

[T]his proliferation of agencies occurred in response to security-related concerns which have since diminished or disappeared. Therefore, we are now encumbered by a plethora of programs which no longer are closely tied to, or clearly serve, U.S. national interests. . . . [The] origins of the agencies being considered for abolition are all rooted in a world which no longer exists.

And former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger—not known for “isolationist” tendencies—wrote,

What is needed is steadiness, coherence and precision in the articulation and implementation of policies. . . .

He went on to say:

Your proposal to abolish the Agency for International Development, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the U.S. Information Agency is a bold step in this direction by centralizing authority and responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs where it properly belongs—in the President's senior foreign affairs advisor, the Secretary of State.

Even current Secretary of State Warren Christopher reportedly made a similar proposal to Vice President Gore's “Reinventing Government” team. But, unfortunately, the Vice President chose to reject the Secretary's plan and, instead, capitulated to the cold war reactionaries in the administration who are intent on preserving their pet agencies at all costs.

Therefore, Mr. President, Congress must act responsibly with the taxpayers' money and do for the State Department what it could not do for itself. Rather than “micromanage” State Department reform, S. 908 preserves substantial flexibility for the President and the Secretary of State to determine its new organizational structure.

Given the complete lack of cooperation Congress has received on this issue from the administration, allowing such flexibility may be considered a “leap of faith.” However, I firmly believe Congress should guide and agencies should be expected to perform.

Above all, Mr. President, the heart of S. 908 must be kept intact. The consolidation of AID, ACDA and USIA under the State Department will end the current duplication of many functions and personnel.

As a result, S. 908 will save the taxpayers \$4.8 billion over 5 years according to the Congressional Budget Office. The international affairs budget must take its fair share of reductions to keep us on track to balancing the budget in 2002.

But I want to remind my colleagues that without the efficient and prudent savings in the State Department reorganization plan, cuts in foreign aid programs will have to be that much deeper.

Finally, I hope that this bill—combined with S. 961, the Foreign Aid Reduction Act—will encourage a comprehensive review of U.S. foreign aid.

We all know that foreign aid is held in low esteem by many Americans. Given the track record of AID and the minimal performance of some foreign

aid programs, this is hardly surprising. We must not abdicate our oversight responsibilities. By enacting the legislation before us today, we can begin rehabilitating foreign aid in the eyes of the American people.

Mr. President, we must ask ourselves: Do we really need a bureaucracy of 9,300 employees and contractors to manage foreign aid programs? There are 405 employees at AID's Egypt mission in Cairo alone. And it costs the taxpayers \$150,000 to \$300,000 a year—not counting salary—to station just one AID employee overseas.

We must focus our efforts on making sure that foreign aid actually reaches people in need rather than getting swallowed up by oversized U.S. and foreign bureaucracies.

I support an approach that conducts more of our foreign aid programs through non-governmental organizations and private voluntary organizations. These are groups that generally have much lower overhead costs than AID.

As we reevaluate foreign aid and demand that it become more accountable, more efficient and more effective, we must also examine the actions of those countries which receive taxpayer dollars.

Foreign aid cannot provide real, sustainable development unless recipient countries are dedicated to economic freedom and free-market reforms. To renew Americans' faith in foreign aid, we must show them proven results.

We cannot afford to run an international welfare program which subsidizes countries that show no progress toward economic self-sufficiency. Just like our broken welfare system at home, such a program will only encourage dependency and continue to burden the taxpayers for years to come.

In closing, Mr. President, S. 908 offers all Senators this opportunity: We have all talked a good game about eliminating agencies that are outmoded or inefficient. Now the question is can we actually do it.

I urge all Members to vote for S. 908, not just for the sake of eliminating three agencies, but because doing so will help ensure that America has the foreign policy tools necessary to take us into the 21st century.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I want to pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. He is one of the newer members on the Foreign Relations Committee. He is always there, and he has always done his homework. I congratulate him on his statement, and I thank him for his participation in the work of the committee.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I intend to speak on the foreign relations

proposal at a later time, but I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes in regard to the welfare situation.

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

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to speak this afternoon. The President of the United States is speaking about the welfare situation. He has promised to end welfare as we know it, and it is important, as we approach the debate on welfare in the U.S. Senate, that we thoroughly understand the condition in which we find ourselves as a result of 30 years during which Washington has dictated a radical theory of welfare on America's poor.

The theory is that bureaucrats in Washington are best equipped to solve the welfare problem. Since the mid-sixties, we have spent nearly \$5.4 trillion on welfare, and the theory that Washington knows best is as dead and as hopeless as many of the people it was intended to help.

Most of America realizes this. Many Members of the Senate realize this. But, unfortunately, it does not appear that the President realizes this. Today in Vermont, veiled in glorious rhetoric, President Clinton announced his intention, again, to end welfare as we know it. But he revealed his intention to expand welfare beyond what we have ever known.

Like so much with this administration's public policy, what sounds great frequently is different from what is reality. The old adage, “signal right and turn left,” has found new meaning in this administration. When you are riding down the highway and someone signals right and then turns left, it can be a very difficult and dangerous situation, and I am afraid that is what has happened here.

The reality of the Clinton plan is that it will result in more misery, more hopelessness, and more despair in America's poor. It will provide a boost to Washington's welfare establishment. The bureaucracy will burgeon. We need another way of helping the poor. It is a way which recognizes that the States have an opportunity, and should have an opportunity, to tailor welfare solutions to meet the needs of their citizens.

Last week, I spoke about Ariel Hill, a 5-month-old child, a victim of the welfare system. I am sure she would have said that we needed another approach to welfare. Today, I want to talk about another tragic story, another personal example of welfare's failure.

In the picture next to me is Ernesto Ventura, a 4-year-old child who was brutally abused and neglected by his mother. Though the crime was committed only a year ago, its roots began about 30 years ago at the beginning of

a cycle of dependency, a cycle of hopelessness and Government sanction, Government approval.

The story begins in the fall of 1968 when Eulalia Rivera left Puerto Rico and came to the Columbia Housing Project in Dorchester, an inner-city Boston neighborhood. Within weeks after arriving in Massachusetts, Eulalia went on welfare to support herself and her family. Her first check, instead of providing a solid foundation on which to build, became a milestone in her life, marking the first leg of a journey which has not ended to this day. "I remember the first check," Eulalia told a reporter for the Boston Globe. "It was for \$75 a month back then." The checks have never stopped and the hope has never grown.

Eulalia never left the housing project where she first lived, and in this place she raised 17 children, 14 of whom were still living as adults. Her daughter, Clarabel, has abused her son. Of these 17 children, almost none graduated from high school, and they have produced 74 grandchildren, many of whom entered the welfare system themselves.

As you can see on this chart, these are the children of Eulalia, and virtually all of them receive at least one form of welfare benefit: SSI, due to suffering from a nervous condition, also collects \$120 a month in food stamps; another child receives: Medicaid, subsidized housing, AFDC, food stamps; this child receives Medicaid, subsidized housing. Here is Medicaid, subsidized housing, food stamps, SSDI; food stamps, SSDI, AFDC. It just goes on in each of these cases. AFDC, SSI, Medicaid, subsidized housing, food stamps; AFDC, SSDI; AFDC.

This is the story of the intergenerational web, the lack of hope. Fifteen great-grandchildren now comprise the fourth generation of this welfare setting. The type of benefits received by the extended family are the alphabet soup of acronyms—all perfectly legal, and just as perfectly destructive to the human spirit. Many of Eulalia's descendents are considered disabled due to a medical condition diagnosed as anxiety attacks. SSI pays these individuals a monthly check in lieu of the jobs they are unable to perform. While interviewing Clarabel's family to find the motivation behind the tragedy of her son's abuse, a Boston Globe reporter found that the cycle continues, noting several school-aged children at home watching MTV at 1:30 in the afternoon.

Theirs is a family that has given up hope of finding jobs or receiving an education, a family caught in a system which rewards illegitimacy and discourages work. Their lives revolve around a monthly check, a dangerous public housing project, and empty dreams.

In the words of Robert Coard, director of the antipoverty agency Action for Boston Community Development:

This family is a classic example of a poverty-stricken class. They are the ones who have given up.

The tragedy of this story is perhaps most evident in Clarabel Rivera Ventura's life. At the time she abused Ernesto, she was 26 years old and pregnant, a mother of six, by five different fathers. Even her family is not sure about the identities of these men. "Oh, wow," her brother Juan told the Globe, "I have no idea." Eulalia gave the same answer. "I don't even know who they are."

A young woman caught up in the overwhelming system, Clarabel Ventura had no hope, no education, no prospects, and her will to improve her lot in life sapped by every check she received. Perhaps she looked to drugs as a way out.

Neighbors said that Clarabel sold food stamps and even the family's washing machine to get money to purchase crack—shouting at and striking her children in frustration, neglecting the needs of the children in order to serve her own addiction. Reportedly, Clarabel would send her children out alone after midnight to beg for money, cigarettes, and food from other residents in their housing project. Finally, something snapped. In a rage, Clarabel plunged 4-year-old Ernesto's arm into boiling water, severely burning him. It was nearly 3 weeks before she sought medical treatment for the wounds. When paramedics finally arrived on the scene, they found Ernesto in a back room on a bare mattress, smeared with his own blood and excrement. His mother, he said, had abused him because she was mad.

Government-sponsored poverty has a face, it has a soul, it has feelings and a body that can be hurt. Every day, children just like Ernesto suffer in an environment which Washington has created. They have no say. They cannot vote, they cannot read, they often are barely old enough to talk. But they pay the price of Washington's arrogant demand that the entire country run a welfare system in accordance with the bureaucrats' dictates.

The fact that welfare needs a major overhaul is beyond debate. Washington's one-size-fits-all bureaucratic micromanaged welfare system has failed, and failed miserably. Unfortunately, President Clinton's solution is nothing more than 1988 revisited, rearranging the deck chairs on the Welfare *Titanic*, just as Washington has done in prior attempts at reformation.

In 1988, Washington reformed welfare. The result has been an increase in spending for welfare programs of over 40 percent. We have more children in poverty today than when the war on poverty began. If there is anything we have learned, it is that no one solution from Washington has worked in the past or will work in the future.

We have a mandate from the American people to tackle the welfare issue head on. If Congress is going to be serious, we need to do more than reform the welfare system. We need to replace it. First, because one-size-fits-none, we need to stop the system as we now

know it. We need to transfer to the States, in a significant way, the opportunity to craft real solutions. Bringing the States, under the guise of waiving, to Washington, DC to gain the stamp of approval from this failed system is the wrong way of doing business and must be curtailed.

Second, Government and dollars alone will not solve the problem. We need to bring in nongovernmental, charitable organizations, and citizens to be a part of the solution.

Finally, let me say that as we debate welfare reform in the days to come, and as we confront the issue in the U.S. Senate, we have to understand that this is not just a debate about numbers. This is a debate about families, about human beings, where despair has come and hope is gone. We need to involve ourselves as communities and citizens. We need to disengage from the idea that Washington knows all and knows best. We need to make available to the people of this country the opportunity to tailor solutions to this challenge in State and local arenas.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the time.

FOREIGN RELATIONS REVITALIZATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the pending business is the State Department revitalization?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

AMENDMENT NO. 2025

(Purpose: To withhold \$3,500,000 from the "International Conferences and Contingencies" Account if the State Department expended funds for the World Conference on Women while Harry Wu was being detained in China)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. HELMS, proposes an amendment numbered 2025.

Mr. DOLE. 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 81, line 3, add the following:

(c) FURTHER CONDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—

(1) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for Fiscal year 1996, in (a), \$3,500,000 shall be withheld from obligation until the Secretary of State certifies to the appropriate congressional committees, with respect to the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women being held in Beijing, that no funds available to the Department of State were obligated or expended for United States participation in the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women while Harry Wu, a United States citizen, was detained by the People's Republic of China.