

coming days because it is time for the House to appoint conferees, time for a conference, time to have a line-item veto. I want to find out who is interested in producing a line-item veto versus who is interested in providing pork. If we are interested in the line-item veto, and I am—and I guess I voted for it 15 or 20 times in my career—I hoped when I voted for it in March we would not be debating in July whether or not we are going to have a line-item veto. Some apparently have decided to move into slow motion here while there is a Democrat in the White House. That is not the way the line-item veto works. And while we see headlines that say "Gingrich Gets \$200 Million in New Pork," I would ask, where is the line-item veto?

Pork is bipartisan and done on a bipartisan basis. I would like to have a line-item veto in the hands of Democrat or Republican Presidents to address it. If someone has some notion of where this bill is or what is holding it up, maybe we can find out if we can get a line-item veto in the hands of this President before these appropriations bills get to the White House.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANTORUM. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. SANTORUM. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

#### WELFARE REFORM

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to continue a forum that we started here as the 11 freshman Republican Members of the 104th Congress to talk about the issues that were important to us during the campaign that are now coming to the floor of the Senate and give a perspective of those who are more freshly from the hustings to the Senate and to the people listening.

Today, the issue that we are going to discuss—and I know the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Missouri, has been an outstanding advocate in his short tenure in the Senate on this issue—is welfare reform. Senator ASHCROFT served as the Governor of Missouri for 8 years and instituted welfare reform and has been a tremendous advocate for really dramatic reform in the States.

Later today, Senator ASHCROFT, along with Senator GRAMM, Senator GRAMS, and others, is going to have a press conference to discuss a version that we are going to put forward which I believe, of all the bills that have been introduced to date, both in the House and the Senate, is probably the most dramatic, the most forward looking, the most flexible, and the most mean-

ingful welfare reform package that has been put forward. When I say meaningful, I mean meaningful to the people who are in the welfare system or who may find themselves at some future time being caught in that net.

We believe this is a dramatic departure from business as usual, and it is something I am very excited about. I have worked on the welfare reform issue as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee and chaired the Republican task force last session of Congress to come up with a Republican welfare reform bill. We worked 9 or 10 months in extensive meetings and came up with a bill—it was included as part of the Contract With America—called the Personal Responsibility Act. That formed the basis of the bill that was eventually passed, H.R. 4, by the House, and what we have done really is take that product and taken it one step further and allowed more State flexibility, more local experimentation.

One of the provisions that is in the bill that I am very proud of that the Senator from Missouri was the author of is a provision that says that community organizations, local community organizations, nonprofits, churches could actually be the welfare agency in a local community, really get back to what we know works. And what we know works in dealing with the problems of poverty are people who are in the community, who care about the people that they are serving, not someone hired from the State capital to monitor caseload, but someone who lives next door, who goes to the same church as the person who is going through the difficult time in their life.

Those are the kinds of really dramatic reforms that are in the Gramm bill that we are going to be introducing today. And I am excited about it. I think it is a good mark. It shows where we want to be ultimately on the issue of welfare reform: Multiple block grants, some flexibility within those block grants to allow States to deal with emergencies or an increase in maybe the number of people who need nutritional assistance, so they can move from one fund to another maybe people—there is an increasing surge in day care requirements. The same thing allows that kind of flexibility for the State to be able to move funds around from account to account. I think that is an important change. Again, the Senator from Missouri was the one that put forward these ideas. So I am excited about that bill.

Let me say that I do not think that is where we are going to end up. That is where I would like to end up. So I am on the bill. That is where I would like to end up. That is where I would like to see somebody come down and say, this the way we should go, this is the dramatic step forward we should take.

But just like the House where there were bills that were introduced that were more dramatic than was passed, H.R. 4, I think we will have to come up with a more modest approach if we are

going to get the 60 votes required to pass a welfare reform bill in this body. And I am confident we can do that.

I am, also, at the same time—having worked with Senator ASHCROFT, Senator GRAMM, and others, working with Senator PACKWOOD, Senator DOLE, and others—trying to come up with a bill that we can form that takes, hopefully, a lot from the Gramm bill, but reaches across to try to get Members who may have concern about providing too much State flexibility, too much local control and provide some sort of compromise that can get the required votes to pass this Chamber.

I think this issue and the opportunity to make dramatic changes is here. And this issue is too important for us to hold out for the perfect solution. I think we need it out there as a goal. But at the same time I think we have to be practical and understand that we have to get what we can today. And if we can, as will be in the Packwood bill, also in the Gramm bill, is a block grant of the AFDC Program to allow States the flexibility to put forward their own plan for welfare recipients, to give them the opportunity to get into jobs, to get into job training, and put stiff work requirements, put a time limitation—those kinds of things that we know work in getting people off the welfare dependency cycle back into the mainstream of American life. Those are the kinds of things that we need to say, "States, do the innovation, do the work that is necessary for your individual States to be able to transition people off." We are going to give that flexibility, and in both bills.

That is only a small piece of the welfare pie, AFDC, what many people, certainly a lot on the other side, consider to be welfare. I think welfare is a much broader category. They say AFDC is the welfare program, Aid to Families With Dependent Children. If we can block grant that program, end the entitlement nature, end the dependency that results from someone being guaranteed money for doing things that, frankly, most people would say are not what we want them to do: have children out of wedlock, do not get a job, do not get job training, do not try to do anything to get yourself out. We will give you more money. I think that is a very perverse incentive. End that entitlement. Say that after a certain period of years, you cannot continue in this life. That we will help you but you must help yourself. It is a contract between those who want to help and those who are to be helped. That piece alone, if we can block grant that piece, send it to the States, give them the opportunity, with a string that says you have a 5-year limitation, you have to have a work requirement; if we can do that piece alone, I think we will make a major change in the lives of millions of Americans and give them the opportunity that they have not seen under this system, which is intended to be

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