

bring under prudent control a culture of radical self-indulgence and oppositional defiance, fostered by drugs, television, video games, street gangs and predatory sexuality.

Now, a visitor from another planet hearing this discourse might say that obviously all three perspectives have much to commend themselves and, therefore, all three ought to be acted upon. But the public debate we hear tends to emphasize one or another theory and thus one or another set of solutions. It does this because people, or at least people who are members of the political class, define problems so as to make them amenable to those solutions that they favor for ideological or moral reasons. Here roughly is what each analysis pursued separately and alone implies:

(1) Structural solutions. We must create jobs and job-training programs in inner-city areas, by means either of tax-advantaged enterprise zones or government-subsidized employment programs. As an alternative, we may facilitate the relocation of the inner-city poor to places on the periphery where jobs can be found and, if necessary, supplement their incomes by means of the earned-income tax credit.

(2) Rationalist solutions. Cut or abolish AFDC or, at a minimum, require work in exchange for welfare. Make the formation of two-parent households more attractive than single parenthood and restore work to prominence as the only way for the physically able to acquire money.

(3) Cultural solutions. Alter the inner-city ethos by means of private redemptive movements, supported by a system of shelters or group homes in which at-risk children and their young mothers can be given familial care and adult supervision in safe and drug-free settings.

Now, I have my own preferences in this menu of alternatives, but it is less important that you know what these preferences are than that you realize that I do not know which strategy would work, because so many people embrace a single strategy as a way of denying legitimacy to alternative ones and to their underlying philosophies.

Each of those perspectives, when taken alone, is full of uncertainties and inadequacies. These problems go back, first of all, to the structural solution. The evidence that links family dissolution with the distribution of jobs is, in fact, weak. Some people—such as many recent Latino immigrants in Los Angeles—notice that jobs have moved to the periphery from the city and board buses to follow the jobs. Other people notice the very same thing and stay home to sell drugs.

Now, even if a serious job mismatch does exist, it will not easily be overcome by enterprise zones. If the costs of crime in inner-city neighborhoods are high, they cannot be compensated for by very low labor costs or very high customer demand. Moreover, employers in scanning potential workers will rely, as they have always relied, on the most visible cues of reliability and skill—dress, manner, speech and even place of residence. No legal system, no matter how much we try to enforce it, can completely or even largely suppress these cues, because they have substantial economic value.

Second, let's consider some of the inadequacies of the rational strategy. After years of denying that the level of welfare payments had any effect on child-bearing, many scholars now find that states with higher payments tend to be ones in which more babies are born to welfare recipients; and when one expands the definition of welfare to include not only AFDC but Medicaid, Food Stamps and subsidized housing, increases in welfare were strongly correlated with increases in illegitimate births from the early 1960s to about 1980. At the point, the value of

the welfare package in real dollars flattened out, but the illegitimacy rate continued to rise.

Moreover, there remain several important puzzles in the connection between welfare and child-bearing. One is the existence of great differences in illegitimacy rates across ethnic groups facing similar circumstances. Since the Civil War at least, blacks have had higher illegitimacy rates than whites, even though federal welfare programs were not invented until 1935.

These days, it has been shown that the illegitimacy rate among black women is more than twice as high as among white women, after controlling for age, education and economic status. David Hayes Bautista, a researcher at UCLA, compared poor blacks and poor Mexican-Americans living in California. He found that Mexican-American children are much more likely than black children to grow up in a two-parent family, and that poor Mexican-American families were only one-fifth as likely as black ones to be on welfare.

Even among blacks, the illegitimacy rate is rather low in states such as Idaho, Montana, Maine and New Hampshire, despite the fact that these states have rather generous welfare payments. And the illegitimacy rate is quite high in many parts of the Deep South, even though these states have rather low welfare payments.

Clearly, there is some important cultural or at least noneconomic factor at work, one that has deep historical roots and that may vary with the size of the community and the character of the surrounding culture.

Finally, the cultural strategy. Though I have a certain affinity for it, it has its problems, too. There are many efforts in many cities by public and private agencies, individuals and churches to persuade young men to be fathers and not just impregnators, to help drug addicts and alcoholics, to teach parenting skills to teenage mothers. Some have been evaluated, and a few show signs of positive effects. Among the more successful programs are the Perry Pre-School Project in Ypsilanti, Mich.; the Parent Child Development Center in Houston; the Family Development Research Project in Syracuse, N.Y.; and the Yale Child Welfare Project in New Haven, Conn. All of these programs produce better behavior, lessened delinquency, more success in school.

The Manhattan Institute's Myron Magnet (author of "The Dream and the Nightmare: The Sixties' Legacy to the Underclass") and I have both endorsed the idea of requiring young unmarried mothers to live in group homes with their children under adult supervision as a condition of receiving public assistance. I also have suggested that we might revive an institution that was common earlier in this century but has lapsed into disuse of late—the boarding school, sometimes mistakenly called an orphanage, for the children of mothers who cannot cope. At one time such schools provided homes and education for more than 100,000 young people in large cities.

Though I confess I am attracted to the idea of creating wholly new environments in which to raise the next generation of at-risk children, I must also confess that I do not know whether it will work. The programs that we know to be successful, like the ones mentioned above, are experimental efforts led by dedicated men and women. Can large versions of the same thing work when run by the average counselor, the average teacher? We don't know. And even these successes predated the arrival of crack on the streets of our big cities. Can even the best program salvage people from that viciously destructive drug? We don't know.

There is evidence that such therapeutic communities as those run by Phoenix House,

headquartered in New York, and other organizations can salvage people who remain in them long enough. How do we get people to stay in them long enough? We don't know.

Now, if these three alternatives or something like them are what is available, how do we decide what to do? Before trying to answer that question, let me assert three precepts that ought to shape how we formulate that answer.

The first precept is that our overriding goal ought to be to save the children. Other goals—such as reducing the costs of welfare, discouraging illegitimacy, preventing long-term welfare dependency, getting even with Welfare cheats—may all be worthy goals, but they are secondary to the goal of improving the life prospects of the next generation.

The second precept is that nobody knows how to do this on a large scale. The debate has begun about welfare reform, but it is a debate, in large measure, based on untested assumptions, ideological posturing and perverse principles. We are told by some that worker training and job placement will reduce the welfare rolls, but we now know that worker training and job placement have so far had only a very modest effect. And few advocates of worker training tell us what happens to children whose mothers are induced or compelled to work, other than to assure us that somebody will supply day care.

The third precept that should guide us is that the federal government cannot have a meaningful family policy for the nation, and it ought not to try. Not only does it not know and cannot learn from experts what to do, whatever it thinks it ought to do, it will try to do in the worse possible way. Which is to say, uniformly, systematically, politically and ignorantly.

Now, the clear implication of these three precepts, when applied to the problem we face now, is that we ought to turn the task and the money for rebuilding lives, welfare payments, housing subsidies, the whole lot, over to cities and states and private agencies, subject to only two conditions. First, they must observe minimum for fundamental precepts of equal protection, and second, every major new initiative must be evaluated by independent observers operating in accordance with accepted scientific canons.

Some states or counties in this regime may end AFDC as we know it. Others may impose a mandatory work requirement. A few may require welfare recipients to turn their checks over to the group homes in which the recipients must reside or the boarding schools that their children must attend. Some may give the money to private agencies that agree to supply parent training, job skills and preschool education. Some may move welfare recipients out of the inner city and to the periphery.

Any given state government may do no better than Washington, but the great variety of the former will make up for the deadening uniformity of the latter. And within the states, the operating agencies will be at the city and county level, where the task of improving lives and developing character will be informed by the proximity of government to the voices of ordinary people.

Mr. Wilson is professor of management and public policy at UCLA. A longer version of this essay will appear in the Manhattan Institute's City Journal. •

#### INVESTIGATION OF CLASSIFIED DOCUMENT TRAFFICKING—CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this Senator would always wish to correct the record of any proceedings of the

Senate, or any of the committees of the Congress, when failure to do so might do an injustice.

Today it is appropriate to correct such a record, having to do with information presented to the Subcommittee on National Security Economics of the Joint Economic Committee, meeting at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, December 21, 1988. The record of the hearing was published in a collection of hearings of subcommittees of the Joint Economic Committee, Senate Hearing 100-1059 beginning at page 559.

The hearing in question concerned trafficking in classified documents of the Department of Defense, and how the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice dealt with those problems during the period 1983-88.

A staff report prepared by the staff of the Joint Economic Committee Subcommittee on National Security Economics and the investigative staff of my office was included in the hearing. The staff report contains some information, supplied by officials of the Defense Criminal Investigative Service, which is not correct.

It has been brought to my attention that some of that information may have cast an undeserved cloud upon one of the persons named in the report. Two individuals are named in this information, on page 2 of the staff report, in the following paragraph:

The Ohio investigation revealed evidence of widespread trafficking in classified documents, involving at least ten contractors and 30 Pentagon officials, including high level civilian and military officials. The investigation resulted in the indictments of two officials, John McCarthy, who was then director of NASA Lewis Research Center, and James R. Atchison, an Air Force employee at the Wright-Patterson Base in Dayton, Ohio. McCarthy plead guilty in 1983 to a charge of filing false claims in connection with travel to Washington, D.C. Atchison resigned from the government and was not brought to trial.

Mr. President, I would like to correct several of the statements about Mr. James R. Atchison.

Mr. Atchison has never been indicted on any charges. This is confirmed in a letter to the Joint Economic Committee of October 6, 1992, from Mr. Derek J. Vander Schaaf, Deputy Inspector General of DOD.

Mr. Vander Schaaf notes that the focus of the investigative effort that led to Mr. Atchison was the unauthorized trafficking in classified documents. But there was no evidence resulting from any DOD or NASA investigation involving Mr. Atchison in any wrongdoing relating to classified documents. The Air Force took an adverse employee action against Mr. Atchison for other reasons.

Mr. Atchison has asked that the statements about him be corrected in the record, to the extent possible. I agree, Mr. President, that the record must be corrected, and that is what I have attempted to do here today. •

#### RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATION AND SERVICE OF THE NEW JERSEY STATE FIRST AID COUNCIL

• Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the New Jersey State First Aid Council which is holding its 67th annual convention from October 5 through October 8.

The New Jersey State First Aid Council has its roots in Belmar, NJ where at the scene of a fire in 1929, Charles Measure, the council's founder, saw a badly injured police officer receive only blank stares and helpless shrugs from a crowd of onlookers who did not know what to do to help staunch the flow of blood. Although someone eventually stepped forward and saved the officer's life, the incident convinced Measure that there was a need for organized emergency response to such crisis situations. From the ashes of that confused and terrifying scene arose a new sense of security and purpose in the State, as the New Jersey State First Aid Council was born.

Developing a statewide organization was not easy, but Measure and his associates persisted until their idea became reality. In November of 1931, the eight squads came together to form the first district, and the council swung into action. Measure's decision to step forward and pioneer this first operation resulted in New Jersey trailblazing a path in first aid work in the United States.

Mr. President, for the last 64 years, the council has served our State in countless ways. They have faithfully followed the tenets of their original constitution: " \* \* \* to bring together all first aid and safety squads; to organize and promote first aid in a systematic manner; to assist all squads in the purchase of supplies and equipment; to standardize all equipment, especially inhalators; and to further advance first aid instruction in conjunction with the Red Cross." Over the last six decades, the council's membership has swelled to 448 squads with over 14,000 members throughout the State. The council has also worked to promote community education and awareness regarding significant health issues. In recent years, the council has worked tirelessly in support of legislation to fund the training of emergency medical technicians and in 1992 the First Aid Technician's Act was passed. The act assesses \$0.50 for every moving motor vehicle violation for a fund to pay for training and recertification of EMT's. The council has over \$4 million in its coffers that will eventually be disbursed for training.

I have often emphasized the inadequacy of relying purely on political means to solve problems in our society. Solutions are not to be found solely in maintaining alliance to a party, or in voting for a particular candidate, but are to be found in the development of a strong civic society and in confronting our problems at the community and family level. Therefore, I am happy to recognize the New Jersey State First

Aid Council as an example of the volunteer spirit which I believe does more to strengthen our communities than many a bill or amendment.

The volunteers of the New Jersey State First Aid Council display an enormous amount of compassion and respect for their fellow human beings, as well as a tireless commitment to creating a safer living environment in our State. Robert W. Snowfield, president of the council, has said that being a volunteer EMT is "something you must possess in your heart and mind." This is undoubtedly true, since the only reward these volunteers receive at the end of a long day is the satisfaction that their sacrifices have helped to make their own community a better place to live.

Mr. President, I applaud the efforts of this dynamic organization and its selfless, dedicated members and congratulate them on the occasion of their 67th annual convention. •

#### PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

• Mr. DODD. Mr. President, earlier today I had the privilege of being present at the White House to witness the historic signing of the Interim Agreement on the West Bank and Gaza by Prime Minister of Israel Yitzhak Rabin and PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat. With the stroke of their pens, they have taken their people and all the peoples of the Middle East one step closer to lasting peace. Today is truly a day for celebration and prayers of thanks.

All of the efforts of those who were the enemies of peace could not deter these two brave leaders from their goal of finding the common ground that made this agreement a reality. Nor were President Clinton, Secretary Christopher, or Ambassador Dennis Ross prepared to cease their efforts as honest brokers to bridge last minute disagreements that stood in the way of finalizing the deal. I for one would like to commend the President, the Secretary, and all those who worked non-stop during this negotiating process—without their dedication, today's event would not have been possible.

Since the establishment of the State of Israel more than 47 years ago, the people of Israel have sought to live in peace with their neighbors in the Middle East. For too long Israeli efforts to reach out for peace and dialogue with its Arab counterparts were met with rejection and terrorism. Fortunately, that has now largely changed.

It is particularly fitting that Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak was among the leaders present at today's signing ceremony. After all, it was the Government of Egypt that was courageous enough to engage in the search for peace in that war-torn region. I remember the excitement, the hope, the inspiration that resulted from the signing of the 1978, Camp David Accords and the subsequent entry into force of the Israel-Egypt peace treaty in 1979.