

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.

All these reports will be reviewed by the President's Intelligence Oversight Advisory Board, which is committed to reporting the results of its own investigation to the President by October 1.

So there is more information coming. The reports in the press are not the final chapter. We, the Congress, are the jury, and the jury is still out.

Let me review what we do know:

First, we know the CIA IG is doing its investigative job well. Fred Hitz' investigators have uncovered new data and organized it with great coherence. It is only because of their complete presentation of the cases that we, Senators, are able to isolate and ask the hard questions.

Second, we know the oversight task of Congress is made more difficult by attitudes of resistance at CIA.

Third, we know the trust which we grant with the right to secrecy is at risk.

Last, we know the CIA effort in Guatemala probably was not worth the loss to the Agency and the United States of being associated with these cases.

But there are some key facts we do not yet know. We do not know yet whether or not the withholding of information was a violation of law.

There is no question information was withheld from Congress. Was the withholding done with the intent to mislead Congress?

There is a question of what happened to the victims? Who killed Michael Devine and the other American victims? Who killed Efrain Bamaca?

Indeed, I think it is important that colleagues understand the investigation ordered by the President is not directed to answer those particular questions but directed, instead, to discover whether our agencies had any involvement with it.

The last question is whether or not the U.S. Government agencies contributed to or abetted any of these crimes, even indirectly. All this is done with the purpose of trying to discover what we can do to prevent events like this in the future. It is not just a simple exercise. It is an exercise that must go forward successfully if the people are to trust that the right of secrecy, the granting of secrecy is deserving of that trust.

In his initial report, Inspector General Hitz has recommended structural changes and cultural changes in the Agency, and Director Deutch has responded forcefully. The changes will come: the structural soon, the cultural over time, because Director Deutch's concept of management accountability will permit no less and because Fred Hitz's display of the facts is so clear and complete.

But the questions of why these events occurred, and what CIA officials at the time intended as they wrote reports to Congress and responded to congressional inquiries—these questions are unanswered. It falls to us, Congress, to apply our judgment and experience to answer them. No one at

CIA or elsewhere in the administration can do it for us.

This investigation is about trust in the way we collect intelligence. Sometimes we concentrate so exclusively on the problems in the intelligence community that we forget why we are doing this.

Very simply, there is valuable information out there in the world that is someone's secret. This information is not publicly available. The intelligence community collects that information and combines it with other, perhaps publicly available information, to turn it into understanding.

That way, they can do what they get paid for: getting the right information to the right person at the right time so as to improve that person's chances of success.

Worth asking is who is that person, the recipient of the right information?

First, we have the national policy customer, seeking success in a policy decision. It is the President, the National Security Council, the Secretaries of State, Defense, Treasury. And it is the Congress, too, as we ponder policy decisions, the latest of which for all of us, has been the situation in Bosnia.

It is the military, seeking success in battle, or in protecting our forces, or in preparing a operations plan, or making a weapons acquisition decision. It is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, it is a pilot or squad leader in a dangerous overseas deployment, and all the military in between. The intelligence support to these customers cannot be too good, and I know that is Director Deutch's commitment, too.

Next, it is law enforcement, seeking success in arresting a terrorist who has killed Americans or in preventing drugs from coming to this country.

Next, we have economic customers like the Secretary of Commerce and Secretary of Agriculture as they seek success in insuring fair trade practices around the world toward American products and services.

Intelligence ought to be an essential contributor to success in all these areas—we certainly pay enough for it.

We should task intelligence, resource intelligence, and grade intelligence on the basis of threats, and we should rank order the threats:

First, we should task intelligence to know most about the threats that could take away America's freedom and independence.

Second, we should task intelligence against the threats to American lives, with higher priority to the threats that can kill many Americans, such as the nuclear weapons still in Russia, and lower priority to the threats that can kill fewer of us.

These are difficult things to do, to establish these kinds of priorities. But it does fall to us to establish these threats, otherwise it will be difficult for us to make assignments to the intelligence community as to what we, indeed, need in order to make good decisions.

Third, we should task intelligence against the threats that can take away American livelihoods, the threats to our jobs and our way of life.

The new threat environment is a challenge for all of us who came up in the world of one large superpower threat.

Information technology poses another challenge: the sheer amount of information has increased geometrically, but our human capacity to know has expanded more modestly. Through the noise of information overload, the intelligence community must deliver that key secret fact, and make it useful to the customer. So effective dissemination is a challenge.

The technology of collection poses yet another challenge.

It is expensive, the lead times are long, and the targets may change before we are done.

Most important, with satellites we very often have significant uncertainties about whether or not a launch will be successful, or the lifespan of the satellites themselves. We need significant amounts of efforts in research and development to explore new technologies, but we also need to pay our employees and run our current operations, and money, we all know, is tight.

We need to explore dual use of intelligence technologies because if the private sector buys some of these things for their own different purposes, the unit cost to the intelligence agency will decrease. But we have to ensure we don't lose sensitive sources and methods in the process.

Secrecy poses yet another challenge. With the passage of the Soviet threat, a threat that could extinguish our national life, secrecy is less acceptable and should be fundamentally challenged.

We still need some secrecy. We could not otherwise collect and safeguard other people's secrets.

But we should challenge blanket secrecy wherever we find it, and we should support Director Deutch's declassification efforts.

Secrecy connotes trust, Mr. President, as I said at the beginning. We trust people, when we grant that trust, to do the right thing in secret. To me, that is the core issue in the Guatemala case and I hope my colleagues will avail themselves of the opportunity to look at the inspector general's report. The facts are quite disturbing and, I believe, precipitate the conclusion that, though we may not have been intentionally misled, the agency is going to have to change its behavior in order for us to be able to continue to trust that they are following our laws.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted 10 minutes to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Without objection, it is so ordered.