1988 more than 25 percent were." But it does not tell us whether in the view of the Commission a fivefold increase represents a qualitative change. Rather, it is as if we are being told that unemployment in the coal fields, in the textile towns, is worse than ever. BUT, the same subject as of old. The question whether a new social condition has appeared in simply not addressed.

Figure 2. WELFARE DEPENDENCY RATES OF CHILDREN BY RACE PROPORTION OF CHILDREN

RECEIVING A.F.D.C. PRIOR TO AGE 18 1980 PROJECTED

White22.2

Black82.9

This is in no wise intended to fault the Commission's work. It is simply to assert that this question has to be addressed. HAS a new social condition appeared? Is something [\*S12867] new going on? Are we missing something large?

As an example, in February 1991, some months before the National Commission report appeared, the Senate Democratic Caucus had approved a legislative program entitled, "Strengthening America: The Democratic Agenda." A section on children included this passage: "There are some 64 million children in the United States. At current dependency rates, 16 million or one-quarter, will be on welfare before they have reached the age of 18... Children now make up the largest proportion of poor persons in the United States. There is no equivalent in our history to such a number or such a proportion.

"All this is new. This circumstance did not exist during the era of the New Deal, a half century ago. It did not exist during the era of the Great Society, a quarter century ago. It marks the emergence of a new issue in social policy. The issue of dependency."

However, before the document was sent to the printer, the "error" was spotted by the Committee staff. The text that read: "This circumstance did not exist during the era of the New Deal, a half century ago. It did not exist during the era of the Great Society, a quarter century ago," was changed to read: "This circumstance was NOT AS RECOGNIZED during the era of the New Deal, a half century ago, nor during the era of the Great Society, a quarter century ago" (emphasis added).

As I had written that passage, I asked about the change. It became transparently clear that those responsible had simply thought they were correcting a mistake. This is becoming the liberal orthodoxy: that there IS nothing new. It is not, come to think, so very different from the views of those in the 19th century who, on observing an industrial

society all around them, could not conceive that society had changed to the extent that institutions needed to change as well. Thorstein Veblen called it "culture lag."

If Veblen has a successor today, in stature as in style, it is James S. Coleman, also at the University of Chicago. Mr. Coleman traces our present situation back to the emergence of the corporation in medieval Europe and its gradual displacement of kinship structures. "The central fact about the modern corporation...is that it is not an outgrowth of the family, but constitutes an alternative institutional structure, independent of the family and little by little drawing power and strength away from it." He notes that only about 20 percent of 19th century American households were without children under 18; this proportion is now something like 65 percent. Thus, raising children is now carried out with the incomes of a minority of adults. Child welfare becomes a minority interest. Before the transformation of society represented by the rise of the corporation -- in this respect think City of Detroit no less than General Motors -- "the family was the central institution of society on which all others were built, and children were part of that center, both an immediate economic asset and an investment for the future. Now that the transformation is largely complete, the family is a peripheral institution and children an economic burden on that periphery. An economist might describe the change as one in which children have become a public good -- and, as with all public goods, this one presents a problem of who will pay the cost of supplying it. Children are not, I should note, an economic burden, a public good, for all segments of society. By a perverse twist of incentives, children are an economic asset at the lowest economic level, through the welfare support they make possible."

Let us return one last time to those hapless young staffers on the Democratic Policy Committee. Had they been checking a text that proposed that the problem of AIDS "did not exist during the New Deal," they would not for a moment have been disposed to change this to "not as recognized." AIDS appears in the 1980's. (It was first recorded by the Centers for Disease Control in 1981.) Had the text read that the problem of "crack" cocaine "did not exist during the era of the Great Society," there would have been no disposition to correct that either. (The "crack" epidemic first broke out in the Bahamas in 1983.) What, then, is the problem with recognizing that our present plague of illegitimacy, welfare dependency, child disorders and youthful violence is also discontinuous? Part of the difficulty is that it isn't exactly. In his introduction to RECENT SOCIAL TRENDS (1933), an early and still unequalled Federal social survey, C. Wesley Mitchell wrote: "Society has three problems which have existed throughout all history -- poverty, disease and crime." Fair enough. But what I argued in 1965 was that we were about to ascend a giant S curve, to the point that what had been familiar and quiescent would soon be something altogether new. Like a cobra, springing up, prepared to strike.

It seemed to me then that there would be a more or less coherent response. The America article began: "The United States is very possibly on the verge of adopting a national policy directed to the quality and stability of American family life." In this I was quite wrong. We did nothing of the sort. The evidence was rejected as inconclusive or worse. It is still rejected in the sense that orthodox opinion rejects the notion that there is anything qualitatively

different about the present, insisting instead that the Federal Government simply do more of what we have been doing.

Enter John Paul II asserting that what we have been doing is precisely the problem. We have been creating the "Social Assistance State" which has led to "a loss of human energies and an inordinate increase of public agencies." Not to mention "an enormous increase in spending." Well, now.

What we have here is a considerable role reversal. A century ago, addressing the social question of that time -- it was called The Social Question -- the church called for more intervention by the state. Now it appears to be saying that state intervention has to some extent created or at least worsened the social problems of the present age. This is high irony. For most of those 100 years, certainly the first 50 or so, liberal opinion in the United States simply ASSUMED the hostility of Catholic social teaching to, well, "liberalism." (We have to assume that President Roosevelt did not in fact read RERUM NOVARUM.) But all of a sudden it may be that the Catholic teaching in this area is IN FACT opposed to liberal opinion.

The intriguing part of all this, of course, is that the papal pronouncement has American fingerprints all over it. It would be well for those involved to come forward, and it would help if Rome let it be understood that to do so is not only acceptable but necessary. How so? Because the argument must proceed from evidence. There are natural law elements in the encyclical. We are told to distinguish between the society and the state; fair enough. We are reminded again of subsidiarity, which again has doctrinal sources. (Not least the ecclesial sanction of Edmund Burke!) But this is a matter for social science as well, and we have a right to hear the complete argument.

Further, we need to learn from these American Catholics whether THEY think something new is going on. This may just be a fixation of mine, but I cannot puzzle my way out of it. If there is a new social circumstance, then, for example, there is no "contradiction" at all between the two encyclicals. The industrial economy that RERUM NOVARUM describes continues, but the enormous dislocations of the past have been quite overcome. Is it possible that some general theory will come along that will tease out the sources of welfare dependency and get this problem back down to an acceptable level as Keynes did with unemployment? A reassuring thought, actually.

So much for the long run. For purposes of the short run it may be useful to note that in 1988 Congress enacted the Family Support Act, the first change in the welfare system since it was established as a Federal program in the midst of the Great Depression. In recent Senate testimony Judith Gueron, president of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, described the legislation: "The vision of welfare reform that we see reflected in the F.S.A. [Family Support Act] is of a 'social contract' between poor parents and government, in which each party has responsibilities. Parents -- both mothers and fathers -- have the responsibility to contribute to the support of their children to the best of their abilities and to engage in activities designed to improve their self-sufficiency. The responsibilities of government are to provide the means for poor

parents to become self-sufficient -- such as employment services and supports -- and to provide income when their best efforts fall short."

It remains to be seen whether the Family Support Act will be made to work. It is, in any event, only one of many measures that will be called for if, as is at the very least likely, the issue of dependency becomes the central issue of social justice in the next century. Come to think, millennium!

#### STATISTICAL NOTE

Regarding the charts, in 1968, the Office of Economic Opportunity provided funds for the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (P.S.I.D.) at the University of Michigan. Under the direction of Dr. Greg Duncan, this longitudinal study that began with 5,000 families and has since been expanded, makes possible a statistically sound measurement of welfare dependency over time. At the joint request of the Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy of the Senate Committee on Finance and the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services, the P.S.I.D. researchers developed the figures reported on pages 134 and 135 and reflected in Charts 1 and 2. The data are contained in a memorandum from Greg Duncan, Terry Adams and Deborah Laren, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, to Bill Prosser, Department of Health and Human Services, Aug. 24, 1990. The information had been requested by Senator Moynihan in a letter of Sept. 18, 1990, to Jo Anne Barnhart, assistant secretary for Children and Families.

- - -Births to unmarried women as a percentage of all births, 1988 --

All races, State rankings

[Nationwide: 25.7 percent]Percent

- (1) D.C.61.7
- (2) Mississippi37.6
- (3) Louisiana33.5
- (4) Maryland32.6
- (5) New Mexico32.3
- (6) South Carolina30.3
- (7) New York30.1
- (8) Georgia29.6
- (9) Illinois29.5
- (10) Florida28.7
- (11) Arizona28.7
- (12) California28.6
- (13) Alabama27.9
- (14) Tennessee27.6
- (15) Delaware27.1
- (16) Pennsylvania26.5
- (17) Arkansas26.5
- (18) Ohio26.4
- (19) North Carolina26.3
- (20) Missouri25.0
- (21) New Jersey24.3
- (22) Connecticut23.8
- (23) Virginia23.8
- (24) Oregon23.6
- (25) Alaska23.4
- (26) Rhode Island22.9

(27) Indiana22.7  
 (28) West Virginia22.7  
 (29) Oklahoma22.4  
 (30) Washington22.3  
 (31) Massachusetts22.2  
 (32) Hawaii22.2  
 (33) Kentucky22.0  
 (34) Wisconsin21.9  
 (35) Michigan21.6  
 (36) South Dakota20.9  
 (37) Montana20.8  
 (38) Maine20.3  
 (39) Texas19.7  
 (40) Colorado19.6  
 (41) Nevada19.1  
 (42) Vermont18.6  
 (43) Minnesota18.3  
 (44) Nebraska18.1  
 (45) Kansas18.1  
 (46) Iowa17.7  
 (47) Wyoming17.2  
 (48) North Dakota15.6  
 (49) New Hampshire14.4  
 (50) Idaho14.1  
 (51) Utah11.7

[\*S12868] Source: Monthly Vital Statistics Report, National Center  
 for Health Statistics, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

PERCENT OF BIRTHS TO UNMARRIED WOMEN BY RACE, 1988: CITY RANKINGS

[(National average, cities of 100,000+: white -- 24.9 percent; black --  
 68.1 percent) (National average, 1987: white -- 23.6 percent; black --  
 66.7 percent)]1988 (percent)1987 (percent)

WHITE n1 -- HIGHEST

(1) Hartford, CT58.560.7  
 (2) Bronx, NY50.051.9  
 (3) Newark, NJ42.042.0  
 (4) San Bernardino, CA39.637.0  
 (5) New Haven, CT39.331.4  
 (6) Los Angeles, CA38.436.6  
 (7) Pueblo, CO38.132.6  
 (8) Bridgeport, CT38.016.1  
 (9) Springfield, MA37.735.4  
 (10) Paterson, NJ36.536.6  
 (11) Gary, IN36.437.8  
 (12) Fresno, CA35.933.7  
 (13) Jersey City, NJ35.532.8  
 (14) Providence, RI35.233.1  
 (15) Baltimore, MD34.733.1  
 (16) Manhattan, NY33.834.7  
 (17) Cleveland, OH33.831.1  
 (18) Syracuse, NY33.235.1  
 (19) Santa Ana, CA32.930.4  
 (20) Detroit, MI32.629.1

BLACK -- HIGHEST



- (1) Peoria, IL83.580.5
- (2) Baltimore, MD82.680.5
- (3) St. Louis, MO80.779.2
- (4) Rockford, IL80.377.6
- (5) Syracuse, NY79.378.6
- (6) Milwaukee, WI79.378.1
- (7) Chicago, IL79.077.3
- (8) Springfield, IL78.974.2
- (9) Pittsburgh, PA78.877.4
- (10) Philadelphia, PA78.878.2
- (11) Louisville, KY78.877.8
- (12) Cleveland, OH77.777.1
- (13) Toledo, OH77.075.6
- (14) Dayton, OH77.075.6
- (15) Erie, PA76.975.5
- (16) Davenport, IA76.771.7
- (17) Paterson, NJ76.772.7
- (18) South Bend, IN76.576.7
- (19) Omaha, NE76.473.9
- (20) Cincinnati, OH76.474.2

n1 The category "white" includes most Hispanics.

Source: National Center for Health Statistics, unpublished data, obtained Aug. 16, 1990. Births to unmarried women as a percentage of all births, 1988 --

By race, State rankings

[Nationwide: White -- 17.7

percent; black -- 63.5 percent]

White -- Highest ratios: n1Percent

- (1) New Mexico27.0
- (2) California26.9
- (3) Arizona24.3
- (4) Oregon22.4
- (5) W. Virginia21.0
- (6) New York20.7
- (7) Maine20.3
- (8) Washington20.1
- (9) Rhode Island19.4
- (10) Vermont18.5

White -- Lowest ratios: n1

- (1) Alabama10.6
- (2) Utah10.8
- (3) Mississippi11.4
- (4) N. Dakota11.6
- (5) N. Carolina11.7
- (6) Georgia11.9
- (7) S. Carolina12.4
- (8) Michigan12.4
- (9) Louisiana12.9
- (10) Hawaii12.9

Black -- Highest ratios:

- (1) Wisconsin76.5
- (2) Illinois75.3
- (3) Pennsylvania75.2
- (4) D.C73.2

(5) Missouri71.5  
(6) Ohio71.5  
(8) Indiana69.1  
(9) Nebraska68.3  
(10) Tennessee68.3  
Black -- Lowest ratios:  
(1) Hawaii15.3  
(2) N. Dakota16.8  
(3) Maine20.0  
(4) S. Dakota20.5  
(5) New Hampshire27.5  
(6) Alaska28.5  
(7) Wyoming37.0  
(8) Montana37.2  
(9) Vermont38.2  
(10) Utah47.2

nl The category "Whites" includes most Hispanics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has raised the issue about whether it is appropriate for the Federal Government to fund research on human sexual behavior. It seems ridiculous to me that we are arguing about this today in our country when we face unprecedented rates of teenage pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, and AIDS. We can only combat these public plagues on our society, and health threats, with knowledge about what people do, why they engage in risky behavior, and what can potentially be done to prevent it.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina read aloud several questions from the teenage survey. I also understand that these questions were removed from the survey 2 years ago.

I just wonder what the purpose was. Did the Senator wish to shock people into voting with him, or was he hoping that this, maybe, was just some disinformation, because these have been removed? When the teenage pregnancy rate is at an all-time high, when the rates of STD's are climbing, we need solid, scientific evidence of what to do about these trends.

Opponents of this kind of scientific research argue that to study sexual behavior is to encourage it. By now, we all know this is just plain bunk. Pretending that controversial behavior does not exist, or lecturing people not to engage in risky behavior, does not work. It is just plain not so. For years, we have been funding programs that encourage abstinence as the only approach to addressing teenage pregnancy. We have learned from evaluations of these abstinence-only programs that they do not work. There is no scientific evidence that abstinence-only programs reduce the rate of teenage pregnancy.

Yes, we hope people will abstain and will be better people in their total lives for having maybe done so, but it is not the way society is. It is not reality. What we have to deal with, in this body, is the

reality of how we deal with a growing public health problem that is destroying our future. What is our future? Our children.

So why waste any more money on programs that do not work. Let us invest money in basic research. That is what we are talking about, basic research that will get to the root of why risky behavior continues. What we need is solid, scientific behavioral, and social research to complement the already advanced biomedical research of the NIH.

If my colleagues choose to shut their eyes to the real health problems of America, that this kind of research addresses, and vote in support of the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, then the future of our Nation is very bleak. Disease will continue. Teenagers will be irreparably injured and we will not know how to confront the problem.

This is the last time we should debate this issue. If we care about our Nation, then we must ensure continued Federal funding for important scientific research on public health implications of sexual behavior. We need this kind of information now because the health and lives of our young people depend upon it.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment of Senator Helms which would transfer funds to the Adolescent Family Life Program.

I finish by quoting from a letter from a public health official in my State:

If the Helms amendment were passed, we would have to continue "flying blind", basing sexually transmitted diseases and AIDS interventions on inadequate data.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article in USA Today dated July 26, 1991, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[\*S12869] [From USA Today, July 26, 1991]

REJECT PRUDERY; TEEN SEX SURVEY NEEDED

A handful of politically potent prigs are treating a major public health problem like a dirty joke.

Secretary of Health and Human Services Louis Sullivan gave in to ideologies who objected to questions about sexual practices in a five-year survey of adolescent sexual behavior and killed funding for this worthwhile effort.

He may have killed more than a study. Ignorance about the risks our young people are taking can cost lives.

The goal of this study was to discover not just what teens are doing but why. Why are they putting themselves in danger of AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases and unwanted pregnancy at younger ages and in greater numbers? What influences do family values have on their decisions? What part do school, peers and the community play?

If this misplaced prudery prevails, we'll never know. Many, like the writer across the page, think that's just fine. They're content with the current state of knowledge and don't want to spend government money to learn more.

This is a dangerous advocacy of ignorance.

Many questions that raised objections had been dropped from an early draft. Three-quarters of the questions were not about sexual practices. Each of the 24,000 teens answering the survey would do so with parental consent. Parents would answer separate questionnaires.

These days, a teen who is careless with sex risks far worse consequences than parental disapproval.

AIDS cases among teen-agers in the United States have increased about 40% in two years, which means that there are now thousands infected with the deadly virus. Other data tells us that awful number is bound to grow:

Half of girls have had sex by age 17; half of boys by 16.

Only one-third of boys always use condoms.

Nearly 80% of boys and 50% of girls age 18-19 switch partners within 12 months.

That's a recipe for disaster for our young people.

AIDS is just one of the diseases that can wreck their lives; they're also in danger of infections that can cause sterility and pregnancy that can put them on welfare. Fifty-nine percent of women who were receiving welfare in 1988 were age 18 or younger when they first gave birth.

If these grim facts are going to change, we have to learn more about teen behavior. What encourages teens to take such risks? What would persuade them to avoid those risks?

Secretary Sullivan should heed the House vote late Thursday affirming such surveys. What better use for public money than buying a tool to save young lives?

What we choose not to know can ruin their lives -- or kill them.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there are no further requests for debate and there has been an agreement on the yeas and nays.

So I would move at this time, Mr. President, to table the amendment provided that the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator withhold at this moment.

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.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I wonder if I might inquire of the majority leader if there is a possibility of limiting amendments on this bill. I do not mean limiting anybody, but saying there are so many amendments left. Otherwise, I know my colleagues, when it gets to be 6, 7 o'clock tonight, are going to wonder why they are still here.

One way to prevent that is to go ahead and get the amendments and get them debated. I thank the majority leader for trying to protect a Member on this side who is absent until 6 o'clock. Then we can start voting.

I want to help the majority leader, if he has any ideas on how I can do that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I discussed earlier this morning, and more recently, with the distinguished Republican leader my desire to proceed to complete action on the pending bill. I will, of course, as always, endeavor to accommodate those Senators who are, by virtue of emergency, unable to be here at certain times.

We have now been on the bill for 3 1/2 hours today, and we have not been able to get to a vote for that reason. But it seems to me that the fair and yet responsible way to proceed would be to prepare a list of those amendments that do remain, identify them, limit consideration to those amendments, obtain time agreements for their consideration, and then have the votes later today at a time when all Senators can be present.

The alternative to that is that we will simply be here again late tonight, doing that which we could have done throughout the day. Of course, Senators will be inquiring why it is that, once again, we are debating at 9, 10, 11 o'clock in the evening after a day without any votes having occurred.

So I inquire of the Republican leader -- I am advised that the Democratic staff has prepared a list of all of the amendments to be offered on the Democratic side, and that they are three in number, and that we are prepared to enter into an agreement. I am advised that there are three on the Republican side. And if we could identify them in the next few moments and reach agreement on a reasonable time for debate on those, and then stack the votes at a time when all Senators can be present, we will achieve both effective utilization of the Senate's time and accommodation of the Senators who, by virtue of an emergency, have not been able to be present.

Mr. DOLE. I will be happy to try to get a list on this side. Hopefully, they will not all require rollcalls. Maybe we can get short time agreements so that we might complete at an early hour this evening.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, might I ask then that, it now being 2:05, since I think both sides have gone through this process, if we could ask the staffs in the next 10 minutes to prepare such a list, and I will come out at that time -- and I hope the Republican leader will be present -- and propound a request to get an agreement on that basis so that we can proceed.

There are only two alternatives to it. We can proceed one at a time, move to table the pending amendments, and vote on them now, or end up doing that at some late hour this evening, to the inconvenience of a very large number of Senators.

So I hope we can reach agreement on that. And I will, therefore -- so those Senators who have an interest in this will have an opportunity to come to the floor at approximately 2:15 -- propound such a request to see if we can get an agreement on that basis.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARKIN. We have an amendment pending now. And I think all debate has been finished, and we can proceed right now to a vote on Senator Helms' amendment. I believe all debate has been finished.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator from Iowa was not present during the earlier part of this conversation. One of the Republican Members of the Senate has been, by virtue of a personal emergency, called away and is not present.

They are making an effort not to have votes at this time. I am trying to accommodate that by getting an agreement that will enable us to complete the amendments and the bill, and stack the votes at a time when everybody can be here. I am trying to avoid the situation that we do not do anything now.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kerrey). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I have an amendment that we set-aside until 1:45. I ask unanimous consent -- our staffs are still trying to work it out -- that that be set-aside until 3 o'clock.

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

.....

Congressional Record -- Senate

Thursday, September 12, 1991;  
(Legislative day of Tuesday, September 10, 1991)

102nd Cong. 1st Sess.

.....

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the only remaining amendments in order to this bill, other than the pending Helms amendment No. 1114 and the excepted committee amendments, be the following, that they be considered under the time limitations listed and that the time be evenly divided and controlled in the usual form:

.....

Further, that there be 5 minutes for debate remaining on the pending Helms amendment No. 1114, that there be 10 minutes for debate remaining on the bill; that once this agreement is agreed to, all committee amendments be agreed to en bloc with the exception of the pending committee amendment and two additional committee amendments, one beginning on page 9 and one beginning on page 60; and that following the disposition of any second-degree amendments to these excepted committee amendments, the committee amendments be deemed agreed to, as amended, if amended, without further debate.

.....

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not plan to object, I would like one clarification or two. On the pending amendment by Senator Helms, No. 1114, I wonder if the majority leader would include in that, to be disposed of by a tabling motion.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HELMS. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. HATFIELD. I suggested that the pending Helms amendment, at the expiration of the time, it would be disposed of by a tabling motion.

Mr. HELMS. I say to the Senator, I would much prefer an up-or-down vote, but a tabling motion is the very same thing. The people of this country understand that it is a distinction without a difference and a difference without a distinction, but that would be satisfactory with me.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I so modify my request.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, further clarification, I would also suggest that on the second Helms amendment relating to Pell grants that that be disposed of, at the expiration of the time, by a voice vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I do not believe that is appropriate to include in a unanimous-consent agreement. This agreement does not require a rollcall vote.

If we get to that amendment and there is no demand for a rollcall vote, then it can be disposed of without a rollcall vote. I do not believe it appropriate to attempt to include that in the agreement in advance.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished leader would permit me to request a brief quorum call so I could speak with him?

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

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.

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

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, the distinguished managers of the bill.

I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, would I be correct that the pending business is the amendment by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The amendment is under a time agreement.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment.

Would the Senator wish to speak? There is 5 minutes, I believe.

Mr. HELMS. I was just asking if the Senator would withhold so I could speak for about 3 minutes?

[\*S12874] Mr. MOYNIHAN. Yes, sir, of course. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, there were very few Senators on the floor this morning during the debate on the pending amendment. So, obviously, Senators cannot possibly know much about it. I think the best illustration I can offer for what the amendment is about is to ask informally that I be permitted to place a copy of the sex survey questions, on both the Democratic and Republican tables.

The material is not prepared by me. It is a photocopy of a few of the actual survey questions so that Senators may at least look at them.



Furthermore, I would just say in connection with this, that for any Senator who may not feel that the sex surveys are all that bad, I hope they would at least glance at the questions. It might turn their stomachs a little, but I think they ought to know what I am talking about. I am not going to read any more questions. I read just two this morning and that was quite enough.

The point is this: Title X is the planned parenthood title. Title XX is the only Federal program that seeks to persuade young people that sexual activity before marriage should not occur. We have only one program. Both title X and title XX have been authorized. But in this bill, only title X has been funded. I propose to transfer the money from the sex surveys and put it into title XX so that title XX will not become extinct.

I hope Senators will have an opportunity to give some thought to that.

I thank the Senator for withholding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, in the spirit in which the distinguished senior Senator has spoken, I would like to say the same, and appeal to colleagues on both sides of the aisle -- this is hardly a matter of partisanship -- to understand that the work that is contemplated would be, among other things, the first serious, systematic effort to learn the fertility history, both of adult women and of adult men, at a time when one child in four in our country is born out of wedlock. In the Senator's State 1 in 4; in mine, 3 in 10; in some cities, 7 in 10; in some groups, 6 in 10.

Across the Nation, this is a wholly new experience. In the past 30 years the illegitimacy ratio in our country has grown from 5 percent to 26 percent. The Canadians have something of the same experience. Other nations, such as Great Britain, as well.

This is not an understood phenomenon. It is new. It is at the base, almost surely, of most of what we call the social problems in our country.

This is a responsible effort by mature demographers, social scientists, trying to get a record of an unprecedented experience for the Nation. It is serious work today -- social science on a new subject of the utmost gravity. I cannot suppose that we will not let the National Institute of Child Health and Development go forward with this study at the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago.

So, Mr. President, I respectfully move the amendment be tabled.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I believe, Mr. President, the votes have been delayed to a later period in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The vote will occur later today.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Chair.

.....

Congressional Record -- Senate

Thursday, September 12, 1991;  
(Legislative day of Tuesday, September 10, 1991)

102nd Cong. 1st Sess.

137 Cong Rec S 12886

.....

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to table the Helms amendment occur at 6:30 p.m.; that the time between now and then be equally divided and controlled in the usual form for further debate on the Helms amendment; that upon the disposition of the Helms amendment, the Senate proceed without any intervening action or debate to third reading and to vote on final passage on the pending bill; and that it now be in order for me to ask for the yeas and nays on the vote on final passage.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now request the yeas and nays on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, Senators should therefore now be aware that there will be two rollcall votes beginning at 6:30 p.m.; one on the motion to table the Helms amendment, then following disposition of the Helms amendment a vote on final passage of the bill. Immediately thereafter, the Senate will proceed to consideration of the Interior Department appropriations bill, and I will have a further statement to make with respect to the schedule at that time.

I thank my colleagues.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FORD. Will the majority leader withhold.

Mr. MITCHELL. I withhold my request.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, one of the amendment that was not included in the unanimous consent was an amendment that I wanted to bring up this evening on this piece of legislation as it related to Medicaid and the new regulations that have been promulgated by HCFA that will go into effect on January 1, which would cause a great deal of hardship as it relates to Medicaid payments within many of our States. Two hundred seventy thousand underprivileged and those in poverty in my State receive help as it relates to health care.

Under the legislation that we passed, that OMB has now set some figures on, it came out of Congress with CBO figures, but once it becomes law the OMB figures are used. They are now increasing -- from \$500 million to \$1.5 billion, now \$2 billion it is going to cost the Treasury. And, of course, if it is scored that way, it would mean we would have to have a sequester, and none of us want that at the end of the fiscal year.

There will be a colloquy between the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Finance Committee, and myself that will accompany this piece of legislation and it will be offered, hopefully, before final passage of the legislation.

Some of my colleagues have been interested in moving forward with this amendment. I think it has a sufficient number of votes to pass, probably pass overwhelmingly. But under the circumstances with the scoring that OMB now said they will use, it means a sequester on all domestic programs, and I do not think any of us want to be placed in that position. It is another way to eliminate help for the underprivileged and those in poverty by the administration.

I regret it very much and look forward to the colloquy and maybe a stand-alone piece of legislation that we could pass out of the Senate and send a message before we leave for the year.

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

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. FORD. Yes.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 1114, AS MODIFIED

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the situation. I have been in an Ethics Committee meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is there is a motion to table the Helms amendment that is to be voted on at 6:30. Between this time and 6:30 the floor is open to the Senator from North Carolina. Thereafter, there is a vote on final passage.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair. Does that mean that I have 5 minutes or 4 minutes?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. May I share one of those?

Mr. HELMS. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I might respond, the agreement provided that the time would be equally divided on the two sides, whatever time remains.

Mr. HELMS. I see.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator would be entitled to half the remaining time and Senator Moynihan the other half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this point Senator Helms has 2 minutes, 30 seconds, and the opposition has 2 minutes, 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I have moved to table the resolution of my friend

-- --

Mr. HELMS. I did not realize that. I thought the Senator was going to speak. I hope he will withhold. In any event, I do not think it would be in order for him to so move until time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, time is to be divided equally between the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from New York. The Senator from New York is to be recognized for 2 1/2 minutes. The Senator from North Carolina is to be recognized for 2 1/2 minutes. Then there will be a vote on the motion to table.

[\*S12890] Mr. HELMS. I see. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as I said, I have moved to table this amendment for the simple reason that the issue before us is a survey of reproductive, procreative patterns in men and in women, adult, of course, at this time. It is to be carried out by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago by distinguished social scientists, people who work with the National Research Service, Professor Gagnon, for example, of the State University of New York.

The issues are pressing. The area is one of surprisingly spare knowledge. We need to know more about how, when, why children are born, why the processes proceed, and particularly we need to know more about the large, growing number of out-of-wedlock births in our country. They are now at 26 percent of all live births, 5 times the rate of 1960.

In one generation we have seen this extraordinary increase. In some cities, Baltimore, for example, the rates approach three-quarters, in

some groups three-quarters, in Senator Helms' State, 26 percent of births, which is the average for the Nation, in my State 30 percent, varying among our States, varying in the world. Japan has 1 percent.

This is something we need to know more about, learn in a dispassionate, scientific survey. That is what will go forward and that is why we hope in the bill, the managers will be allowed their wish and the administrations' wish that the National Institute of Child Development will be able to do this work.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I thank the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Glenn). The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 2 1/2 minutes.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I do not question the statistics. I think they are correct as given by Senator Moynihan. The point is that the present policy of this Government is to encourage young people to think that sex before marriage is OK just so long as it is "safe sex."

However, the Federal Government has one, just one, small program -- title XX -- that promotes delaying sex until marriage and it is that one small program, which is not funded in the underlying bill.

Mr. President, for those Senators, if any, who may think that the sex surveys which we discussed in detail earlier are not all that bad, I am going to send down to the Republican desk several copies of some of the questions. I ask that they be available for Senators on both sides of the aisle to read what the American taxpayers are being required to finance over the will and judgment of Secretary Sullivan.

I am not going to read any of the questions because I do not want to be responsible for putting such language in the Congressional Record. But I say again, any Senator who strongly supports these studies should be willing to at least take a look at what we are talking about so that the public can see what they are being required to pay for.

The bottomline is that under the present system we are encouraging teenagers, whether we intend it or not, to engage in sex just so long as it is "safe sex." On the other hand, the only Federal program, the only activity in the Federal Government, that pleads with young people to abstain from sexual activity until they are married is title XX -- and the pending bill does not fund it.

I think the Federal Government ought to fund title XX and that is the purpose of the pending amendment.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, this amendment creates for me a difficult choice. It is unfortunate that the limitations of the budget forces us to choose between two worthwhile measures.

The Adolescent Family Life Program is a valuable addition to the compliment of sex education and pregnancy prevention programs funded by the Government. I think the outreach to adolescent males this program has provided is especially important.

However, I strongly disagree with the Senator from North Carolina's characterization of the studies sponsored by the National Institute of Child and Human Development. His characterization of these surveys is wrong, misleading, and malicious.

I am surprised that the Senator is so out of touch with his own constituency at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill that he is quoting questions that were deleted from the survey 2 years ago. Considerable effort has already been spent to develop the questions in these surveys, and that development is continuing at the University of North Carolina and the University of Chicago.

The surveys the Senator attacks have been endorsed by the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Sociological Association, and 30 other national health and scientific organizations.

The surveys the Senator calls unscientific have been reviewed by some of the finest minds in the United States. I suggest that those scientists are better able to judge the scientific merit of these surveys than is the U.S. Senate.

We look back at the days of the Scopes monkey trial with embarrassment. And yet we are moving dangerously close to the same intellectual climate where unpopular ideas are shouted down or made illegal.

As I said at the outset, the Adolescent Family Life Program is a valuable program and deserves funding. It can stand on its own merit. We do not need to cloud the issue with misinformation about valuable and much needed research. If we must choose which of these programs to fund let us do so on the merits.

On one hand we have a set of surveys that are needed to guide policy formation for the prevention of adolescent pregnancy and the spread of sexually transmitted diseases. We are now making policy using data that is 40 years old.

On the other hand we have a program that will add a unique and valuable dimension to the programs of Federal sex education.

I understand that this amendment is expected to pass overwhelmingly. I urge my colleagues to work in the conference committee to see that both the AFLP and the NICHD surveys are funded.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Under the previous order we move directly to the vote on the motion to table.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced -- yeas 34, nays 66, as follows:

(See [Rollcall Vote No. 188 Leg.]

So, the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 1114), as modified, was rejected.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GRAMM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

[\*S12891] The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment (No. 1114), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GRAMM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT ON PAGE 25, LINES 5 THROUGH 8, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment on page 25, lines 5 through 8, as amended, is agreed to.

#### HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I would like to engage my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], in a colloquy regarding a provision in the pending bill (H.R. 2707). Specifically, my concern relates to title II, making appropriations for Health Resources and Services.

I understand that the provision appropriates funding for the creation of an Office of Adolescent Health within the Department of Health and Human Services. The appropriations bill for that Department specifies that \$2 million should be used to establish this office. Would the distinguished Senator please clarify the proposal further? I am particularly interested in hearing more about the source of funding, and whether the Senator contemplates permanent funding of this program. More specifically, would the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant [MCH] Program, authorized by title V of the Social Security Act, be the source of the funding? And is the \$2 million seed money intended to initiate the effort only, or is the use of title V funds in the nature of a long-term commitment?

Mr. INOUE. I would be pleased to answer my colleague's questions. The source of the funding for an Office of Adolescent Health would be the Federal portion of the title V program used for conducting Special Projects of Regional and National Significance ("SPRANS"). I view the \$2 million as seed money to assist the Department in developing a plan for a Federal role in addressing the needs of adolescents.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the Senator. I also would appreciate further clarification about the provision in the appropriations bill.

It is my understanding that the intent of the provision is to make funds available for an Office of Adolescent Health in anticipation of authorizing legislation. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. INOUE. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. BENTSEN. Since the source of the funds to create the Office of Adolescent Health is the SPRANS portion of the MCH Program, and since the MCH Program is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance, I would be interested in knowing whether the Senator contemplates asking the Committee on Finance to authorize the new program.

Mr. INOUE. Certainly, I would be pleased if the Committee on Finance would consider authorizing an Office of Adolescent Health under title V of the Social Security Act. I would like to point out, however, that I am not necessarily seeking the creation of such an office, per se. The appropriations provision is intended to catalyze the Department of Health and Human Services to focus on the topic of adolescent health, and to develop a coordinated, systematic effort in this area. It is not essential to this end that a new bureaucratic entity be created at this time.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the Senator for clarifying that. Is it correct to assume that the Senator expects that the Department's efforts in this area be directed by the Maternal and Child Health Bureau within the Health Resources and Services Administration? I believe it is especially important to clarify this point in light of current reorganization efforts within the Department of Health and Human Services.

Mr. INOUE. I agree with my colleague and can affirm his assumption that I expect the Maternal and Child Health Bureau to oversee the Department's efforts to develop a systematic approach to addressing the health care needs of adolescents. And, if an Office of Adolescent Health is established, I would expect that office to be created and administered under the auspices of the bureau.

Mr. BENTSEN. I appreciate my colleague's assistance in clarifying this provision and I commend his efforts to get the Department to develop a systematic approach to adolescent health. I, too, am interested in the special health care needs of adolescents, and would be pleased to consider authorizing an Office of Adolescent Health within the Maternal and Child Health Bureau.

My colleague from Hawaii has long been a leader in attempting to improve the delivery of health care. And as one of the principal requestors of a study on adolescent health by the Office of Technology Assessment [OTA], he has already demonstrated his concern for adolescents. I joined him in requesting this important work. Unfortunately, the OTA study indicated that many of our Nation's teenagers suffer serious health care problems -- such as chronic physical illness or substance abuse -- that too often go unattended. To help ensure that older children and adolescents have access to the care they need, I authored a provision that was included in last year's budget act which expands the Medicaid Program to cover all children under age 19 with incomes below the Federal poverty level on a phased-



in basis, so that all teenagers will be eligible for Medicaid by the year 2002.

Thus, I agree with my colleague that it would be reasonable to consider the creation of an Office on Adolescent Health which can guide Federal policy on the provision of health care to adolescents. Given the Maternal and Child Health Bureau's expertise in addressing the health care needs of special populations, it is entirely appropriate to consider creating and administering such a program under the auspices of the Maternal and Child Health Bureau.

.....

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read for a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass? On this question, the [\*S12899] yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced -- yeas 78, nays 22, as follows:

(See [Rollcall Vote No. 189 Leg.]

So, the bill (H.R. 2707), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SPECTER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer [Mr. Glenn] appointed Mr. Harkin, Mr. Byrd, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Bumpers, Mr. Reid, Mr. Adams, Mr. Specter, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Rudman, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Gramm of Texas, and Mr. Gorton conferees on the part of the Senate.

YEAS -- 34  
AdamsAkakaBentsen  
BingamanBradleyBurdick

ChafeeCohenCranston  
DeConciniDoddGlenn  
GoreHarkinInouye  
KennedyKerryLautenberg  
LeahyLevinLieberman  
MetzenbaumMikulskiMitchell  
MoynihanNunnPell  
RiegleSanfordSarbanes  
SimonWellstoneWirth  
Wofford  
NAYS -- 66  
BaucusBidenBond  
BorenBreauxBrown  
BryanBumpersBurns  
ByrdCoatsCochran  
ConradCraigD'Amato  
DanforthDaschleDixon  
DoleDomeniciDurenberger  
ExonFordFowler  
GarnGortonGraham  
GrammGrassleyHatch  
HatfieldHeflinHelms  
HollingsJeffordsJohnston  
KassebaumKastenKerrey  
KohlLottLugar  
MackMcCainMcConnell  
MurkowskiNicklesPackwood  
PresslerPryorReid  
RobbRockefellerRoth  
RudmanSasserSeymour  
ShelbySimpsonSmith  
SpecterStevensSymms  
ThurmondWallopWarner  
YEAS -- 78  
AdamsAkakaBaucus  
BentsenBidenBingaman  
BorenBradleyBreaux  
BryanBumpersBurdick  
BurnsByrdChafee  
CochranCohenCranston  
D'AmatoDanforthDaschle  
DeConciniDoddDole  
DomeniciDurenbergerFord  
FowlerGlennGore  
GortonGrahamGrassley  
HarkinHatfieldHollings  
InouyeJeffordsJohnston  
KassebaumKennedyKerrey  
KerryKohlLautenberg  
LeahyLevinLieberman  
LottMcConnellMetzenbaum  
MikulskiMitchellMoynihan  
MurkowskiNunnPackwood  
PellPresslerPryor  
ReidRiegleRobb  
RockefellerRudmanSanford  
SarbanesSasserSeymour

ShelbySimonSimpson  
SpecterStevensWarner  
WellstoneWirthWofford  
NAYS -- 22  
BondBrownCoats  
ConradCraigDixon  
ExonGarnGramm  
HatchHeflinHelms  
KastenLugarMack  
McCainNicklesRoth  
SmithSymmsThurmond  
Wallop