

occurred on May 24 and 25 was inconclusive. The second meeting on July 11 and 12 produced an acknowledgement, finally, of a glimmer that says, yes, there is a problem, and suggested there were prospects for eventual solutions, but without sufficient urgency, in my opinion, to curtail the massive loss of U.S. industry and jobs that is now going on in this country.

More than 10 years ago I organized congressional opposition to this persistent, recurring problem. And I say this morning to the Canadians, down the road from this Capitol, turn up the volume on your television set if you are watching C-SPAN2 at this moment, because in the Canadian Embassy you are about to begin to work once again, because we are going to put you to work, as this country speaks out for its forest products industry and the men and women who work for it. We will no longer allow this loophole to exist in the United States-Canadian Free-Trade Agreement.

I have sent letters to the administration urging a quick and permanent solution to this problem. And I must say at this moment, Ambassador Kantor, your lip service does not answer very well the concerns of the men and women in Idaho and across the Pacific Northwest that are losing their jobs.

A third United States-Canadian lumber consultation panel is to meet in September. This meeting must accelerate and complete efforts to produce a concrete framework for permanently reforming Canadian pricing schemes in order to eliminate the subsidies provided to the Canadian producers.

So in conclusion, Mr. President, I hope this problem will be resolved quickly, jointly between the United States and Canada in their negotiations. Frankly, I would prefer if that were to happen. But if it does not happen, this is one Senator who will rally other Senators and Members of the other body to resolve this problem legislatively like we had to do in the late 1970's. And to our Trade Ambassador, Ambassador Kantor, go to Canada in September and work to resolve the issue. Lip service no longer serves well the unemployed men and women of the forest products industry.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

#### FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Mr. President, today's debate over reforming the welfare system is a debate over the values we hold most sacred as Americans. We prize independence over servitude, personal accountability over irresponsibility, hard work over Government handouts. A welfare system

that works ought to embrace those values, inspire people to seek the freedoms these values represent, and help them lead a better life.

And yet, the Democratic system imprisoned over 20 million needy Americans since the 1960's. Instead of bringing families together, America's welfare system tears them apart. It encourages dependency, it subsidizes illegitimacy. And the people who benefit most from the present system are not the underprivileged Americans who need it, but the bureaucrats who run it. And it is time for a change.

With the welfare reform legislation being debated in Congress, we at last have an opportunity to change 30 years of failed policies. We are determined to replace the old system for one simple reason; and that is, it does not work.

Over the last 30 years, since the beginning of the War on Poverty in 1965, American taxpayers have spent more than \$5 trillion on 79 different means-tested welfare programs. And what have we accomplished with their sizable investment? Not enough, because the poverty rate has remained constant. Federal, State, and local governments combined are now spending \$350 billion every year on welfare benefits. That is nearly 40 percent more than we spend on national defense each year.

If the Senate's welfare reform proposals were signed into law today, we would still spend nearly \$1.2 trillion in welfare over the next 5 years. Anyone on Main Street will tell you that that is an awful lot of money. And it is all funded by the taxpayers. And I believe \$1.2 trillion is a sufficient amount of taxpayer dollars to accomplish our goals of the next 5 years. And anyone who does not believe that this is enough, well, they spend too much time inside the beltway. Just look at the hard-working men and women of Minnesota who hand over more than a third of their paychecks to Washington.

Last fall Republicans pledged to use the American taxpayer dollars more efficiently and more effectively. And reforming the welfare system is part of our effort to keep that promise. Our goal in the Senate is to truly end welfare as we know it. We must change the priorities that this country places on welfare and emphasize personal responsibility. We must include tough work requirements for welfare recipients. We must give States the power to develop policies which make both parents responsible for their children and eliminate benefits for drug addicts and alcoholics.

We must give block grants to the States and put an end to the role of the Federal Government as a barrier in the welfare reform experimentation. States should begin the freedom, unhindered by the Federal bureaucrats in Washington, to implement innovative reforms. And we must give State governments the flexibility that they need to customize programs to address local needs, because State officials, not

Washington bureaucrats, know best how local welfare dollars should be spent efficiently.

State and local communities will finally be given the flexibility that they need to customize their welfare programs to best meet the needs of their citizens.

It was President John F. Kennedy who once said:

Welfare programs must contribute to the attack on family breakdown and illegitimacy.

Unless such problems are dealt with effectively, they fester and grow, sapping the strength of society as a whole and extending their consequences in troubled families from one generation to next.

And I agree.

This legislation makes a first step in this direction by overhauling 6 of the Nation's 10 largest welfare programs. And this will save the taxpayers approximately \$70 billion over the next 7 years. Now we will require able-bodied welfare recipients to work 20 hours a week. Welfare recipients will no longer be able to endlessly job search and then count that as work. Under the Dole-Packwood bill, work is work. In addition, the bill would require 50 percent of a State's welfare caseload to be working by the year 2000.

This bill will no longer give welfare recipients more food stamps if their cash assistance is lower because they have refused to work. In addition, the bill requires States to meet a minimum paternity establishment ratio of 90 percent. Now welfare recipients who refuse to cooperate in paternity establishment will have their benefits withheld.

Another significant change this bill will make is that drug addiction and alcoholism will no longer be considered a disability for the determination of supplemental security income. Taxpayers will no longer be required to pay for an individual's drug or alcohol addiction.

The Dole-Packwood bill will deny welfare benefits to illegal aliens and also impose a 5-year lifetime limit on welfare benefits. And I commend Senator DOLE for these very, very important steps.

One element of the bill that I am particularly proud of is the adoption of an amendment that I proposed with my friend and colleague from Alabama, Senator SHELBY, our pay-for-performance amendment that will require States to pay benefits to welfare recipients only for the number of hours worked.

If a welfare recipient refuses to work at all during the required 20-hour work-week, they would receive no benefits for that week. If they decided to work only 15 hours instead of the 20 hours required, they would receive welfare benefits for 15 hours' worth of work.

Now, Mr. President, this amendment which has been included in the leadership amendment will hold welfare recipients to the same employment

standards as the rest of America's work force. You will be paid for the amount of hours you work, no more, and no less.

Now, Congress has no intention of turning its back on the most needy in this country. We simply want to try a new approach, an approach that creates opportunity and offers a hand up and not just a handout, an approach that is just as fair to the taxpayer as it is to the welfare recipient.

Truth be told, the only people who will be turned out on the streets by welfare reform are the thousands of bureaucrats and lobbyists who administer and protect the current welfare system's complex maze of dependency.

And maybe those who are bilking the system of millions, if not billions, of dollars each year—those who enjoy taking hard-earned money from taxpayers—maybe they have forgotten that taxpayers in Minnesota would like to keep their dollars and use them wisely for their child's care or their children's education.

Again, \$1.2 trillion over the next 5 years is a major commitment by America's taxpayers. Amazingly, however, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will argue that \$1.2 trillion is not enough, that America's taxpayers should pay more.

I disagree. I believe taxpayers have been generous, but now they have had enough of these failed policies which have produced little return for their investment, policies that have only created more dependency and have not solved any of the problems we face. Taxpayers have paid more than their fair share, and as an advocate for America's taxpayers, I am prepared to be their voice in this debate.

We have witnessed the attacks over the last few months organized by the entrenched bureaucrats, the special interest lobbyists for the taxpayer-financed welfare industry, and the liberal activists who oppose any welfare reform.

We have been subjected to the orchestrated campaigns of these opponents of change, these jealous defenders of the status quo.

They continue to distort the truth and misrepresent our intentions.

They cry that changing the welfare system is dangerous and it is cruel, that Republicans will take food out of the mouths of starving children. But I believe that nothing could be more dangerous or cruel than letting the current system remain.

The American taxpayers must look beyond the scare tactics, the rhetoric, and focus on the facts. The facts are reducing bureaucracy, increasing flexibility, and demanding work from those who are capable of working is an investment in our future—in their future—and both welfare recipients and taxpayers will be better off for it.

Welfare, as it was originally envisioned, was meant to be a temporary safety net for those who had fallen upon hard times, not a permanent

hammock that coddles them into lifelong dependency. The American people are calling for a new vision that will make this country better, stronger, in the year 2000 and beyond.

To the liberals, the solution to the welfare problem is the same solution they have turned to over and over again for the past 30 years.

Whenever they have faced a fiscal crisis, their answer has always been to raise taxes on the middle class. That is what they have done each time the Medicare trustees warned that Medicare was facing bankruptcy. And that is how they would have us fix welfare, give away more of the taxpayers' dollars.

That makes the liberals feel good to take away people's money, to fund programs of their choice, so they appear righteous—but what does that do to middle class Americans?

This Congress is not going to raise taxes.

This Congress is not going to ask the taxpayers to finance these fundamental changes to the welfare system. Instead we are going to ask more from the welfare recipients, and I believe that is a fair deal.

After all, the taxpayers have supported the failed status quo for far too many years. And with little but a bloated bureaucracy to show for it.

For those reasons, I am proud to be cosponsoring the Dole welfare reform bill to change the status quo, to protect hard-working, middle-class taxpayers, to lift people out of the vicious cycle of dependency, to truly end welfare as we know it.

As Oklahoma Representative J.C. WATTS has stated so well:

We can no longer measure compassion in this country by how many people are on welfare. We need to measure compassion by how many people are not on welfare because we've helped them climb the ladder of success.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join my efforts to offer opportunity to all Americans by fundamentally reforming our failed welfare system and providing a fair deal to the taxpayers and those who receive the taxpayers' earnings.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, we have an informal arrangement alternating side by side, but no Democratic Member on this side is seeking recognition. I am happy to hear from the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, in the mid-1960's, this country declared war on poverty. It was done with the greatest conviction, the greatest sense of purpose that Americans carry forward to all of our enterprises. It was sincerely and honestly believed that through Government action at the Fed-

eral level we could not only declare war on poverty but that we could beat poverty, that we could end it in this country.

Ironically, today we spend in Federal programs almost enough that if it were divided among all the poor in this Nation there literally would be no one in poverty. We are not quite to that point, but it is very close.

But obviously, all that money does not go to eliminate poverty. As a matter of fact, to our great chagrin, poverty has increased, not gone down. The number of people in poverty in this country has increased dramatically, even as we have added programs. It does not mean that our effort, our humanitarian effort, was not well intended, but it does mean that the program did not meet the objectives we set forth.

Part of the money we spend, obviously, goes to administer it. Is it too much? Perhaps. But I think the problems go further. In thinking about ending poverty, we forgot about the most important factor of all, and that is ministering to the human spirit and providing opportunity and incentive for people to change their lives. What we have done, tragically enough, is create a system that at times made things worse, not better.

For some people, we have locked them into poverty, we have literally made them financially unable to get out of poverty. We provided incentives to stay in poverty and penalties for getting out of poverty. That is what this welfare reform is all about: Finding a better way to help people realize their abilities and their opportunities and the potential for their own lives. We must understand that incentives, rewards and initiative have to be recognized in any program that helps people.

Mr. President, I look forward to participating in this historic debate. I am confident that together both parties will fashion a bill that will make a dramatic difference not only in our welfare system but in improving the lives of the poor of this Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

#### ACCOUNTING STANDARDIZATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, it may shock many Senators to realize that the largest single enterprise in the history of the world does not have a uniform accounting system. Perhaps that is not on the top of your list to worry about today, but let me tell you why it is important.

The U.S. Government has a \$2 trillion cash flow. It has 900 million checks issued each year. It has a payroll and benefits system for 5 million employees. It has over 1,962 separate budget accounts. It has though, incredibly,