

in both programs are the same. As States implement this new change in AFDC eligibility and benefit determination there are bound to be increases in errors of computation. It seems unfair to give an increased benefit—through the \$50 disregard—on one hand, and turn around and penalize States for errors made because they have had no time to accommodate changes made in this session of Congress, on the other hand.

Mr. President, I believe there should be consistency between the involved programs in the treatment of error rates. A chief cause of errors in AFDC and food stamps is, ironically, due to inconsistencies between the two programs in the treatment of the same income. While the \$50 disregard is not treated as income in the AFDC program, it is treated as income in the food stamp program. It must be factored in when determining food stamp eligibility and benefits. Errors are more likely to occur, since under prior law, child support payments were retained by the States as reimbursement for AFDC benefits and thus did not have to be taken into account.

Unfortunately, it is not the State workers who will ultimately be affected by sanctions; it is the children and families for whom the program exists. Sanctions mean loss of Federal revenue. Unless States can replace funds lost through sanctions, the intent of the Senate to provide higher benefits to welfare families through the \$50 disregard may have been in vain.

I intend to urge the Department of Agriculture to declare a 1 year moratorium for counting food stamp errors associated with implementation of the disregard for child support collections as the Secretary of HHS has said she intends to do.

I intend, also, to bring this matter up again in the next Congress.●

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

● Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, it is now clear that we will not have time this session to consider S. 2433, the Paperwork Reduction Act Amendments of 1984. This outcome is a considerable disappointment to me personally, as I believe that S. 2433 represents a good effort to strengthen an already successful law.

There has been some concern about the effect of this inaction on the workings of the Paperwork Reduction Act. Such concern is unwarranted, however. While S. 2433 would have made some valuable and needed improvements in the act, the act's provisions continue in full force and effect.

Some confusion has arisen about this point because the act authorized appropriations only through September 30, 1983. OMB has continued and will continue to pay for the operations of the act under its general appropriation, however.

Since the act was passed, nearly 500 million hours of annual paperwork

burden on the American public have been eliminated. Calculated at \$20 an hour, that amounts to a tax cut of \$10 billion.

The analogy, I might add, is a fair one. Reporting and recordkeeping requirements cost the public—in real dollars and in lost time that otherwise could be used productively—many billions of dollars each year. OMB estimates the current inventory of paperwork requirements at more than 2 billion hours annually. Again using the \$20-an-hour measure, that works out to a \$40 billion annual burden on the public—one that surely could be cut further.

S. 2433 would direct OMB to continue its efforts to cut. The bill would require OMB to set annual goals reducing paperwork by 5 percent for each of the next 5 years. This 25-percent cut would eliminate another 500 million hours—another \$10 billion—of annual burden.

S. 2433 would authorize \$39 million for this program over the next 4 years. It would make crystal clear the fact that all Federal paperwork requirements are covered by the act. It would improve congressional oversight of the program, by requiring Senate confirmation of the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs and by requiring additional annual reporting by the Office of the use of its funds and the implementation of its programs. It would increase public access to the regulatory process by making draft regulations available to the public. And it would enhance the Federal Government's ability to adapt to the information age by merging the Federal telecommunications fund and the automatic data processing fund into a new information technology fund.

S. 2433 floundered, in my judgment, because certain interest groups did not want the Congress to reemphasize the applicability of the act to reporting and recordkeeping requirements contained in existing rules. They raised a number of chimerical bugaboos to make their point and to persuade some Members of this body to block consideration of the bill, while they evaluated the arcane procedural questions involved. The committee addressed these concerns during its markup of the bill, in the committee report, and ultimately in a procedural amendment. However, the clock kept ticking, and we were never able to proceed with floor action. With more time, I believe, the outcome would have been different, and I am hopeful that the outcome will be different in the 99th Congress.●

AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, on October 3, the Senate passed S. 999, the American Conservation Corps. I joined the Senator from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, by cosponsoring

this legislation when he introduced it in 1983. I am very pleased we have passed this bill.

The idea embodied in S. 999, to put our young people to work on projects for public improvements, is not new. In the 1930's, President Roosevelt created programs to employ our young people to construct public works and make other improvements. S. 999 will likewise give our young people vital work experience while improving our natural resources. It will provide assistance for unemployed youth to work on soil conservation, urban revitalization, and flood control projects.

Unemployment among young people in our cities is still tragically high. Estimates are that fully one-half of black teenagers cannot find work. S. 999 promises to provide not only work, but an educational experience for participants.

All over the Nation we see the lasting value of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. Rare is the area not touched by a CCC project. The projects undertaken by the American Conservation Corps promise similar benefits.

Mr. President, alumni of the old CCC have been some of the most vocal supporters of this legislation. This bill was brought to my attention by New Jersey Assemblyman George Otowski, who introduced legislation to establish a State Conservation Corps in New Jersey. Mr. President, I am pleased to note the passage of this important legislation.●

TITLE V—H.R. 6163— GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

● Mr. DOMENICI. Would the Senator from Kansas please explain how title V of H.R. 6163, as passed by the Senate, will effect Government-owned laboratories that are operated by contractors.

● Mr. DOLE. The answer to this question has three parts.

First, Public Law 96-517 gave nonprofit organizations the right to own inventions made with Government R&D funding. That law included, however, an exception allowing the Government to retain title to inventions made by the nonprofit contractors of Government-owned laboratories. In the main, this bill removes that exception and allows nonprofit contractors to own their federally funded inventions regardless of whether they are made at their own or Government-owned facilities.

Second, most Federal agencies that have nonprofit organizations operating their laboratories have not been using the Government-owned, contractor-operated [GOCO] exception and are allowing the contract operators to own their inventions. The Department of Energy, however, has made a blanket use of the GOCO exception, so the bill will primarily effect the nonprofit DOE lab operators. For profit contrac-