

effort produces a major shift from nutrition to farm programs, I will not be able to support farm programs.

UNIQUE NATURAL RESOURCE CHALLENGES

So, should there be any Federal program in which tax dollars are transferred to farmers?

The answer is yes—for two reasons.

First, because farmers face unique problems with natural disasters.

Second, because farmers have a unique role in meeting widely held national natural resource objectives.

First, farmers face unique problems with natural disasters. Droughts, floods, and disease cause catastrophic losses that can bankrupt even the most efficient farmer. Without Government assistance, the private sector cannot provide adequate and affordable insurance to help farmers manage production risk. Thus, a subsidized crop insurance program makes sense.

Second, farmers play a unique role in managing our natural resources. Farms and grazing lands make up 50 percent of the continental United States. It is impossible to successfully regulate such a vast area, even if one wanted to—which I do not. To successfully address natural resource management on private lands, farmers must be part of the solution. The taxpayers are willing to pay farmers to protect drinking water, preserve lakes and rivers, and to be stewards of the soil.

In the 1985 and 1990 farm bills, farm programs were harmonized with environmental objectives. For example, no longer were farmers paid to destroy wetlands. Instead, farm programs began to protect wetlands.

Today some farm groups favor destroying this harmony. They even go so far as to say that farm conservation should only be funded if there is money left after farm subsidies and exports subsidies are paid for.

This may make sense to a farmer or a grain exporter. It does not make sense to the public. There is no reason a farmer should be richer than a machine shop owner. There is no reason that the taxpayer should help huge grain exporters control market shares.

So this is the time for testing.

Will farm programs become just another special interest trying to take the last few dollars from the Federal Government before the bank goes broke?

Will farmers accept the challenge of living up to their historic responsibility of feeding the poor and gradually transform farm programs into natural resource management programs?

Wallace Stevens once wrote:

After the final "no" there comes a "yes,"
And on that "yes" the future of the world depends. . . .

The next month will decide whether the final answer will be a "yes" on which the farmer and the taxpayer can depend.

I am somewhat dismayed to see the pattern that has grown up over the past decade so suddenly become shattered. This pattern farmers, con-

sumers, and environmentalists working together on the farm bill. Each realized that they would not get every single thing they wanted, but working together, they would better represent the interest of farmers, ranchers, environmentalists, consumers, the hungry, and those who could afford to buy food in this country.

You will find some who want to shatter that kind of coalition, who want to grab their own special interests immediately, almost on "The devil take the hind most." Well, that is not going to happen because some are going to stand up and speak for the "high" most.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we had arranged, prior to this morning, for the freshman focus to have some time during morning business. Now we have that opportunity. I would like to take that time that was allocated.

As you know, there are some unique insights that are brought to this body by people who are elected, those who have just come through an election who, I think, are perhaps more attuned and more aware of what the electorate, at least in our view, was talking about.

So the purpose of our freshman focus has been to bring that sort of insight to this body. And, frankly, I think we are a little more impatient. We would like to see things move a little faster than the "blinding speed" we have encountered over the past 6 months. We want to talk a little about fundamental change.

The issue that will come before us soon, hopefully, will be that of welfare reform—one of the fundamental changes that obviously needs to be made. I think it is fair to say that, for whatever reason, over the last 25 to 30 years, there has not been a willingness on the part of the Congress to really take a look at fundamental change, to take a look at programs to see, in fact, if they are effective in terms of carrying out the purpose of the statutes; whether or not they are efficient in terms of providing results for the dollars that have been spent; or whether the delivery system has worked well; whether or not there is an opportunity to bring programs, Government, and decisions closer to people by involving the States. Rather, we have had this growth of Federal Government without much consideration of alternatives.

We will soon be entering into the year 2000, a new century. We need to ask ourselves what kind of a government do we want to pass on to our kids and grandkids with respect to spending and with respect to the budget? We will be considering, in the next 2 months, an increase in the debt of \$5 trillion. We will be asking ourselves what are the priorities? What should the Federal

Government be doing with what is inevitably a finite amount of money? We will have entitlements to the extent that, in 5 years, we will have nothing to spend except in the entitlement programs. I do not think we want to find ourselves there.

So we have an opportunity now to look at some fundamental change. We have done that, I think. I must say that my observation is generally that the folks on the other side of the aisle have resisted almost everything that has come up here. Always there is this idea that, yes, we are for it, whether it be unfunded mandates, line-item veto, or balanced budget. But when we get into it, we find that there is an effort to maintain the status quo. That is frustrating. I think it is frustrating for us, and I clearly believe it is frustrating for the voters in this last election.

It seems to me that one of the measurements of good Government is whether there is a response—if there is a response to public outcry for change. And I think there has been. So we find ourselves now, I think, with the opportunity to take a look at welfare, to look at a program that everyone agrees is useful, and that we should help people who need help to get back into work and back into the private sector.

But let me share just one frustration. We seem to be engaged in a little bit of a game here of perception. Each time we talk about how do we do something better, the argument goes on back to whether you are going to do it or not. You know, we talk about Medicare. There is not a soul that I know of in here who does not want to continue and strengthen Medicare. The choice is not doing away with Medicare or not funding Medicare. The choice is how do you do it? The same is true with welfare. Nobody wants to do away with the opportunity to help people who need it, but we need to find a way to do it in such a way that there are incentives to move off of the program and get back into the private sector, where there are restrictions and limits to the cost, and to develop programs that have some flexibility.

Certainly, our needs in Wyoming are different from those of my friend from Pennsylvania. That is what we are seeking to do.

So, Mr. President, we have strong feelings about it—I suppose no stronger than anyone else—simply because we are freshmen. But maybe we do feel a little of the frustration a little more easily. Maybe we grow impatient a little more easily, and sort of suffer from the movement here. In any event, I think we have great opportunities.

One of the Senators who has done more work in this, I think, than most anyone I know and is very knowledgeable, is the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am glad to see him here on the floor.

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his comments and again for his leadership in bringing the freshmen to the floor on a regular basis

to talk about the issues that are important to us. I rise to talk a little bit about welfare reform.

I want to start by congratulating the senior Senator from West Virginia for his tremendous service in the U.S. Senate. I was in the chair at the time and did not have an opportunity to congratulate him personally, but I listened very carefully to the words that he spoke in receiving the congratulations from the Senate. His talk about the civility of the Senate struck me as a pertinent comment as to what goes on here.

I share those concerns, that the body should be a civil body, and that we should be able to have a civil discourse as to the issues of the day. I also understand that there are certain periods in history where there occurs a fundamental realignment of thinking, where ideas of great magnitude clash that causes, at times, an uncivil reaction to those who are engaged in this ideological struggle.

I think we are at the beginning of one of those times here in America and here in the U.S. Senate. Time will tell whether the election of last year, when we were all elected freshmen, and the changes that were brought here in the U.S. Senate, will be the beginning of a realignment politically in this country and ideologically in this country—a new way of governing in the United States.

We do not know that. I suspect, and in fact, I hope, that is the case. We do not know that. I think there are many here who believe that is what is going on. Not really that different than what happened in the 1960's or what happened in the 1930's during the New Deal where we had a fundamental shift of the role of Government, and people here came with very different views of the way Government should operate.

At times, because of the passion which we feel for our positions, and the distance between one side and the other, things can get a little hot and heated. I hope that we pay attention to what the Senator from West Virginia has said, and try to keep our civility, our level of civility, and our respect for our colleagues and their thoughts—although we may disagree—keep that in mind.

I do not think there is any issue that shows the fundamental difference that is going on in this country, as far as the direction of Government in our lives, than the issue of welfare.

I have been working on that issue, as the Senator from Wyoming knows, for the past 3 or 4 years. I worked on it in the House of Representatives, the chairman of the task force that wrote the House Republican bill last year that by and large passed the House of Representatives this year.

To look at what happened in the debate on welfare in the past 2 or 3 years is an enormous change. Even the bills now being put forward by the leadership on the other side have dramatically moved from the status quo posi-

tions that were being offered just a year or two ago by the President.

I am encouraged by that. I think it does show a difference between how we believe on this side—or many believe, not all—to solve problems; how we have been doing it over the long period of years; and how we have been doing it, really, since the 1960's.

We have been doing it with Government perhaps out of Washington, DC, where we attempt to provide for people who are less fortunate, with some Federal direct grant, cash, food stamps, housing, or whatever; but it is run out of Washington. It is administered out of here.

Sure, there are local agencies that actually pass the money through, but all the decisions are made here, and then implemented down at the lower level where the individual just sort of receives the end product, which is usually a check, a stamp, or something tangible—usually not an exchange, other than qualifying because you are low income. There is no work required, no sense of duty or obligation to the people who have provided to give back. In fact, there is discouragement in many cases.

Many believe that is fundamentally flawed. That a system that provides or seeks to provide for the poor, that does not expect anything in return, is a system that is doomed to failure. I think we have seen that it not only results in the failure of that individual in their ability to turn their lives around and come back, but it causes the destruction of the community, the family and the like when you say to someone that, because of their poverty, they are unable to provide for themselves or give or contribute back to society.

That is what, unintentionally, indirectly, has occurred in our welfare system. That is the debate that will occur here in the U.S. Senate, I hope, in the next couple of weeks. We will have a bill on the floor, I am hoping the last week we are in session.

We have been working, and I give a lot of credit to Senator PACKWOOD who has done an absolutely outstanding job in working and trying to pull together the Republicans, with a bill we can come together and move forward with, that is dramatic and in sync with the principles I outlined.

I want to commend Senator DOLE who has been fostering that dialog; Senator GRAMM for staking out a responsible position on the issue and trying to form the debate.

We have a lot of good debate going on over here on this side of the aisle right now but the debate is not about dollars and cents. It is not about how much money we can save on welfare. It is not about how we can punish anybody. It is about one thing. That is, how do we give people who have less opportunity today, more opportunity, so they can live the American dream. That is what it is all about. That is what this welfare reform will be about. That is what our plan is going to be about.

I am encouraged by that. I look forward to the debate. I think it will be a great one here on the floor of the Senate. I want to thank, again, the Senator from Wyoming for reserving this time. I yield the floor.

GUATEMALA

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

The newspapers today are reporting conflicting information about the CIA inspector general's initial investigation into CIA involvement in murder and human rights abuses in Guatemala. This is an important topic, Mr. President. Following our hearing on this topic in the Intelligence Committee yesterday, I feel obligated to tell the Senate about this investigation and my concerns with it.

This is an important topic because it centers on trust, the trust related to secrecy.

We the effected policymakers—The President and Congress—ask the CIA to collect information covertly. Sometimes we also ask the CIA to undertake covert action in support of U.S. policy, covert action which is supposed to be deniable. To accomplish these tasks, we permit them to operate in an environment of secrecy.

However, with secrecy comes trust. We trust they will not abuse secrecy by using it to cover mistakes or actions which contradict the U.S. law or American values. To be sure they will not, Congress set up the oversight committees to check what CIA is doing, in particular, in secret.

We check by looking and asking. When we ask, we trust the answer we are getting is true. The law says it must be true, and that the two oversight committees must be kept fully and currently informed.

Were we so informed about the CIA's human rights record in Guatemala? Clearly, the answer is no. That being the case, the question then occurs, did CIA employees intentionally withhold information from Congress with the intent to deceive or mislead Congress? That is the core remaining issue in my mind.

Let me review where the investigation process stands right now, so colleagues, perhaps, have a better understanding, if asked, about the reports in the paper yesterday and today.

The report presented yesterday to the Intelligence Committee, the report of CIA IG Fred Hitz, is the first of six reports ordered by President Clinton on the Guatemala-United States human rights relationship.

A second CIA IG report on the cases other than the murders of Michael Devine and Efraim Bamaca will be completed by the end of August.

A Defense Department report on defense relationships in Guatemala will be ready at about the same time.

A State Department report on these cases will be ready in mid-August.

A Justice Department report is in final draft and could be out this week.