

compassionate but is nothing but destructive to millions of lives, families, and communities across America.

We have that opportunity today. I think we can get 60 or more votes for that provision. We should go as far as we can. We should try to do more. We should do food stamp reforms. I would like to see a block grant for food stamps. I do not know if we can get a block grant for the Food Stamp Program. If we can get major reforms that came out of the Agriculture Committee that require work for people who are on food stamps, that get rid of a lot of the waste and fraud that encourage electronic benefits transfer, which is being used just north of here in Maryland and other places, in isolated programs, for example, in Berks County in Pennsylvania, using the debit card as opposed to a food stamp. It cuts down tremendously on fraud. We need to encourage that for States to be able to do more of that, to reduce the amount of food stamp fraud, which I know is a very sensitive issue among millions of Americans who see the fraud every day at the grocery store.

Those are the kinds of things that we can and should debate here on this floor. And I am hopeful that we can bring a bill—I want to doff my cap to the majority leader for his courage in setting forth the last week of the session before the recess to do welfare reform so that we can come here and have a great debate before we get into the reconciliation process after we come back, but have a debate focused solely on the issue of welfare reform. Many have encouraged the majority leader to just fold welfare reform into reconciliation and consider it all one big package. I think that is a mistake. I do not think it gives welfare the kind of focus that it deserves in changing America.

So I appreciate the opportunity to come here and talk about this. I want to again congratulate the Presiding Officer for his tremendous work on this issue. And I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

#### WELFARE REFORM, NOT REFORMATORY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all, before my colleague leaves, we come here to speak on the floor and we have other engagements. Let me just say to him that I think we are totally in agreement on the need for a full discussion and debate. Hopefully, it will be one that is done with a considerable amount of substance and grace and dignity on welfare. I do think it would be a mistake to fold this into a reconciliation bill because I think whenever you are considering such a major departure from public policy—and this is a major departure of public policy—it is a mistake to fold it into the reconciliation bill where you really

do not have the opportunity for the debate and discussion.

I say to my friend from Missouri that, if he is going to speak in morning business, I would really prefer to let him have the time, so I will just take 2 minutes rather than taking up the rest of the time for now. I do think there are a couple of things that concern me about what is called welfare reform.

First of all, I want to make sure it is not reformatory as opposed to reform. It seems to me real welfare reform enables a family—and in the main we are talking about women and children—to make the transition from welfare to workfare. Now, we have been talking about that for a long time. Actually, Franklin Delano Roosevelt talked about that in 1935 when what we now know as the AFDC Program was introduced as a part of the Social Security Act.

The problem is when we talk about moving to workfare as opposed to welfare, it is very difficult to have any welfare reform unless, in fact, there is affordable family child care. I mean, it is very difficult today for a single parent. Almost all of these single parents are women. In some ways I wish more were men. And I wish there were less single parents, period, No. 1; and, No. 2—and I think the Chair and I agree on this—men took more responsibility. But if we are going to say to a single parent, “You need to work,” there are a couple of critical ingredients to make sure this is real welfare reform and not reformatory. One is for especially smaller children, that there is affordable child care. That is not done on the cheap.

I know that in Minnesota, one of the problems that we have run into—and I think we are doing a really good job on welfare reform—is we have long waiting lists. As a result of that, many of the mothers that you talk to cannot make the transition to work because they simply cannot afford or find—not custodial—but developmental child care for their children.

A welfare family is not 1 mother and 10 children. We are usually talking about one mother and two children.

I will be done because I do not want to take the time away from my colleague from Missouri and we will have plenty of time for debate on this.

The second point is the one we talk about all the time, which is we have to somehow figure out where health care reform fits into this, because all too often what happens is a single parent goes back to school, a mother goes back to school, a community college, maybe then finishes up at the University of Minnesota, then tries to get a job. The Washington Post had a very, very good portrait about this. What happens is, you are no longer receiving Medicaid, you are paying child care, and if you look at the wages that are out there for jobs, you are behind. So we have to make sure that, in fact, families are able to make this transi-

tion without punishing families. So I think the health care reform piece is critically important.

Finally, I think this is a challenge for all of us. I think it goes well beyond welfare reform policy. We really need to look at the fundamental question of standard of living in this country and the squeeze on the vast middle class and what has been going on for the last 15 years, plus—I am not pointing the finger in any party direction—and I think the overwhelming challenge is to have an economy that produces good jobs that people can count on. I think that has to be part of welfare reform as well, so a mother has a job that pays a wage, has benefits on which she can support her children. I think we need to look at these much more carefully.

I could say more. I will not. My colleague is anxious to speak. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The Senator from Missouri.

#### RESTORE HOPE AND OPPORTUNITY

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, it is true that there is a broad consensus that people understand what we have attempted to do with our welfare system has been a failure. If you want to see what our current Washington-based, one-size-fits-all welfare program has done, to see how the perverse incentives of the welfare system have failed, I guess you could go just a couple blocks from here. There you can see a generation raised by welfare and fed through food stamps, but literally starved of nurture and hope. You will meet young teens in their third pregnancy. You will meet children who not only do not have a father, but they do not know any other child with a father. These are tragedies of the current system, and these are the realities against which reform must properly be judged.

There has been a great deal of reporting recently on divisions in our discussion on welfare. I would like to make something as clear as I possibly can. While it may have taken us some time to reconcile our differences in terms of the strategy that we have, we have never forgotten the horror of our current system, we have never disagreed on our fundamental values, and we have never wavered from our central commitment, and that is to end the system of welfare we have now, to strengthen States and communities, to restore hope and opportunity to the millions of Americans for whom such words now are tragically words without definition or words without meaning.

I might add that it is important for us to understand that as well meaning as we might be in Washington in seeking to find a single solution to all of the problems that relate to the needs of people that would move them from dependence to independence, it would be inappropriate for us to try and find

a solution because there are lots of solutions that are going to be necessary, and no one garment will fit all children and no one vehicle will carry all loads and no single system imposed from Washington on this great Nation will be productive in moving people from the web of dependency to the opportunity of independence.

We really need for the creative capacity of the States, the innovation and the energy of people who are working to develop their own systems and the commitment that that investment in their own systems brings, to be allowed in a new system which would give States the opportunity through block grants to develop the strategies which will elicit the response among the citizens of the communities that those States represent.

So as we work together, and I am pleased to have had the opportunity to work with so many people in this respect, through vigorous discussions and the discussions I have had have been no more vigorous with anyone than those discussions which I have had with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania who inhabits the chair at this moment. But it is that kind of discussion, it is that kind of exchange, it is that kind of a collusion of ideas that provides the opportunity for the truth to emerge and for the real progress to be made.

In the weeks ahead as we debate welfare, it is my hope that this debate will serve as a trial. It should be a trial that will indict the abuses, the horrors, the lies of our current Washington-knows-best, one-size-fits-all perverse, incentive-laden system of welfare. It is my intention in the weeks ahead to try and ensure that an understanding of the current system happens so that we can avoid making the mistakes of the past over again. Someone much wiser than I has said appropriately that those who ignore history are destined to repeat it. Let us not be destined to repeat the horror of our welfare system.

Today, I just want to begin by talking about an incident that probably all of us remember, because we cannot forget. In February of 1994 in the process of a routine drug raid in Chicago, police stumbled upon 19 young children, some handicapped, living on dirty mattresses in an unspeakably filthy six-bedroom apartment infested with roaches and soiled with animal dirt.

The Chicago Tribune reported it this way:

The children of [six] mothers from [six] fractured families \* \* \* [were found] vacantly watching TV \* \* \* [and] fighting over the remains of a chicken bone that the family dog had eaten.

President Clinton said that the despair and wasted human potential within that one Chicago apartment was not merely a social problem from far off places like Calcutta, India, but the heart of a very domestic problem occurring in urban centers all around America.

Among the adults that lived in that apartment, more than \$65,000—more than \$65,000—per year was received annually in public assistance, aid that took the form of cash payments, food stamps, medical care. Somehow, some way that money was not having its intended effect.

A system designed with the best intentions, unfortunately is leading to the destination of the road paved with best intentions; a system designed with the best intentions is eliciting and encouraging the worst behavior; a system which built change of dependency rather than breaking shackles.

In that house, there were no fathers to be found, no hope to be found for anyone. This is a tragedy that happens all across America, and it is a tragedy of our current system.

So as I conclude, let me just say that as we consider welfare reform, let the true measure of our reform never be the dollars that we might save, or the bureaucracy that is cut, or the programs that are reduced. But let our measure of reform be found in the ability to move people from hopeless governmental dependence to hopeful economic and personal independence, from the grasp of a perverse system of Government programs to the embrace of the loving and caring communities and the limitless opportunities of America.

Mr. President, I thank you.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### WELFARE REFORM THE COUNTRY WANTS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I see morning business is about to be concluded. I want to make a couple comments about our subject of the day, the welfare reform the country so desperately wants.

The postelection survey showed that there are three major elements to the mandate of the election of 1994. They were: We want to do something to eliminate the deficits; we want to do something meaningful about regulatory reform; and we want real welfare reform.

Mr. President, I am very proud that we in this House, the Senate, and over in the other body, submitted and adopted a budget resolution that is going to end up eliminating the deficit by the year 2002. So the President could not veto it, or I am sure he would have. Nonetheless, I think we are on our way to fulfilling that mandate. Regulatory reform—we are working on that right now, and I think we will end up with a product by the end of the week in getting it out.

Welfare reform is more difficult, because it seems that everybody campaigns on it, until they get here, and then they do not want to do anything about it. The two most important points are the exploding welfare costs and the crisis of legitimacy. In 1935, when AFDC was enacted, 88 percent of

the families who received State cash relief were needy because the fathers had died. Benefits were intended primarily to enable the widow to care for her children at home.

Today, AFDC serves divorced, deserted, and never-married mothers and their offspring. Since the beginning of the program in 1965, in the last 30 years, State and Federal Governments have spent \$5.4 trillion on welfare, providing cash, food, housing, medical care, and social services. For the \$5.4 trillion spent since 1965, you could buy the entire industrial infrastructure of the United States—every factory, machine, store, every hotel, television station, office building, and still have money left over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The Chair advises the Senator that his time has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. I understand that. I ask for 30 more seconds.

Mr. DOLE. I will be glad to yield some of my leader time.

Mr. INHOFE. I will just conclude by saying that we have an opportunity to do something about this—one of the three major mandates of the election in 1994. It is incumbent upon to us do this. We have introduced legislation that will give true welfare reform and take the profit out of illegitimacy, and the people of America are demanding that we do it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

#### MID-YEAR REPORT—1995

The mailing and filing date of the 1995 mid-year report required by the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended, is Monday, July 31, 1995. All principal campaign committees supporting Senate candidates for election must file their reports with the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116. You may wish to advise your campaign committee personnel of this requirement.

The Public Records office will be open from 8 a.m. until 7 p.m. on the filing date for the purpose of receiving these filings. For further information, please do not hesitate to contact the Office of Public Records on (202) 224-0322.

#### THE PRESIDENT REQUESTS A DELAY ON BOSNIA VOTE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I noted that Senator DOLE was asked to delay a vote on Bosnia until some time next week, as I understand it. I will support Senator DOLE in whatever decision he makes. I understand that when the President of the United States asks for action to be taken that concerns national security, that request must be given great credence, and if Senator DOLE decides to delay that vote, I am sure that every Member of this body will support that decision.

If Senator DOLE decides otherwise because of events that transpire in