

If we do not have the ability to put our financial house in order, we will not be respected by countries around the world. If we continue to race down the road to bankruptcy, our influence will not be substantial.

This is the first authorization measure to come before the U.S. Senate that makes good on the promise we extended to the American people when we passed the budget resolution; that is, to have a balanced budget, to put our financial house in order. I submit to you that living within those rules and setting our priorities, financially as well as refining and clarifying our message in the international community—all of these things have no promise whatever other than to raise the prestige of the United States and to set an example in the world community that we should be responsible.

Unfortunately, there are those in this country who think that there cannot be any cuts at all in the foreign relations area. And the lobbyists came around with their buttons saying "Just 1 percent." They said that since our foreign aid budget represents only 1 percent of the total Federal budget, it cannot be touched. I just want to point out that the "Just 1 percent" is actually \$14.3 billion. And I believe it can be touched.

Should it be abolished? I am not in favor of abolishing foreign assistance. But I am in favor of sending a signal around the globe that when American citizens are tightening their belts, and exercising fiscal responsibility, there will be some ripple effects in terms of our aid. Not that we are going to shut anything down, not that we are going to change our policy dramatically, but we need to send a clear signal that the shared sacrifice here at home should be matched by a certain degree of sacrifice around the world. If we did not have the courage to ask them to participate in that respect, they would lose some of their admiration for the way we do business and they would lose some of their respect for us, and we would lose some of our ability to influence events around the world.

This administration seems to be following the same path as the foreign aid lobbyists leveling charges that this commonsense reform bill represents a dangerous shift toward isolationism. It is not a shift toward isolationism but rather a shift toward the development of respectable foreign policy. We have dealt with foreign situations but we have not had foreign policy. Policy is something that is coherent, that sticks together, that you can forecast, that you can predict. It has a philosophy about it. We have too many lawyers in the process and too few philosophers. We solved this problem, and we solved that problem, and we solved this other problem. But we never do it in accordance with a philosophy. And the philosophy should be a philosophy which keeps us from having additional problems.

I remember when the leaders of the so-called foreign policy establishment of this administration came to talk to the committee about the North Korean situation and the problems which we had negotiating with the North Koreans over nuclear issues. I asked the leadership of this administration's foreign policy what it was about the way we solved that problem that would suggest to the rest of the world that we should not do the same things that the North Koreans had done. They said, "Well, nothing. We think this is a unique situation, and it will not never happen anyplace else." So we could afford to make this a very sweet deal for the people who went against the U.S. interest because it could never happen again.

I submit to you that is not foreign policy. It may have temporarily solved that problem. But that is not policy. That is just pragmatism at the moment, and does not look down the road.

We need a foreign policy, and we need a Secretary of State with the capacity to articulate that foreign policy with clarity, with singularity, and coherently around the world.

The administration has pursued a "Chicken Little" approach to denouncing the reorganization plan by issuing a series of gloom and doom forecasts about how passage of this bill will result in damaged American prestige abroad and the possible emergence of more Rwanda-type situations.

Well, it is just not so. The sky will not fall if the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is abolished. At the present time, the State Department, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the CIA all have departments that are dedicated to pursuing arms-control-related functions. We have the ability to handle these issues in a coherent, rational, integrated, coordinated way if we make the changes that are in this important legislation which is before us.

It is time that we prioritize. Some said we cannot afford to reduce our foreign aid at all in 1993. AID helped fund a visit to the United States by a group of Romanian architects so they could study U.S. architecture. Was this a priority for a country whose economic infrastructure was devastated by 40 years of Communist rule? I doubt it.

Last week, the Washington Times reported that AID recently spent \$175,000 to produce 3,000 of these gender analysis tool kits.

I think the American people might wonder if the purchase of gender analysis tool kits is the right kind of priority setting.

AID even floated a plan to help supply Moscow with street lamps. I know that crime has gotten to be a problem in Moscow. But it is a tough sell to say to the people of the United States of America, some of whom live in inner-city neighborhoods in the United States that make Moscow after dark look like a trip to Disney World, that we should spend millions of dollars put-

ting street lights in Moscow, particularly at a time when Moscow was spending billions of dollars grinding up the people of Chechnya. I wonder.

Again, it is a question of establishing priorities.

In closing, and with great enthusiasm, I want to draw attention to the key features of this reform legislation. It says we do not have unlimited resources, we need to set priorities, and we need policy, and policy should not be articulated by contradictory messages issued by a variety of organizations. It says we must maximize our influence, and in order to maximize our influence, let us not speak with many voices in contradictory messages; let us speak with one voice so those who deliver the benefit can also be those who ask for the cooperation.

It says that we in the United States of America will not sacrifice without expecting others to sacrifice along with us, because ultimately when we have the kind of fiscal integrity that we ought to have, the entire world will benefit. When our house is in order, we will be the leader that provides the kind of message and the kind of opportunity around the world which will lift the performance of many nations with us.

We cannot spend as we have in the past in ways that are counterproductive. As the world desperately needs a leader—and there is only one—the United States must revamp its capacity to deliver that leadership with clarity and coherence, and the Foreign Relations Revitalization Act does that.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this measure, because it is a major step forward in our world leadership responsibilities.

Thank you, Madam President.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, before the distinguished Senator from Missouri leaves for the policy luncheon, I want to say that he has made an extraordinarily brilliant speech. He has said it all, and he said it well. If I may reminisce just one moment, one of the first people I met in another State after I came to the Senate was a young man in Missouri named JOHN ASHCROFT. I went to Missouri to work with him on a little matter. I have admired him ever since. He has had a distinguished career, and he has already begun a distinguished career in the U.S. Senate. I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:50 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).