

according to the Pentagon, it won't cost the American taxpayer a single dime to grant 2 million civilians unlimited access to commissary stores. If this is true, and commissary stores have become efficient, streamline operators, this has to be one of the most astounding success stories in recent memory for the Pentagon.

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that many of us in this Chamber have been working very hard to reduce the Federal deficit and to achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002. Therefore, it is my concern that section 631 and section 632 may be taking us in the wrong direction if this expansion results in the need for greater appropriations and taxpayer subsidies next year. This is especially true in light of the multitude of needs we are trying to fulfill for both active personnel and reservists, within growing budget constraints.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

WELFARE IN AMERICA

Mr. ASHCROFT. Thank you for this opportunity to address the Senate, as I have done on 3 or 4 previous evenings. I am here to talk again about a topic which will confront the Senate very dramatically later this week. It is the topic of welfare reform.

It is time for the Senate to begin to focus not only on the cost of welfare reform in terms of dollars and cents, but the cost of the welfare tragedy in terms of the human cost—not numbers, but lives.

In each of the previous evenings when I have had an opportunity to address the Senate on this topic, I have talked about specific individuals. Individuals who have a story; individuals who were tragic victims of our welfare system.

The story I want to talk about tonight is the story of Jack Gordon Hill, Jr., of French Camp, CA. Mr. Hill's story is not a particularly uplifting story, for it is yet another story of human suffering at the hands of the welfare system.

Mr. President, I believe that Mr. Hill's story is the personification of a system that has replaced responsibility with rights, and has replaced opportunity with entitlement.

This picture beside me is one bright spot in Mr. Hill's welfare legacy. About

a year ago, Mr. Hill credited the Federal Government's Supplemental Security Income Program with saving his life, and all the indications seemed to support his assertion. He was physically strong. He was mentally prepared, and ready once again to accept a place in America.

Mr. President, Jack Gordon Hill, Jr., had a serious problem with drugs and alcohol his entire adult life. His cocaine and whiskey cost him everything he had. Years ago he lost his job, and shortly thereafter he lost his family. He and his wife divorced. He gave up an infant son for adoption. Most tragically, he abandoned his two small daughters in Baltimore, unable or unwilling to take care of them.

In short, Mr. Hill was rushing ever faster toward rock bottom and almost hit, he claims, when he discovered SSI, which provides special payments for addicts. In his words, "It is like I've been falling in a bottomless pit all my life, and all of a sudden there was this one thin branch sticking out. I grabbed it. Now I am climbing out."

It turns out that the branch of SSI did not save him. It accelerated his fall. Mr. Hill's branch was a \$458 a month governmental check, with which he was able to enter a drug and alcohol treatment center and get away from the street corner he had haunted.

In an interview with the Baltimore Sun last July, he sat in his room, in the California rehab center, playing with his kitten, Serenity—its name represented a new-found state of peace in his life. This world of contrived contentment was built on a foundation of sand.

Six months after that interview, the Baltimore Sun found Mr. Hill back on the same corner where he had begun, drunk and doped up. His Federal funds were now being used to support his renewed addiction to cocaine.

His use of these funds is far from exceptional. The system under which he got them spends \$1.4 billion per year of taxpayers' funds. Unlike Mr. Hill, however, most of the individuals who received these funds—hundreds of thousands, according to the Baltimore Sun—never enter treatment centers, or seriously try to beat their addictions. The \$458 a month they receive only speeds their inevitable demise.

One drug counselor at a health clinic for the homeless told the Sun that drug dealers flock around the recipients of these Government checks whenever the checks come in. Speaking of his patients who had died from drug overdoses, the drug counselor said, "All the dealers came circling around the patient of the day like vultures. A week later he would crash from whatever dope he was doing and feel terrible. Those were the times he would go looking for help. The problem was that we could never find help for him when that check came in the mail on the first of the month, and the whole cycle started over again."

This cycle of abuse, funded by the Federal Government, this welfare sys-

tem which provides funding for the maintenance of these habits, is a tragedy which is costing us a tremendous toll in terms of human lives. When our welfare system clearly and openly supports a policy which runs contrary to every law and principle in our Government, we cannot be so blind as not to see the immediate and overwhelming need for an overhaul of the welfare system.

I have come before this body repeatedly to relate the personal stories of real Americans, stories which demonstrate how bankrupt our current welfare system is, how it enslaves its beneficiaries, how it traps them and robs them of their independence, their hope, and their futures. It is hard enough to break out of the cycle of poverty and dependence which the welfare system creates economically, but when the welfare system buys drugs for addicts, it virtually guarantees they will not escape and they will never be anything but wards of the Federal Government.

Mr. Hill did not only find himself abused, but he tried to do something. Mr. Hill did more than most of the SSI substance abuse recipients. He tried to get treatment. Yet, because Washington, DC, perceived the solution to his problems to be a wad full of Federal money—because the helping hand of Washington extends money to those who are in need and does not do much else—it destroyed his capacity. True charity cannot come from the Federal Government, it must come from concerned citizens who know the problems of their own communities, know the citizens in those communities, and truly want to solve the problems. And Federal money, money alone, cannot solve the problem. We need to involve the communities. We need to involve the States. We need to involve people—people who have the chance to introduce those on welfare to opportunities that lift them out of welfare.

Federal money should be administered to the States directly, allowing them the freedom to direct funds where they are needed. Federal funds should not be administered from a distant Washington bureaucrat and directed in ways that are not meaningful on the local level. Welfare, as it is currently practiced, simply provides a means for Mr. Hill and others like him to continue their self-destructive behavior. This behavior costs not only Mr. Hill, it costs us—not only in terms of our resources but it costs us productivity and lives. It has cost his three children an association with a father. It has been a tragedy, not just in financial terms, but in personal terms. It provides a means for Mr. Hill and others like him to continue their destructive behavior.

This is not a time for us to engage in half measures of welfare reform, and it is not a time for silence. Unfortunately, silence is exactly what we are getting from the Democrats who are making proposals which they call welfare reform. Every Republican plan

that has been proposed eliminates the drug addiction and alcoholism disabilities from SSI. The Democrats are silent. President Clinton is silent on this issue. On issues as important as these, silence is death.

We have been down the road of half measures before. It was called the 1988 Family Support Act. It made big promises. It was going to put people to work. We had hoped, with the so-called Welfare Reform Act of 1988, that the devotion of additional resources, that additional Washington management, that additional one-size-fits-all solutions from the Nation's Capital would somehow provide a solution to the problem. But if we take a good look at what has happened in terms of welfare spending, we did not solve the problem in 1988. The problem skyrocketed in 1988. Half measures, the rearrangement of the deck chairs on the welfare *Titanic*, will do no more than provide a basis for taking the line on this chart right off the page.

We need to have real reform. We need to understand that welfare that is simply the Federal Government's handing individuals a wad of money, like the welfare reform proposal made available to Mr. Hill, is not welfare reform. That is welfare entrapment. We need to be involved in welfare replacement.

We must do more, we must ask for more, we must involve more people in the program. We must ask that civic groups and nongovernmental organizations be allowed to work with States. We must send the resources to the States to give them flexibility. The idea that there is a single solution in Washington that will provide the opportunity for everyone everywhere is an idea that has been proven to be a failure.

My family has an average size. If we were to try to buy pajamas based on the average size, one-size-fits-all would translate into one-size-fits-none.

When the Government in Washington, DC, tries to have a one-size-fits-all solution, it frequently fits none. It is time for us to turn the opportunity over to the States, States that can involve institutions that care for people, States that have the courage to make basic reforms, States that will have the courage to say to those on drugs and alcohol, "We will not continue to support your habit."

The real costs of welfare are not just the costs that we face as a result of the budget crunch. They are the costs in terms of human tragedy, costs like those endured by the Hill family as a result of the fact that, as a Government, we have chosen to fund one's addiction rather than to provide the kind of care that would help an individual leave the welfare system and become a productive individual.

This Saturday we will begin the welfare debate. We will have the opportunity to make a decision to pull together the information which will lead us to an inevitable conclusion that the one-size-fits-all Washington system has

failed. We will have the opportunity to give the States, which have been begging for decades now, the flexibility to do what works, to give them the resources through block grants, to allow them to make the kinds of changes and to have the kinds of conditions and requirements that will lift people by enlisting nongovernmental organizations and others in their communities to help individuals on welfare become productive members of our cities and towns.

It is with this in mind that we need to understand that welfare reform cannot be tinkering around the edges. It must be substantial. It must be real renovation and reformation, for without renovation and reformation in the system, we will not have a new opportunity for the citizens of the land. Indeed, that is what citizens who now are on welfare desperately need.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

NOT THE TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I have enjoyed the statement by the Senator from Missouri related to welfare reform. I think that is one thing that this country is looking forward to. But I do object to no morning business. Now we have not had morning business, or been allowed morning business for over a week. We come in here on a defense authorization bill and we take 10 minutes to talk about welfare reform. I am sitting here trying to get an amendment on the bill.

So we have morning business periodically during the day. That is fine. This is prime time, and I know it is a lot better than 8 o'clock in the morning or 9 o'clock in the morning. But we have a Defense authorization bill here. I would like to get that done. We are going to have welfare reform. You can talk all day Saturday if you want to, about welfare reform.

As I say, I have enjoyed what the Senator said. I appreciate what he is trying to do. But we are also trying to get a Defense authorization bill through, and I think we ought either to have morning business and do it then, or we should have morning business late in the evening, instead of going through and interrupting the flow of business in the Senate.

I thank the Chair and suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the cold war is over, and in some ways we all long for the old certainties it provided. The Armed Services Committee has grappled with the difficult task of matching our national security interests to the new realities of international politics, and I commend them for their hard work in this area.

But I also want to take this opportunity to express serious concern about certain provisions in this legislation which, in my view, would discard a generation of progress toward arms control that serves our national security needs.

In terms of arms control—and, in terms of our Nation's solemn commitment to its treaty obligations—I have strong reservations about the paths charted by the committee legislation. I hope the Senate fully appreciates the weight and implications of proposals now before us.

I know that there are some negotiations that are going on regarding language, and I am pleased to hear that.

By my count, this legislation puts at risk at least four important arms control agreements. It puts us on a path toward abrogating two treaties which the United States has ratified with the advice and consent of the Senate—agreements which, in accordance with the processes of our Constitution, our Nation has pledged to honor. It also takes policy steps that may jeopardize our chances to successfully conclude and implement at least two other important agreements that our Nation long has pursued.

The stakes are high:

The Anti-Ballistic Missile [ABM] Treaty has been in force in the United States since 1972. This bill would put us on a path to abrogate the ABM treaty by setting a date to deploy national ballistic missile defenses and by unilaterally imposing a line of demarcation to separate ballistic missile defenses, which are covered by the treaty, from theater defense systems, which are not. This important demarcation issue is the subject of ongoing negotiations—and, yet, this bill would have us act alone. Perhaps, as its critics suggest, the ABM Treaty no longer serves our national interests. But if that is so, we should review our commitment to the treaty through a deliberate process—we should not simply take steps toward no longer complying.

The safeguards agreement between the United States and the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] has been in force since 1980.

This is another aspect of language in the agreement that I find troubling, and perhaps this has been addressed.

This legislation would walk away from that agreement by setting unrealistic criteria that must be met before any IAEA safeguards inspection