

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: National Service
Series/Staff Member: Shirley Sagawa
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 24265
FolderID:

Folder Title:
Sagawa, Shirley - Urgent Folder

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	66	1	9	1

gene

MEMORANDUM

To: Bob Goodwin
Info.: John Dutton, Pat Bland, Kenn Allen
From: Bill Dell

Subj.: Preliminary Recommendations from Ad Hoc Advisory Group on National Service

Ref.: Your voice mail of 9/13/95

The Ad Hoc committee met on September 12, 1995 with the following present:

Mary Elizabeth Larson	Sr. Staff, Senator Nancy Kassebaum
Ellen Hargis	VC Tucson
Billie Ann Myers	Volunteer
Pat Kells	Exec. Dir. Kansas Commission on National Service
Laura Lee Geraghty	Volunteer
Sue Vineyard	President, VMSystems
Bill Dell	POLF
Cynthia Scherer	POLF
Kim Harper	POLF - YES Ambassador
Virginia Faulkner	POLF

The morning discussions centered around a candid discussion and briefing by Mary Elizabeth on her perception of recent developments in the Senate re: funding for National Service and the degree to which Senator Kassebaum would likely support re-authorizing legislation. Mary Elizabeth frankly admitted that she was caught by surprise with the \$0 funding recommendation coming out of the VA/HUD subcommittee. As late as last Friday, she had been led to believe that there would be funding restored for national service and that something had obviously happened over the weekend to change the situation. Although she was not aware of what strategy had been developed, she still thought there was room for compromise on national service. She did state however, that any re-authorization action would totally depend upon whether or not some funding was restored and there was in fact a National Service Bill to re-authorize. Mary Elizabeth made it plain that although Kassebaum was generally supportive of national service in some form, if the current program was in fact eliminated, Senator Kassebaum would not attempt to start from scratch with an authorization for a new program.

Given the uncertainties surrounding the entire issue, the decision was made to continue the groups deliberations betting that some accommodation and compromise would be made between the White House and the republican leadership and that in fact there would be a Bill to re-authorize for FY-97 through FY-99.

The group concurred that Senator Kassebaum's alternative national service bill, as well as her current position as portrayed by Mary Elizabeth, was, save a clearer focus on educational (service learning) issues, was not substantially different in concept than the existing program. Kassebaum's primary concerns centered around the issues of size for an unproved program; too much (\$), too soon, too many (participants) and the belief that the size of the educational stipend was too great. The message was to "perfect, improve" and re-package a good idea that **will** be more palatable to the Republican leadership.

Concerns from the volunteer field leadership was primarily expressed in terms of current program administration, lack of coordination/cooperation with field organizations, both Volunteer Centers and direct service agencies and the **need to expand the connection with traditional volunteerism and the Volunteer Centers**. Along this line, great care must be taken to ensure the "traditional volunteer community" is not perceived as opposed to national service. There are those in the field of volunteerism, primarily because of being given the cold shoulder during the first two years of the program, that have few good things to say about AmeriCorps. We must take care to present a united front because the national service initiative has a prominent role to play in the continuation of the volunteer sector. Other concerns were:

- The need to make sure that the new Bill is one thing to all, as opposed to the current one which is an education program to some, a jobs program to others, and a service bill to the remaining.
- The difficulty with going from the Act to implementation. Much of what is needed in a new authorization is already in current law, but has been implemented differently than the original intent.
- The need to consider this as not creating something new, but instead building on current and historical volunteer efforts, strengthening those efforts rather than competing or weakening.

The following items were discussed regarding what would be "lost" if the current national service program was to end:

- The federal/state focus on service ethic and participation
- Common view and movement toward service (National /State/ local)
- Much needed service infrastructure
- opportunities for youth service
- impetus/networking (learning and sharing)
- Fostering and/or renewing the non-partisan ethic of service as a right and responsibility of citizenship

In the area of desired changes:

- A possible change in the treatment of the monetary remuneration from "stipends" to out of pocket expenses/ allowances. (would remove much of the aura of paid service and change public/players perceptions)
- A broader umbrella of service that includes/invites all manner of participation through service
- A vision/mission definition so that the vision becomes the goal of the national service effort
- Simplify the process /reduce the bureaucracy (Need single entity to manage. Some states now have a State Office of Volunteerism, State Commission on National Service, and other state/local agencies vying for control and limited funds.)
- Re-emphasis and use of what works in the field (Historical Value/ best practices)
- Support for 3-5 years
- Empowerment/accountability at federal and local level
- Creation of a federal pool of money from which local community projects can be funded
- Development of significant resources from the field/local community (Corporate fundraising)
- Block grants to states specific to the national service mission/vision

The following preliminary recommendations were discussed that might be included as provisions/ initial elements to a "re-packaged national service program.

1. Establish a clear vision/mission statement for the national service program that would be more inclusive, (i.e.) "To foster and/or renew the non-partisan ethic of service as a right and responsibility of citizenship".
2. Convene a national (White House) conference on national service.
3. Provision for the convening of national academies of service leadership (similar to our VC-2000 leadership meetings) to obtain buy-in and support from local communities.
4. Provision for formalization of teacher education in the principles of service learning.
5. Provision for Block Grants to states to fund local projects specific to the national service mission.
6. Provision for the establishment of a single coordinating body within state government to administer national service initiatives.
7. Refinement of evaluation procedures to measure outcome/impact with a goal towards increased citizen involvement in meaningful service-- ultimately without government involvement.
8. Provision for expansion of nonprofit board/executive leadership training at the national and local level.
9. Provision for local agency readiness training.

At this point we have no idea as to the ultimate acceptability of any of the above, but it's a starting point. Without question, through our interaction with Mary Elizabeth, we are well positioned to influence whatever happens with new authorizing legislation. Next steps are to further flesh out the above and other ideas as yet to be developed. As a next step, we need your help in having the Corporation help the discussions along by providing answers to the following questions:

1. What does the Corporation want?
2. Other players?
3. State Corporation/Executive Director input?
4. Current spending patterns re: service learning programs/training, youth development programs, programs for seniors, other categories.....?
5. Marketing plan for this fall?

Obviously we will need to have representation soon from the Corporation. Recommend we wait until Harris is confirmed.

H: bdreauth.doc

MEMORANDUM

To: Shirley Sagawa
From: Emily Keller
Date: November 1, 1995
Re: Article Summaries

Attached are the article summaries that you requested from the October edition of *Perspectives on the Federal Role in National and Community Service*.

Perspectives on the Federal Role in National and Community Service, October, 1995:
Article Summaries and Excerpts

"Setting the Context for the Discussion: An Introduction" by Fran Rothstein

The turmoil in this country makes now the ideal time for new service initiatives, crafted by public and private organizations and supported by the federal government. Although national and community service have their roots in the private sector, they deserve federal investment to ensure that their initiatives will grow in scale. Although the authors of the following essays write from different perspectives, there exists a startling unison about the value of national and community service and the absolute necessity, timeliness, and correctness of a federal investment strategy.

National service offers youth a chance to redirect their lives in a positive way. National service has proven its potential to build responsibility, compassion, and community involvement among its participants. The federal government has a responsibility to ensure that every young person has an opportunity to serve the community and country, as part of their civic education.

AmeriCorps, the centerpiece of the current federal investment strategy, will grow in popularity as more people recognize that those providing valuable service are AmeriCorps members. However, some agencies have found it difficult to balance their known and respected identity with an AmeriCorps overlay. In addition, in the polarized political climate in which the reauthorization debate is occurring, legislators may be more inclined to support the diversity of homegrown programs over the perceived "AmeriCorps umbrella."

While the president's involvement with national service has boosted the scope and visibility of national service, AmeriCorps has also become the opponent's most valuable hostage in this fractious partisan climate. The challenge for the near future is to balance a principled stand on federal support for service with political expediency. People must realize that, in the end, the most compelling argument for national service is that "it's the right thing to do."

"National Service: An Opportunity Worthy of Government Investment" by Randi Shade

Voters' alienation, frustration and anger with government have created an ideal opportunity to implement and strengthen national service. Politicians should be scorned for failing to recognize the connection between national service and the idea of government creating common highways by replacing the "old system" with a more flexible, grassroots system. Our elected officials are ill-informed and motivated only by immediate political ramifications.

The national service debate is truly confusing. National service is not just one program, but an entire movement. This movement refers to the federal government's fostering of opportunities that bring diverse people together to find common ground and achieve positive results in their communities. The debate should revolve around which initiatives to fund and how to fund them, rather than whether to fund national service at all.

National service has the potential to inspire even the most alienated citizens to become involved in our country. Government must support ventures that create value for society by involving people with skills and talent to make opportunity out of chaos, contradiction, and confusion, and provide the resources for these people to pursue that opportunity.

AmeriCorps has done more to attract individuals with vision, passion, commitment and motivation than any other government program in recent history. Though not perfect, AmeriCorps has done much to meet the public's demand for federally-funded initiatives that inspire creativity, logical design, broad citizen involvement, and new solutions to problems. AmeriCorps should not be judged for its individual failures because, as with venture capitalists, not every investment will pay off. The federal government must give AmeriCorps a few years to solidly establish itself.

National service is government's ideal opportunity to involve citizens in the process of making our country run better, and now is the ideal time to implement national service. Americans want government to put sensibility ahead of politics. National service is a sensible solution to many of society's current problems.

"The Importance of a Bipartisan Consensus for a Federal Role in the Service Movement" by
Roger Landrum

The central goal of the national and community service is to provide quality opportunities for young people to serve their communities and country in various settings. Service provides young people with active and positive roles in their communities, developing them as citizens and bringing with them the valuable resources of energy and idealism.

National government plays an extremely important role in achieving the goals of national service. Congress and the President must tell America's young people the importance of service. Federal power and resources must be invested in national service to sustain large-scale participation. The real challenge is to define the role the federal government should play in the service movement and create a policy mix that will win bipartisan support.

Though finding the right policy mix to build consensus will take much time and care, any feasible proposal must include key elements that can win bipartisan support. The identity and marketing of national and community service are crucial for support. National service should be marketed as a nongovernmental institution which government supports but does not own, operate or dominate. Government should be seen as only one of many investors in this movement. AmeriCorps must be viewed as a truly national effort instead of a Democratic program.

Many suggestions focus on separating the federal government and federal funds from national service. There should be a mix of both public and private funding. A policy which limits federal funds to no more than 49 percent of the budget of any service program could prove a valuable way of reducing the intrusiveness of federal regulations and winning support of Republicans. A balance of full-time stipended service and part-time volunteering could also win

the support of Republicans. Colleges and universities could become the primary investors by giving volunteers priority eligibility for federal higher education grants and loans. The Corporation for National Service could be moved outside of the government entirely or could rely more heavily in nongovernmental organizations. Unless compromises can be reached to build bipartisan support for national service, the movement risks losing federal support entirely.

"A Modest Proposal for Rescuing and Redirecting AmeriCorps" by Steven Waldman

The Republicans are missing a terrific opportunity to use national service programs to eliminate "bureaucratic waste" such as the Welfare State. Programs such as AmeriCorps could make it easier to slash social spending and undercut the handout mentality. Republicans should propose cutting several billion dollars from social programs and adding half the amount to AmeriCorps. National service programs have the added benefit of engendering a sense of obligation to community among young Americans.

AmeriCorps is not a typical government program. Most of the money is distributed through the states to local nonprofits which must compete for grants. Because AmeriCorps programs are based in the private sector and staffed by hard-working idealistic youths, they tend to be far more efficient than traditional government bureaucracies. Often times AmeriCorps programs have been able to accomplish much more than many other government-run programs in the areas of low-income housing, inner-city education, immunization of children, and reading programs. AmeriCorps programs, therefore, could be used in conjunction with slashes in welfare and Medicaid.

Service programs also offer subsidiary benefits, such as providing skills and confidence to the participants. Participants may also benefit from a sense of discipline and self-worth. Service brings people of different backgrounds together in pursuit of a common goal.

Some AmeriCorps programs have been and will be ineffective. Unlike stationary bureaucracies, however, it is easy to defund ineffective AmeriCorps programs since they must compete each year for continued funding. Republicans must resist their impulse to focus on the negatives of AmeriCorps in order to kill a program associated with Clinton.

"How to Maximize the Impact of Federal Investment in National Service" by Robert K. Goodwin

The federal government must help fund national service. National service has shown itself to be an investment, rather than an expense by signalling of importance of service and citizenship in our society, encouraging innovative efforts to solve serious social problems that plague communities, leveraging nonfederal resources, promoting service opportunities for the breadth and diversity of our population, and providing both formal and informal opportunities for personal, social, and academic development of young and old. Recent reports document that the gains to society and the percentage of nonfederal funding leveraged by tax dollars of national

service rival even the most efficient government programs.

National service must retain bipartisan federal support over the long term. Even with this support, national service must change in order to survive. In this article, some such changes follow.

We must first change our perception of what national service is. The definition should be made broad enough to include all manners of voluntary service, not just AmeriCorps. We must focus on a vision of national service as a means, not an end. The vision of national service should be inclusive and should help politicians and the public understand the importance of service to individuals and to communities. People must also understand that national service costs money, such as staff, transportation and food expenses.

We must restructure and simplify the funding process. There should be less bureaucracy, less redundancy, and less competition among local, state and national entities. A federal pool of money for community projects could be created and block grants could be provided to states to fund local and state projects. We should not be unrealistic in our timeframe. Realistically, it will take at least three years to build strong programs so we must therefore see the federal funds as a long-term investment. We must increase the emphasis on the best practices. Successful practices should be captured, analyzed and disseminated. Local agency readiness training must also be provided to ensure quality service opportunities for national service participants. Excellent planning and administrative structures at both the state and local level must be ensured through single coordinating bodies in each state.

The Corporation for National Service, through partnerships with national and local resources, should take some steps immediately. The Corporation along with the White House should have a conference on national service. The Corporation could obtain buy-in and support from communities by organizing national academies of service leadership which could increase the visibility of service-learning. These steps could help national service achieve its goal of calling all Americans to serve their communities and build a stronger country.

"Five Recommendations for National Service" by Suzanne Goldsmith

National service programs are in danger of elimination although they are at the cutting edge of a movement to redefine the federal government's role in shaping social policy and programs. They offer a decentralized, flexible, and responsive vehicle for increasing citizen response to local needs. The model for national service does, however, present some serious problems. Many Americans are not aware of the impact of national service because of the diversified nature of the programs. If national service is to flourish, adjustments must be made.

Service and volunteerism must work hand in hand. Though unpaid volunteers can meet many of the nation's needs, most Americans only have a few hours a week to volunteer. National service targets people with time to give then offers them living stipends, educational incentives, and bottom-line benefits to enable them to commit full- or half-time. Wages should not be paid

for service. Many national service participants are willing to work for less than minimum wage. Stipends should be offered as a way of meeting expenses, not as wages.

National service should focus on bolstering important public services, such as hospitals, police departments, schools, and long-term care institutions. As government reduces services, national service can help fill in the gaps. National service will not be considered vital until it meets vital needs.

National service should not be promoted as a reform program for youth for many reasons. It sets up expectations that cannot possibly be met. For every reformed youth, there are probably nine who are not reformed by national service. It also fails to recognize the important contributions of college graduates, recent immigrants, and teenagers, who have taken time out of their schedules or careers to serve their country. National service is concerned primarily with accomplishing needed work. If lives are changed by national service that is just an added bonus.

National service can strengthen national identity by harnessing the energy and goodwill that accompanies being part of a large national effort. Those who serve must be made visible, and all Americans must be made aware of the role national service is playing in meeting community needs. Standard uniforms and common language would help unify national service. National service, in order to be successful, must learn from experience, keep improving, and tell its unique story in such a way that the nation cannot fail to listen.

"What Is the Ideal Role for the Federal Government in the National Service Field?" by Linda Forsyth

There is an appropriate national service leadership and investment role for the federal government. AmeriCorps, first of all, should be thought of as arms and legs for social institutions. Linked with social institutions, AmeriCorps is a fitting way for us to deal with a tumultuous, polarizing, highly volatile environment. Community members could come together to name their most urgent needs and to figure out how to use this new domestic service corps to help. Every school could develop a comprehensive plan that uses all of its resources to educate all of its students. AmeriCorps could become the key tool for school improvement. AmeriCorps gives core institutions, such as schools, flexibility, credibility, rapid response capacity, and mission.

The issues of fee-for-service and spiking must also be resolved. Ways must be found to sustain corps-based teams of AmeriCorps, but the concept of AmeriCorps as responding to the needs and that have been identified and written into AmeriCorps proposals by community-based collaboration must also be honored. The AmeriCorps model "swat" teams could be legitimized and brought into a community to meet specific needs. The best solution may be a separate subtitle for swat team programs. Spiking, or allowing AmeriCorps members from one program to serve for a specified time in another, could enhance the AmeriCorps experience if pre-planned and well-organized spiking were incorporated into certain placements.

States should be responsible for designing and implementing a sound competitive grant

process, without the duplication of effort in having proposals read at both state and federal levels. The federal leadership role should include approving the process and providing help and technical assistance to states. The final approval of candidates should be made at the state level. The federal agency must relinquish some authority, responsibility and accountability to the states, and focus on leadership.

Apprenticeship placements for individuals who have completed an AmeriCorps term of service and who wish to apply their trust award toward an apprenticeship wage could be developed. The use of AmeriCorps members to extend existing services must also be examined. AmeriCorps is only defensible if it fits into a plan carefully designed by a private-public community partnership, but questions still remain as to whether to use teams of AmeriCorps members only to do work that is qualitatively different from that performed by regular employees. The reauthorized Act should contain very clear delimiting language.

AmeriCorps could also be established as State Peace Corps, that address each state's identified urgent needs. The federal government could assure that the "service army" is exempt from unemployment insurance requirements, enjoys a national identity, has common health coverage, and has sufficient training. The country could return to the idea of mandatory service, with AmeriCorps as one of the options. In this post-Cold War era, the most urgent threats to our freedoms are coming from within the country. National service could help protect these freedoms.

"Streams Into A River" by Harris Wofford

In the 1980's all of the streams of national service in America put together fell far short of being a mighty river. Though President Reagan called for the restoration of the American spirit of voluntary service, membership in such organizations as the Peace Corps dwindled. Today's AmeriCorps, which draws on the spirit of the Peace Corps, the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the G.I. Bill, is different in that it is based in the independent sector. It goes beyond government to release the power to the people.

AmeriCorps has thousands of members working at programs throughout the country. In addition to the programs of the Corporation for National Service, there are scores of other youth corps and long-established civic and religious volunteer agencies throughout the country. In spite of this wealth of opportunities, national service is not yet strong enough to overcome some of the most urgent problems of our communities and country.

National service offers an opportunity to bring Americans together at a time in our country where there are sharp racial and class divisions. National service also can help solve our country's problems that are due to a lack of values. With the Welfare State being reduced, the problems of education, public safety, health and environment can be helped by national service.

In order to galvanize citizens to do what urgently needs doing, we must show that decentralized national service is a cost-effective way of getting things done. We must break

through the citizens' cynicism and thereby release the constructive power of people working together. We must find ways and means to make citizen service the common expectation and experience of all Americans.

We must begin at the school with well-organized programs. The senior programs must also be supported and strengthened, because one's later years is a period when people can dedicate a large part of time to their service. Seniors also bring a lifetime of practical experience and community connection.

Full-time and part-time service complement one another. A substantial portion of AmeriCorps assignments are directly geared to enlisting and organizing the volunteer service of others. The Corporation should give a higher priority to AmeriCorps assignments that focus on expanding the service of such unpaid part-time community volunteers.

AmeriCorps should aim to become less of a government bureaucracy and more of a trust of the American people, like the American Red Cross. We must work together to get national service established in the public mind as a nonpartisan institution in which all American people can take pride. National service is not the property of any one President or party. If there is any idea that is truly all-American it is national service. National service eventually will prove itself by the deeds of Corps members and community volunteers who get things done.

DRAFT

Reauthorization Issues

by Linda Forsyth

This paper covers only issues that should be part of the National and Community Service Act of 1993 reauthorization discussion. It does not include the many suggestions that are appropriate for Corporation administrative policy and practice that would improve services for and partnership with Commissions. It is a compilation of ideas and recommendations from practitioners, commissioners and executive directors. Later, suggestions from leaders in the foundation world will be added.

The final version of this paper will contain results from the attached survey that is being sent with this draft to all state executive directors, foundation leaders, and a broader constituency of program leaders. Please use the attached survey to add your comments. We will certainly not gain consensus on all of the ideas contained in this paper, but all ideas that relate to the law have been included. There are some notable common themes, and perhaps I can show the degree of agreement by summarizing your responses on the survey. Should any suggestions that represent the views of only one audience be so identified in the final version of this paper?

AmeriCorps Typologies

Before discussing the technical and structural areas for change in reauthorization of the Act, it is useful to first discuss some of the ways that people think about AmeriCorps. Several visions have emerged in my discussions with others throughout the country. I have attempted to roll these visions of AmeriCorps into two broad typologies. In any case, it is necessary, in my opinion, to address the very different ways in which people envision AmeriCorps in the reauthorized version of the Act---even if only to allow States the authority to implement whatever model or vision they choose.

The Leadership Typology

In this model, AmeriCorps members are placed within host agencies, singly or in very small teams to help that agency implement its designed services---reaching more people, or expanding that kind of service. Generally, I see the leadership typology as an "ongoing service" model, in that the services are provided as a continuous strand throughout the year, and achievement of specific annual objectives is measured by noting qualitative changes over time (benchmark changes are generally required for demonstrating annual results). Examples might be Members acting as Service-Learning Coordinators or school reform facilitators, using school-community service as a tool. In these instances, schools have adopted a service strategy, but need assistance with its implementation. AmeriCorps

Members provide that assistance, and leave behind a record of knowledge about what they do and how someone else can do it when the Members are gone.

Other examples include the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) and YMCA Pryde programs that use single or teams-of-two AmeriCorps Member placements within the placement organization to expand that organization's capacity to service its local community. CASA Members, for example, act as advocates for children who are dependent upon services ordered by a court; one YMCA Pryde program uses AmeriCorps Members to teach swimming classes to students from the neighborhood school, by agreement with the school district, at the local Y and to conduct an after-school program that emphasize resiliency and character development to resist the lure of gangs, in addition to strengthening academic performance.

The Corps Typology

This program type may or may not be found in a corps (local or state conservation corps; City Year) but I see it as a group or crew-based model that is characteristic of the corps. Corps models are usually also project-based models, in that the team or crew undertakes specific projects, which, taken together, meet the program's stated annual objectives. Most often, the projects are tangible (unlike the services of the leadership model) and are evident to the observer within the Member's service year. Examples of this are City Year, the conservation corps, the Watershed Project, and the Summerbridge summer school programs for students.

These two models derive from two visions of AmeriCorps: as "extenders" that allow agencies providing needed community services to reach more people, and as "teams" or "crews" of AmeriCorps members that are organized to respond to the action plan of collaborations of community organizations, public and private.

Another twist is that many of our currently operating corps model programs face the question of whether or not they may accept fees-for-services provided. At present, there seems to be acceptance of this practice if the services are part of a community collaboration (partnership) funded AmeriCorps plan or if the designated services are requested by an entity that manages resources in the public domain or that acts on behalf of the general public, such as the U.S Forest Service, the State Fish and Game Department, or Housing and Urban Development. The fee-for-service issue still cries for clarification, since one of the underpinnings of AmeriCorps is its prerequisite for a community organizational partnership that assesses its community's urgent, unmet needs and develops a plan (a proposal for AmeriCorps funding) that shows how AmeriCorps intervention will address those needs.

This is conceptually different from taking a fee from one entity to provide a specific service requested by that entity.

Reauthorization Issues

The reauthorization ideas collected over the past several months tend to fall into two categories: technical, "clean-up" issues and fundamental restructuring ideas. It should be noted here that many excellent suggestions have been made for improving the Corporation-Commission partnership, and that those have found their way to the Corporation offices and to the Board. The focus of this paper is on those issues that require changes in the law, rather than suggestions for improved administrative policies.

National Level Technical Issues

Below are listed the technical clean-up suggestions from Executive Directors of many states, Commissioners, discussions with program implementors and state program officers:

1. Amend all necessary bills to assure consistency nationwide that AmeriCorps members are not entitled to unemployment insurance benefits; therefore, payment of unemployment insurance premiums is not required of AmeriCorps programs. Clarify (define) the difference, in law, between a Member and an employee. Go beyond the intent language and inferred understandings currently in the Act.
2. State clearly, whatever structural changes may obtain in the new Act, that the ADA disability funds are open to all AmeriCorps streams and to all AmeriCorps funding sources equally.
3. State clearly that the Member's education award is not taxable.
4. Combine AmeriCorps*USA and AmeriCorps*VISTA into one funding and programmatic bill. Use this as an opportunity to clarify the differences between the kinds of service these two programs provide to an agency and/or a community.
5. As clearly as possible, set limits on the kind of high-risk service environment to which Members may be assigned without first having the necessary training and/or credentialing. If the project or services do require advanced training, that becomes a prerequisite for recruitment.
6. Update the Domestic Volunteers Act (Federal law that supersedes State law) to assure ease in AmeriCorps contracting with VISTA and Senior Corps, and to assure that the definition of AmeriCorps Member as neither a

volunteer nor an employee is clear, for purposes of unemployment insurance, risk-management, or other relevant areas (as in item #1).

7. Clarify the responsibilities of the Commissions for national direct grantees and fund all administrative, training, and monitoring responsibilities designated to Commission staff. (This may be better handled through major restructuring of national service programs; in fact, one recommendation is to cease funding of federal agency and/or all national direct programs entirely. Another is to move that funding and responsibility to the State Commissions.) Specific role clarifications offered in our surveys include: requiring national directs to participate in Commission-sponsored national identity and training activities; ensuring that national parent organizations are clear about their relationship with the larger national and state service organizations; either developing clear (and funded) relations between national directs and State Commissions or completely separating the two, with the Corporation taking full TA and monitoring responsibility for the national directs. (This is not the preferred solution; States would strongly prefer a restructured view of this, in which national directs become State-selected and administered programs; i. e., national direct funds and responsibilities are rolled into the State's formula and administrative grants.)

8. Amend necessary Federal law(s) to permit the participation of welfare participants in AmeriCorps programs and eliminate any disincentives that may exist under Federal statute. States that want to use AmeriCorps as an avenue to enhance the character and skills development needed to assure employability should be encouraged to do so, as long as the program meets AmeriCorps standards; i.e., it clearly differentiates AmeriCorps from other jobs corps and workfare programs. Eliminating whatever constraints may continue to exist federally (after welfare reform enactment) allows States to be innovative in using service as a strategy to move individuals to self-support, emphasizing the power of Member development through becoming the "server" rather than always the recipient of services.

9. Eliminate the binary approach of funding AmeriCorps*USA programs (i.e., competitive and formula) to assure consistency and the incentive for Commissions to invest equally in both as they carry out their program monitoring responsibilities (for troubled programs, this can be a heavy staff and resource investment). OR, alternatively, if the binary approach continues, then clearly award Commissions the final authority and responsibility for monitoring and providing the final recommendation for funding status of its competitive grant programs to the Corporation Board. If the Commission determines that a competitive grant program is unworthy of continued investment (renewal funding), then another program that has demonstrated a threshold of excellence and is on a waiting list from that state should be the first program recommended to the Corporation Board as a substitute for the nonrenewed program. If the state has no alternative

program on the Competitive grant waiting list, the Corporation Board then acts on the recommendation of Corporation staff. This rewards the time and resources spent by a Commission to ensure maximum good faith effort to help even the most troubled programs succeed.

10. Emphasize the intent to promote the ethic of service by requiring States to include general plans for Learn and Serve, AmeriCorps, VISTA, the Senior Corps and traditional programs in their State Plan. Emphasize the landscape of CNS programs in Federally sponsored evaluation, training, administrative (including Corporation organizational design) and clearinghouse efforts. Promote a seamless system of service by encouraging cross-stream applications (devise one) and talking about the "seasons of service" or the "citizens in service" so that one stream does not become the entire focal point of the movement. (This may be an administrative, rather than a legal, issue.)

11. Require Higher Education Learn and Serve applicants to apply for their funding through the State Commission's grant process. This provides better linkage across CNS programs, encourages Commissions to take a more earnest interest in higher-ed-based service programs, and could encourage innovative recruitment of AmeriCorps service-learning coordinators among those who are also participants in service-learning (in their college courses).

12. Use a portion of the T/TA funds to support training for and placement of a young Program Officer Fellow in each Commission office for one year. This could be done for \$3 million (less than 25% of current T/TA funds) and would be particularly helpful for small states that do not have sufficient administrative funds to support the program specialist staffing they need. It is also a way to contract for centralized training (perhaps one week for the initial training, with follow-up support trainings once or twice during the year). It may be a prerequisite that Fellows have prior experience as participants in a service program. This helps Commissions develop high-quality programs, provides a vehicle for disseminating good administrative and program technical assistance practices, and provides opportunities for those who are interested in furthering their service program experiences at a policy and State implementation level. Moreover, if States do assume responsibility for national direct programs, additional staffing will be essential.

13. Strengthen or emphasize the use of AmeriCorps Members as service-learning coordinators in schools, and provide incentives for linkages between AmeriCorps and Learn and Serve America programs.

14. Require that data collected by the Corporation be available to Commissions, upon request, as aggregate reports on Members, service hours, etc. in their States. For example, data from Member entry and exit forms should be forwarded to State Commissions.

15. Base State Administrative Grants on the number of CNS projects (not limited to AmeriCorps*USA) operating in the State and requiring coordination and/or technical assistance efforts.

16. Clarify the fee-for-service issue; align it with the adopted vision of AmeriCorps. If necessary, develop a special funding strand for corps-based programs that allows greater latitude with this than is otherwise contemplated for AmeriCorps programs.

Technical Issues That States Should Have the Authority to Decide

Commission should have increased flexibility and matching authority on a number of issues, according our constituents. Commission should have the authority to decide:

1. Whether, and under what limits, AmeriCorps members may (or may not) engage in fundraising or soliciting of donations for their programs, projects, or host agencies. Some programs allow Members to solicit donations of materials needed for their projects. While this may be acceptable, one source indicated that some Members said they were told that if they could not raise the needed materials or funds for their project, they would have to donate money themselves to support the project.
2. Which applicants will receive Formula-funds and full authority to design and implement their system for determining which programs will not receive renewal funding. There would be no need to submit the Formula applications in the State plan; a list of the names and locations of programs selected for funding would suffice. The Act should also clearly delineate the monitoring responsibilities of the Commissions and the Corporation for Competitive grantees, if those two funding typologies continue to exist (see item 9 above).
3. The program match requirements within the State, particularly for Formula-funded programs. Programs in some states may have no problem making a 20% match the first year and moving to a 50% match by the last grant year (another State decision---the maximum number of years, if any, for any grant award). Other states may not have a sufficiently strong corporate or foundation base to require a large, multi-year match, or they may decide that the ultimate goal is for local area service programs to prove so worthy that they garner local governmental (tax-base) support.
4. The duration and transition terms of grants (particularly for Formula grants, if the two kinds of AmeriCorps*USA grants are to continue in the Act). That is, a State may elect to award a five-year grant, renewable upon reasonable accomplishment of objectives, to a community-based partnership

that has (a) a given partnership make-up, and (b) accepts certain rather stiff match requirements. This contemplates allowing a longer period for "transitioning" the services to other community funding sources, and/or allowing programs that emphasize long-range goals to have sufficient time to attain those. Additionally, it allows programs with high upfront costs (such as a project-based program) to amortize costs over a longer period of time.

5. Whether there will be one administrative office or two for the national service programs in the State. States should be free to consolidate the current Corporation office with the Commission for efficiency. (This may be better covered as a reauthorization issue.)

6. How host agencies/programs should insert AmeriCorps into their local (and State) identity. There is much unhappiness about this issue. One writer stated that the obsession with national identity caused some problems for programs in securing local agency or corporate support. Programs, for example, should be encouraged to use a slogan that identifies the agency, State, or key corporate supporter--i. e., "this is IBM-AmeriCorps," if IBM is a major player in that program and partnership!

7. All training and technical assistance required by the panoply of service programs in the State, and control of the T/TA funds (and PDAT, to assure strategic integration and coordination). Commissions are closer to the needs of programs in various parts of their state, and should be required to develop an effective system for delivering technical assistance. GET RID OF THE CURRENT NATIONAL T/TA system. Suggestions from virtually all input sources support this. Suggestions ranged from awarding States T/TA vouchers to setting up a direct drawdown T/TA account to simply awarding a T/TA grant to each state, on a formula basis. Small states may elect to combine their funds to develop an efficient training and technical assistance system, such as four states in the Pacific Northwest have already done (contracting with North West Labs in Portland). Other large states, like California, have widely diverse T/TA needs and have developed, through a public-private partnership, a system and the regional infrastructure to meet those needs.

8. Whether to approve an instate request from two or more programs that seek to make "spiking" arrangements. Spiking refers to the temporary assignment of AmeriCorps members from one program to serve in another AmeriCorps program that has similar objectives for a specified (and limited) amount of time.

9. Whether higher education applicants can represent a single campus or must represent a statewide (or collaborative) effort. Also, empower the Commissions to read and select the Higher Education Learn and Serve grantees. This creates a more cohesive State effort that crosses program

streams, including traditional programs and encourages Higher Education institutions to participate in State conferences, trainings, regional networks, etc.

Fundamental Restructuring Ideas

There is a movement in Congress to block-grant program dollars to States, with general provisions that define the purposes for which the funds are to be used (with delimitations and prohibitions), leaving the strategies for meeting those purposes to each individual State. What might we contemplate if National Service dollars are also moved to the States in a block grant--or in some near-block grant form that provides greatly increased authority and flexibility to States in exchange for accountability?

Block Grant CNS funds to States on a formula basis, with a guaranteed minimum grant to small States (should this be called a Consolidated Programs Grant??)

1. Consolidate all CNS programs (perhaps with the exception of the NCCC which is located in a few States and which better lends itself to Federal oversight) into one National Service Grant and award funding to States on a formula basis, with a minimum base of funding guaranteed for small States. This has implications in particular for the national direct programs. Those may be retained by States and operated with the other "multi-operating-site" programs that Commissions presently administer. For example, one YMCA-based program in California operates in over 40 locations, and may provide a useful model for handling national directs that have more than one operating site in a State and that operate under policies of their national nonprofit host organization.
2. Under the Block/Consolidated Programs Grant scenario, the flexibilities listed above are a given. Basically, States would have full decisionmaking authority to develop and manage their priority issues and strategies, the grant process, a technical assistance and monitoring system, and responsibly administer the program grants.
3. Under terms of the Block/Consolidated Grant (or whatever it is called), States should be encouraged to link program streams and tie CNS programs into traditional service programs creatively. States should be required to develop a plan for the coordinated use of the funds and show how their plan meets the (given) intent of the Act. Even under a Block/Consolidated Grant, there may be some caveats: for example, the Act may stipulate that funds be distributed through a competitive grant process to assure maintenance of quality and eventual rotation of these funds in and out of communities; a certain percentage of funds may be earmarked for Governor's Innovative Programs (per the intent of Subtitle H), or a percentage of the funds may be

earmarked for programs administered by a public-private partnership of organizations (or by local governmental agencies), or a percentage may be earmarked for service-learning (K-12 and higher education). The caveats should be few and strategic, however, in order that the intended flexibility not be greatly diminished.

Treat different States differently

1. Block/Consolidate the grant to States that submit a plan for managing one grant that meets the intent of the reauthorized Act (i. e., assures the integrity of programs as contemplated by the Act, and assures fiscal accountability) and allow other States to function with greater dependency on the Corporation. Hold all States accountable for implementing their plan and accomplishing their objectives.

A Change in roles for the Corporation and the Commissions

1. The Corporation would assume a leadership, convener, information-disseminator role, and the Commission would become the entrepreneurial administrators of innovative, adaptive, effective programs. The Corporation might fund and promote national research designed to add to the body of knowledge about service from the viewpoint of political sciences, sociologists, educators, psychologists, public policy specialists, etc. Commissions would concentrate on statewide evaluations of the effectiveness of various program models and demonstration projects, training and assisting programs with data collection that, for example, uses common instruments so cross-comparisons can be made.

2. Commissions would be held accountable for the effectiveness of their selected strategies; in exchange, they have the authority to make all of the decisions in the discussion above, in addition to creating innovative programs such as the apprenticeship-AmeriCorps, whereby the "education award" can be used as an "apprenticeship award." Additionally, States may elect to promote short-term planning grants to communities, or long-term grants to assist communities move successful demonstration programs to achieve local, public funding. In this example, a partnership operating a successful AmeriCorps program for three years may seek additional years of "transitional funding" during which time the cash match increases dramatically. This gives the program leaders time to convince the city council, the board of supervisors or citizens to support a local tax that assures continuation of the partnership's services. This would demonstrate the ultimate success in our communities: endorsement with cash from the taxpayers!

Ideas States may want to try: States may elect to have a national service effort that is a State Peace Corps model, or they may elect to develop an all-corps model or an all-leadership model. They may establish "mobile service teams" that specialize in environmental clean-up, emergency disaster relief, or building houses for the homeless. These "mobile service teams" would move to communities that request and can support their work and provide leadership in getting the specific things done and rallying community volunteers to help. The teams would be in a community for six weeks and move on.

States may decide to use their national service corps as demonstrations of effective ways to help other publically funded efforts meet their legislative intent; for example, welfare reform, special education, school-to-work, post-10 high school reform, healthy start or public health efforts, domestic violence and teen pregnancy prevention programs.

States may elect to create a challenge grant system, whereby a certified program could be guaranteed a dollar for dollar match for local funds that are raised beyond the minimum match required by the State.

Thanks to all of you whose ideas are in this paper! More thoughts?
Please fill in the attached survey that is based on the content of this paper and fax to Linda Forsyth, The California Commission on Improving Life Through Service, at (916) 323-3227. E-mail comments should be sent to:
lforsyth@ocde.ca.gov

Shirley —

Patty pulled these.

John Walters agreed to be the "negative" editor.

If you want to continue w/ your idea of pro-con Congressional viewpoints for ACMs, somebody should send this (d other?) stuff to John.

RA

Rick:

11/28/95

Per your request, here are statements "in support" of Nat. Service.

Patty

that serves as an inspiration to us all. I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to this outstanding American. His contributions to freedom's cause cannot be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO BOY SCOUT TROOP 283

HON. JIM RAMSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 15, 1995

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the proud history, rich tradition and remarkable accomplishments of Boy Scout Troop 283 of Wayzata, MN, in my Third Congressional District.

This Sunday, November 19, Troop 283 will be celebrating its 80th anniversary.

I am particularly proud of Boy Scout Troop 283 since it is based at my own Wayzata Community Church. I know the great work this troop has done and its commitment to excellence.

Boy Scout Troop 283 has represented the highest standards in Scouting for eight decades. The hundreds of Scouts and their many volunteer leaders have displayed an inspiring dedication through these past 80 years which has had a powerful and positive impact on the quality of life in our area.

The young people of today, who now more than ever need strong adult guidance and parental involvement in learning valuable skills that will help them mature into good citizens, have been extremely well-served by the generous and dedicated volunteers and parents who have led Troop 283 through the years.

Troop 283's emphasis on providing our young people with positive role models, the importance of community service to help people in the need and protect the environment, and the critical value of exercising active, good citizenship has been truly remarkable. There is no price you can place on that kind of public service, leadership, and good citizenship.

The participation of adult volunteers and the Scouts of Troop 283 will continue to make a huge difference in the future of our community, State, and Nation. These young people are tomorrow's leaders and they are getting the skills, knowledge, moral guidance, and inspiration they need to keep America the greatest country in the world and a lighthouse for freedom and liberty into the 21st century.

Everyone who has been involved with Boy Scout Troop 283 through the years is to be congratulated on their invaluable 80-year investment in the future of our Nation. Troop 283 has our deepest admiration and sincerest gratitude for a job well done, as well as our best wishes for the future.

On behalf of all the people in our area, I wholeheartedly thank Boy Scout Troop 283 for its contributions to making our area a great place to live, work, and raise a family.

REQUEST TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 119, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2621, the bill which the Republicans say is to enforce the public debt limit and to protect the Social Security Trust Fund, and other Federal Trust fund accounts invested in public debt obligation. Once again, more Republican smoke and mirrors. Make no mistake about it, H.R. 2621 is the Republicans' measure to force the Government to default on its obligations.

It is appalling for the Republicans to hold the country, and the American people hostage to their politically contrived and premeditated train wreck. Is there no limit to the extreme tactics that the Republicans will use to force a tax cut for the wealthy. The Republicans have forced the Federal Government to shut down; are striving to force the Government to renege on its debts; are bent on forcing seniors to pay more for less health care; are set of forcing poor children and pregnant women to go without critical health care services; and are set on forcing college students to pay more for their college education. Despite the fact the Republicans' budget defies logic and common sense, they want to force the President to agree to their life threatening budget provisions.

Now, they have introduced H.R. 2621 a measure strictly designed to back the country into a corner, and to force the Government to default—all this destruction, just to give a tax cut to the rich. The Republicans' tantrum tactics must end.

Mr. Speaker, a family would not pay off its mortgage in 7 years if it meant that they had to take food out of the mouths of their children. Both food and shelter are a necessity, it is not a one, or the other situation. The Republicans need to take a lesson from families. Families sensibly balance their responsibilities. Families sensibly spread their debt—and their payments for services over time.

The Republican budget measure is not a balanced budget mechanism—it is a measure that is specifically designed to destroy the quality of life for the most vulnerable in our society—children and the elderly. Those who have entrusted us with their future, and who are most vulnerable to the Republicans' assault.

I applaud the President for this strong leadership, and wholeheartedly support his veto of the Republicans' front-loaded continuing resolution, and debt limit measures.

Day after day, we have heard our Republican colleagues refer to Medicaid and Medicare as "socialized programs." We have heard them use phrases like "we have to get on with it," "the pain is not so severe," and "we have to hold the President's feet to the fire." We have also continuously heard the Republicans speak with concern for the unborn children of

the future, while showing no compassion for the children who walk among us today—despite the fact that the Republican budget takes food out of mouths of poor children; takes the roof from over the heads of door seniors; and takes away health care services from pregnant women. These senior's and children's future will be crippled and their very survival jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have never had any intention of sending the President a clean continuing resolution measure, or a clean debt limit bill. The Republican touted crown jewel in their contract—the tax cut give away for the rich—knows no bounds. As early as April, House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH vowed to create a titanic legislative standoff with the President by adding vetoed bills to must pass debt ceiling legislation. As recently as July, the GOP admitted that default was a major political weapon in their arsenal. The Republicans' escalating mean spirited attack is firm evidence that they think that no child's cry is too harsh, and no senior's pain is too bitter to forgo their tax cut give away to the rich.

Over the past 11 months, the Nation has witnessed the unfolding of the Republicans' premeditated assault on the most vulnerable in our society—children and the elderly. Nearly 6 weeks into the new fiscal year, work on 10 of the 13 appropriations bills is still pending. The Republicans are dragging their feet. If Speaker GINGRICH and his cohorts performed their responsibilities in a timely and responsible manner, there would be no need to bring the Federal Government to a halt.

With each day of the Republican-forced shut down of the Federal Government, 20 thousand new Social Security claims will not be processed. With each day of the Republican-forced shut down of the Federal Government, 2,500 to 3,000 veterans' benefits claims will not be processed. The American people must not be held hostage to the GOP's tax cut for the rich.

Again, I applaud President Clinton for vetoing the Republicans' life threatening budget and debt ceiling measures. I commend him for his principled stand to protect the American people. And, I join President Clinton in condemning the Republican leadership for its shameful attempt to blackmail the oval office by holding seniors, children, veterans, and our Nation's economy hostage.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that it is the height of irresponsibility for the Republicans in Congress to force American citizens to suffer inconvenience and hardship simply because they are trying to score political points. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2621.

SALUTE TO AMERICORPS PARTICIPANTS OF SOUTH DAKOTA

HON. TIM JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 15, 1995

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the participants of the second AmeriCorps team in South Dakota. On October 24, 1995, at an Oath of Service ceremony in Rosebud, SD, 15 dedicated individuals committed themselves to 1 year of community service in South Dakota as participants in the AmeriCorps Program. I strongly

support the concept of national community service, and I commend each of the participants who will provide much-needed assistance to communities all over the country.

The AmeriCorps team will be working on two projects both of which will help rebuild rural America and protect the environment. The first project, headquartered at the Bad River watershed area in Ft. Pierre, SD, involves five members of the AmeriCorps team, and focuses on range and water quality improvements, as well as youth and adult education projects. The second project on the Rosebud Reservation involves a 10-member team which is helping with locally identified projects. These projects include range improvement, water quality activities, and other locally identified natural resource improvement projects.

I am confident that the experiences of the participants as members of AmeriCorps will establish a lasting ethic of civic duty in each of them. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize each member of the second AmeriCorps team of South Dakota: Matthew Blumer, Ft. Pierre, SD; Kevin Boyd, Rosebud, SD; Roger Brush Breaker, Rosebud, SD; Michele Edelbach, Ft. Pierre, SD; Harvey Elk Looks Back, Rosebud, SD; Paula Hoerner, Ft. Pierre, SD; Kathy Knife, Rosebud, SD; Lester Leader Charge, Rosebud, SD; Joseph Nichols, Ft. Pierre, SD; Clarence Poorman, Rosebud, SD; Pat Buscher, Ft. Pierre, SD; John Sitting Bear, Rosebud, SD; Melvin Staples, Rosebud, SD; Richard Traversie, Rosebud, SD; and Emily White Hat, Rosebud, SD. I am confident that the work of these individuals will not only provide much-needed assistance to the Rosebud Reservation and the Bad River watershed project, but also that the next year will be immensely rewarding for each of the participants. I congratulate each participant on their commitment to service and to furthering their education—I firmly believe that education is essential to a productive life and vital to American efforts to remain a first-class economic power.

Today, I would also like to commend the USDA for its innovative and extensive participation in AmeriCorps, and the members of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe. AmeriCorp-Team; USDA provides for a truly unique partnership involving tribal, State, and Federal Government, and this effort will address a lot of the traditional native concerns for the environment. So, as the GOP threatens to terminate funding for AmeriCorps, I am proud that rural enhancement and environmental protection is taking place in the great State of South Dakota and I believe that these programs are examples of why the continuation of the AmeriCorps program is critically important.

IN APPRECIATION OF DR. HARRY SCARR

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 15, 1995

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with Chairman BILL CLINGER in expressing our deepest sympathy to the wife and children of Dr. Harry Scarr, the Deputy Director of the Census Bureau.

Dr. Scarr is one of those outstanding individuals who devoted his professional time and

energies to making the Federal Government work better to serve the public. Trained at Harvard and the University of Michigan, Dr. Scarr chose to devote his considerable talent to public service, and we are all the better for it.

There are a number of sensitive positions in the Federal Government that require a manager with both skill and tact. Dr. Scarr held several of those posts. During the 1970's he worked at the Department of Justice guiding policy and planning decisions for research and statistics on the Federal Justice System. Among the positions he held there were the assistant director in the Office of Policy and Planning, administrator of the Federal Justice Research Program, and Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

In the 1980's he moved to the Department of Commerce Economic and Statistics Administration. He subsequently was appointed Deputy and then Acting Director of the Census Bureau. Dr. Scarr brought stability to the Census Bureau which was without a director for a year and a half.

The Federal Government has many dedicated and hard working employees. The dedication and contribution of Dr. Harry Scarr was among its best.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SECOND SOUTH CENTRAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM GRADUATION CEREMONY

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 15, 1995

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, on November 17, 1995, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund [MALDEF] will hold its second South Central Leadership Program Graduation Ceremony. At the ceremony, 100 graduates of the program will be honored for their successful completion of the program and dedication to community service in the South Central Los Angeles area.

This year were four projects: the Youth and Parent Empowerment Conference, the Citizenship Conference, the Economic Development Conference, and Alternative Methods for Education. The Youth and Parent Empowerment Conference deserves special merit for its collaborative effort with the leadership development in inter-ethnic relations program. The Citizenship Conference, with assistance from the National Association of Appointed and Elected Officials [NALEO], resulted in the processing of more than 100 applications for citizenship. The Economic Development Conference, working with L.A. Councilman Mark Ridley Thomas' district 8, enlisted several organizations, such as Bank of America, the Mexican American Opportunities Foundation, and the University of Southern California, to name a few, and designed new strategies and opportunities for local economic growth. The alternative method for education project, using the Montessori School Model, shared the successes of the tested and innovative approach to education.

The South Central Leadership Program is another example of MALDEF's efforts to help the Latino community build and strengthen the social, economic, and political infrastructure in

this neglected area of Los Angeles. Through the program's grassroots leadership training and support of existing and emerging community based organizations, MALDEF plays an important role in opening new doors of access for Latinos.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring this distinguished graduates. From the Technical Assistance Program the graduates are: Maria Alvarez; Marina Alvarez; Sonia Alvarez; Rosa Avelar; Gloria Barragan; Maria Campos; Kwame Cooper; Eduardo Cordero; Jeanette Lopez Escobar; Maria Flores; Grace Galindo; Rudy Garavito; Maria Gonzales; Vivian Harmon; Ramiro Hernandez; Letisia Mauricio; Bertha Melgoza; Gloria Mendez; Dina Moreno; Maria T. Palacios; Faustina Palomares; Yolanda Perales; Eduardo Peregrina; Sonia Ramos; Ana Maria Rodriguez; Irma Rodriguez; Maria Rubalcava; Gloria Saldana; Reina Schmitz; Leticia Vega; Laura Villegas, and Enrique Carrillo.

Graduating from the Leaders of the Future Program are: Gloria Barragan; Maria Campos; Magdalena Cervantes; Maria Dubon; Maria Gonzalez; Evelia Landaverde; Margarita Landeros; Rosalia Lucero; Gloria Mendez; Ana Alicia Munoz; Sara Olivera; Eduardo Peregrina; Guillermina Perez; Alicia Ramirez; Estela Tortoledo; Hermelinda Gonzalez; Sonia Alvarez; Maria Alvarez; Wendy Rivera; Laura Villegas; Fermin Rivera; Marina Meraz; Ivone Garcia; Maria Palacios; Ana Maria Rodriguez; Enrique Carrillo; Marcos Aguilar; Pastel Mireles; Maria Ortiz, and Salvador Rios.

IN HONOR OF S. REID GUSTAFSON

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 15, 1995

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege for me to rise today to recognize and honor S. Reid Gustafson, a man who, for many years, has contributed greatly to the community of Santa Clara County, CA.

On Tuesday, the 21st of November, 1995, Mr. Gustafson is being honored as the 1995 Distinguished Citizen, at the 21st Annual Distinguished Citizen Award Dinner of the Santa Clara County Council of the Boy Scouts of America. The dinner will take place in the Imperial Ballroom of the Fairmont Hotel in San Jose, CA. I am honored to join with the Santa Clara County Council of the Boy Scouts of America in congratulating Mr. Gustafson on this momentous occasion.

As the Santa Clara County Council of the Boy Scouts of America has noted in their event program from the Distinguished Citizen Award Dinner, Mr. Gustafson is, "a person who exemplifies a commitment to the community, integrity and leadership." Those who know Reid Gustafson know that his spirit and dogged commitment of the community, make it a better place for all of us to live and work.

By profession, Mr. Gustafson is a leader in the housing industry, having been president of Shea Holmes of northern California for the last 12 years. In spite of a very busy work schedule, Mr. Gustafson has also found the time to become involved in numerous community programs and activities, and is a role model for all of us in terms of his outstanding commitment to community service. From a personal

somehow assert their will in the Congress of the United States and somehow get through a bill that looks like mining reform, smells like mining reform, but is reform only in the sense of a piece of paper but has no substantive reform underneath it, then in fact the moratorium disappears.

The American people grow up being taught that pennies are made out of copper. But if you are a foreign mine operator, they are made out of gold. The gold of the American taxpayer is being handed over to foreign mining operators simply because we do not have the will in the Congress of the United States to stand up to them. We have got a Republican Congress sitting here telling us today that we have got to raise Medicare premiums, that we have got to raise the rates on senior citizens in elderly housing, that we have got to raise the price of a college education, that we are going to take the meals away from elderly people, but when it comes to big foreign mining operations, oh, boy, we can find the dollars to subsidize them.

There is no real attempt to reform the foreign mining operations in this bill. There is an attempt to pretend on the floor of the Congress of the United States that we have foreign mining operations that are going to adhere to some new standard, but underneath it everyone knows that follows this place that all those guys come in here with their contributions, they come in here and are able to somehow assert their will on the majority and be able to get the kind of consideration that no poor person in the United States of America can expect to get in this Congress these days.

So I ask the people of this country, to, please, wake up; please, recognize that if you want a balanced budget, let us go after foreign miners, not after the working people and the poor of this country.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here as far as the American people are concerned is, yes, dealing with the question of appropriations, in this instance the Interior appropriations bill, and I guess the confusion is that they are seeing the Government not work, and we are now on the House floor talking about appropriations.

I wish this had been done some time ago. But it is all a question of priorities. I just voted for an appropriation also bill on Treasury and Postal and the reason is because there was a compromise there. But this has no sense of compromise. This has no understanding of what the American people have been saying.

Because it guts energy conservation programs, it certainly guts the National Endowment for the Arts, the Na-

tional Endowment for the Humanities, and as to the native Americans, it guts the programs that will help educate their children. This legislation bars the listing of additional endangered species. It does not extend the moratorium on transferring the mineral-rich Federal lands to private owners. It overturns a key provision of the California Desert Protection Act, which designates the Mojave National Preserve as a unit of the national park system.

Yes, it places new restrictions on the National Endowment for the Arts grant. This legislation wants to negatively legislate the NEA out of existence. Nobody wants to talk about that, the question of the arts and the First Amendment and the idea of children understand their Art heritage, arts in rural and inner-city schools is being. This is not about obscenity. This is about the National Endowment for the Arts providing programs for our rural hamlets and urban centers. In my district this hurts the Ensemble theatre, MECA, the Houston Ballet, Kuumba House, and the Houston Grand Opera. This bill hurts our Museums national and local (like Houston's Museum of Fine Arts). This bill cuts grants award going to our starving artists so they will not be able to produce the Nation's art. Yet we say we do not care about this. We do not care about the art of this Nation or the history of this Nation, and we are not supporting the fact that our history is the very manner by which we preserve our past.

□ 1530

The National Service Program, the AmeriCorps Program, which has been so successful in helping young people help their communities and go to college too! They work in cities and rural areas across this Nation. In Houston in the 18th Congressional District, they work with those unable to read, teaching them to read as they work in inner-city schools. These AmeriCorps students, under this bill see their funding gutted.

That is what is wrong with the appropriations process. There are no priorities. We want this Government to work, we want the doors to be open, we want to bring people back to work so they can serve the American people, and, yes, we have agreed, over and over again, the Democrats, to a balanced budget. What we have not agreed to is the list of priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let the Interior bill conferees go back, and be fair with the dollars that the American people have entrusted to them. Do not give \$270 billions in tax cuts to the rich and then gut programs governing our environment, our Arts, our history and the American Indian. Do not take arts and history away from our children and deprive us of an environment that we can stand for and support. I just ask for a sense of fairness in this whole process. We must ap-

propriate funds with the right priorities.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill probably speaks more to the values that we in Congress have toward the esthetics of America, its land, its people, and certainly its arts. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is probably one of the finest Members of this House, and it is a tough thing to bring this thing to the floor in the shape it is in.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today in opposition to the rule, and hopefully it will be defeated. If it is not, I hope that the bill is defeated and recommitted as it was once before, for several reasons.

First of all, the taxpayers are still ripped off under this bill, particularly as the mining process goes. It defers to the authorizing bill, which makes it worse, so by adopting this bill and then leading us to the authorizing bill, we are not getting a fair shake for the American taxpayer.

Second, the public gets cheated on the issue of the Endangered Species Act. It prohibits adding species not in the jurisdiction of the appropriations committee. It is in the jurisdiction committee, and this bill prohibits any endangered species from being added.

Third, the bill cripples the Columbia River Basin from the ability to create a sustainable timber harvest, at the same time protecting the salmon runs, which are so vital to the local economy.

Fourth, it puts a moratorium on the development of Federal energy efficiency standards.

Fifth, and worst of all, it cuts the subvention to State and local governments for acquisition of lands to enhance the quality of life issues, that enhance the local economies. It locks up over \$11.1 billion in the bank. This money is made from the sale of public resources, and does not give it back, does not reinvest, does not do what most things do when you try to run Government like a business, reinvest in its resources.

This bill locks that money up. These moneys should be reinvested, allowing us to create the esthetics that are essential for local communities to be a nice place to live. It fails to reinvest in America. That is why the rule should be defeated. If the rule passes, the bill should be defeated.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. The reason that this bill and appropriation bill needs a rule is because, as the ranking member stated, this bill goes well beyond a straight appropriations bill. In fact, it gets into the heart of writing and re-writing almost 30 years of land use and

business. How ingenious can you get? Under the old loan system still being used by most schools, a student applies to a bank for a loan. Checking his or her qualifications is a loan guarantee agency, commonly run by state governments, but also by private enterprise. The agencies then issue a guarantee of repayment to the banks. The federal government pays banks subsidies to forgive part of the interest payments and pays fees to the guarantee agencies for their services.

If a student defaults on a loan, the bank is reimbursed—making student loans the safest loans a bank can make. Loan guarantee agencies are paid fees to hound defaulters. Is this not big government? Can this be free enterprise?

There's more. The old system created a secondary loan business, including the huge public-private Sallie Mae association based in Washington, and smaller ones, like one operated by the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. These groups make money by buying loans from banks and packaging them in large blocks for resale. They were created by Congress and the states to free money for more student loans, but as was said of some missionaries to Hawaii, Sallie Mae and its emulators came to do good and ended up doing well. They are big businesses with highly paid executives.

The direct loan program, a plan advanced by Sen. Paul Simon (D-Makanda), eliminated this entire pyramid. No government subsidy or risk-free lending for banks, no government payments to loan-guarantee agencies, no Sallie Maes with executives paid from profits extracted from government loan subsidies.

But odds are increasing that Congress this fall will stop the direct loan program in its tracks, led by the same people who claim they are trying to get government off our backs. And so far, it seems to be going down like a cold, sweet Coke on a hot summer's day. •

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK ACT

• **Mr. BURNS.** Mr. President, I am pleased to add my name as a cosponsor to S. 581, the National Right to Work Act. As a strong supporter of the right to work, I feel this legislation is vital.

We have spent the first part of this Congress fighting for freedom—the freedom from Government intervention, the freedom of speech, the freedom to choose your health care and even the freedom to succeed. This bill, though it does not add a single letter to Federal law, guarantees the freedom to work free of union imposition.

Why is this important? Americans have always been independent. No matter where they came from, they came to America to see their hard work pay off. And they are not afraid of hard work. This is especially true of Montanans.

But when a worker is forced to pay union dues in order to get a job or keep a job, they have lost part of their freedom. They may get some benefits from joining a union—I am not saying there is no role for unions here—but they lose the freedom to choose.

Mr. President, Congress created the law which allows union officials to force dues in any State back in 1935. Now we need to correct that. All we need to do is to repeal that portion of the National Labor Relations Act

[NLRA] which authorizes the imposition of forced union dues contracts on employees.

Nearly every poll taken on this issue over the last few decades has shown that about 8 out of 10 Americans are opposed to forcing workers to pay union dues. It is tough to get 8 out of 10 Americans to agree on anything. I think this is a call for action.

And if you look at job creation in States that have implemented right to work laws, it is hard to ignore the results. Hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs have been created in right-to-work States. And in forced-unionism States, hundreds of thousands of jobs have been lost.

I have supported this bill in the past and I truly believe that this is the year to finally make this change. Working men and women in Montana want the freedom to work and they are not alone. I urge my colleagues to listen to what their constituents are saying as well. If you do, you will feel compelled to join me and the other cosponsors in supporting the National Right to Work Act. •

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONTINUED FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR AMERICORP

• **Mr. PELL.** Mr. President, this month marks the start of a new class of AmeriCorps members who are dedicated to serving this Nation. As AmeriCorps celebrates its first successful year and the new class begins its service, I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate my support for continued Federal funding of this important national service initiative.

Over the past year, 20,000 AmeriCorps members worked in schools, hospitals, national parks, and law enforcement organizations to meet the most crucial needs of individual communities. AmeriCorps clearly helps to provide a more promising future for Americans by expanding educational opportunities for the young while simultaneously improving the public services in hundreds of communities.

In my own State of Rhode Island, AmeriCorps has been particularly successful due to the efforts of Lawrence K. Fish, chairman of the Rhode Island Commission for National and Community Service. Mr. Fish challenged higher education institutions in Rhode Island to grant scholarships to AmeriCorps members. Many of our colleges and universities answered Mr. Fish's challenge and have begun lending their support in the form of college scholarships. His endeavor to expand AmeriCorps has offered more students access to an otherwise unaffordable education. Mr. Fish's exemplary work in Rhode Island serves as the quintessential example of building the natural bridge between public service and educational opportunities. In this regard, I ask that an opinion editorial by Lawrence Fish from the Providence

Journal of October 11 be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Providence (RI) Journal, Oct. 11, 1995]

THE CHALLENGE OF AMERICORPS

(By Lawrence K. Fish)

Not surprisingly, the debate in Washington over continued funding of the Corporation for National Service has become laser-focused on the politics of embarrassing President Clinton, and not on the people for whom AmeriCorps has been a ringing success.

And the reason is not surprising. It is that Washington, to the frustration of just about everyone outside the District of Columbia, just can't resist playing an inside-the-Beltway version of Gotcha! From the politicians to the pundits to the press, the emphasis remains on the politics of issues, not on the substance of issues or their impact on real people.

For whom has AmeriCorps been successful? It's been a success here in Rhode Island to the 250 AmeriCorps members who have signed up for this domestic Peace Corps and whose efforts, mostly in education, have made better, dramatically better, the lives of thousands of our neighbors. Giver and receiver have been enriched by the effort, and for that, Rhode Island is a better place.

Let me try to explain why AmeriCorps' success here in Rhode Island ought to serve as a model for programs in the 49 other states, and why that success and our promise for the future stand as far more compelling points in the debate than political one-upmanship.

AmeriCorps members have served in cities and towns from Woonsocket to Newport, bringing with them a wealth of desire, experience and cultural diversity. They have gotten results—good results that are measurable. You can see the results on paper and you can see them on the faces of children getting their first "A's" and in adults reading for the first time.

Rhode Island's AmeriCorps program has been very successful—and has been recognized as such. For the second straight year, after a very competitive process that pitted us against 49 other states, we received more AmeriCorps funding on a per capita basis than any other state. In this our second year Rhode Island will field 250 AmeriCorps members in eight programs that will touch the lives of thousands of our neighbors. Once again, they will work predominantly in education, because that's where many believe the greatest need is.

Linking public service and education, we approached the leaders of the state's colleges, universities and technical schools to see if they would accept our AmeriCorps challenge to inaugurate a public-private partnership from which they will get the lessons of service and commitment from AmeriCorps veterans and to which they will provide a quality education.

The Rev. Philip Smith of Providence College was the first to meet the challenge, and Vartan Gregorian of Brown was close behind. They were followed almost immediately by our other higher-education leaders—Bob Carothers of URI, Sister Therese Antone of Salve Regina, Bill Trueheart of Bryant, Roger Mandel of RISD, Jack Yena of Johnson and Wales and Ed Liston of CCRI. I mention them to dramatize that AmeriCorps runs cost-effective, successful, nonpartisan programs.

I accompanied the presidents of seven of the state's public and private colleges and universities to Washington for meetings on Capitol Hill and in the White House. There we outlined the Rhode Island Challenge to

Higher Education, a challenge to provide scholarships to AmeriCorps members that complement the stipends they receive for their year of service. The result is a win/win for both sides: Higher education gets the kind of committed students who are potential campus leaders; and AmeriCorps members pass through another gateway to opportunity.

The foundation for the Rhode Island Challenge to Higher Education was laid a year ago. Rhode Island's bipartisan congressional delegation, each member of which played a role in the passage of the legislation that brought about AmeriCorps, joined other dignitaries at Slater Junior High School in Pawtucket in AmeriCorps's debut. The setting, a junior high school in the heart of one of our older, struggling cities, provided a fitting backdrop for the Rhode Island AmeriCorps members and the educational programs they would serve.

In the year since, AmeriCorps members have farmed out across the state, serving as teachers' assistants in public schools, tutors in after-school mentoring programs, and teaching English as a Second Language and GED classes to adults. And they've had an impact, all because they are 100 percent behind keeping their end of a bargain to make AmeriCorps work the way in which Congress and the President intended.

Rhode Islanders would have been proud to have joined me and some of the presidents in the White House Cabinet Room recently when we introduced the Rhode Island Challenge to Higher Education to President Clinton. From the smallest state to the other 49 came the challenge for their colleges and universities to match our commitment of scholarships to AmeriCorps members.

Our hope, and that of AmeriCorps members around the country and others committed to public service, is that our Challenge to Higher Education can help overcome the cynicism that has come to mark the debate in Washington.*

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, first, I indicate there will be no further votes this evening.

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 186, submitted earlier by Senator DOLE and Senator DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 186) to authorize testimony by Senate employees and representation by Senate legal counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the U.S. Government is the defendant in a pending case in the U.S. Court of Federal Claims arising out of a dispute with a private real estate developer over the Government's procurement to lease a new headquarters building for the Securities and Exchange Commission. The plaintiff developer responded to the Government's request for proposals

by offering to build the SEC a new headquarters building in Silver Spring, MD. The plaintiff alleges in this lawsuit that the Government violated procurement law in connection with the SEC headquarters procurement.

The Government has determined that the group of individuals who may have relevant information about this case includes two employees on Senator SARBANES' staff. In addition to his interest in this matter arising out of the SEC's potential selection of a site in Maryland for its headquarters building, Senator SARBANES is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, which has oversight jurisdiction over the SEC.

Senator SARBANES would like the Senate to authorize the employees in his office to testify in response to the Government's request. This resolution would authorize them to testify with representation by the Senate legal counsel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Without objection, the preamble is agreed to.

So the resolution (S. Res. 186) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 186

Whereas, the defendant in *Triangle MLP United Partnership v. United States*, No. 95-430C, a civil action pending in the United States Court of Federal Claims, is seeking testimony at a deposition from Charles Stek and Rebecca Wagner, employees of the Senate who are on the staff of Senator Paul S. Sarbanes;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by administrative or judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate is needed for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288B(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent employees of the Senate with respect to subpoenas or requests for testimony issued or made to them in their official capacities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Charles Stek, Rebecca Wagner, and any other employee of the Senate from whom testimony may be required are authorized to testify and to produce documents in the case of *Triangle MLP United Partnership v. United States*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Charles Stek, Rebecca Wagner, and any other employee of the Senate in connection with the testimony authorized by this resolution.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES EMERGENCY LEAVE TRANSFER ACT OF 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 197, S. 868.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 868) to provide authority for leave transfer for Federal employees who are adversely affected by disasters or emergencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the bill (S. 868) was deemed read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 868

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Emergency Leave Transfer Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after subchapter V the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER VI—LEAVE TRANSFER IN DISASTERS AND EMERGENCIES

"§ 6391. Authority for leave transfer program in disasters and emergencies.

"(a) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) 'employee' means an employee as defined in section 6331(1); and

"(2) 'agency' means an Executive agency.

"(b) In the event of a major disaster or emergency, as declared by the President, that results in severe adverse effects for a substantial number of employees, the President may direct the Office of Personnel Management to establish an emergency leave transfer program under which any employee in any agency may donate unused annual leave for transfer to employees of the same or other agencies who are adversely affected by such disaster or emergency.

"(c) The Office of Personnel Management shall establish appropriate requirements for the operation of the emergency leave transfer program under subsection (b), including appropriate limitations on the donation and use of annual leave under the program. An employee may receive and use leave under the program without regard to any requirement that any annual leave and sick leave to a leave recipient's credit must be exhausted before any transferred annual leave may be used.

"(d) A leave bank established under subchapter IV may, to the extent provided in regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, donate annual leave to the emergency leave transfer program established under subsection (b).

"(e) Except to the extent that the Office of Personnel Management may prescribe by regulation, nothing in section 7351 shall apply to pay solicitation, donation, or acceptance of leave under this section.

"(f) The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations necessary for the administration of this section."

worst. But whatever the results, we are not going to give up on you. We're going to fight with you and for you all the way." I hugged her and thanked her for hanging in there with me.

If I have learned anything, it is that we never know when, how, or whom a serious illness will strike. If and when it does, each one of us wants not simply the best possible care for our body but for our whole being.

I still am bound upon Lear's wheel of fire, but the love and devotion of my family and friends, and the deep caring and engagement of my caregivers, have been a tonic for my soul and have helped to take some of the sting from my scalding tears.●

TRIBUTE TO THE MISSOURI MERCHANTS AND MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay a special tribute to the Missouri Merchants and Manufacturers Association. I am very pleased to recognize this organization for its 15 years of superior service to the Missouri business community.

The Missouri Merchants and Manufacturers Association was formed in 1980. With hard work and untiring commitment, the MMMA has grown into a strong, well respected voice in the legislative process representing over 5,000 small and mid-sized businesses across the State of Missouri. It is actively involved in educating MMMA members and serving as an advocate on State legislative issues impacting businesses.

While Governor of Missouri, I found that the MMMA's active involvement in State legislative issues provided a vital resource. As chairman of the Committee on Small Business, I highly value the insights they have shared on numerous issues of great importance to America's business.

The quality individuals that comprise the MMMA epitomize the kind of dedication, work ethic and ideals necessary to meet the ongoing challenges and demands of the business community. Their leadership has influenced passage of important legislation and provided dependable resources in many court cases to benefit employers. The Missouri Merchants and Manufacturers Association will commemorate its 15th anniversary at an annual fall dinner on September 30, 1995. It is my great pleasure to congratulate the MMMA for this significant accomplishment.●

THE AMERICORPS PROGRAM

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, over the last few months, there have been a number of speeches in this Chamber and even more outside of it criticizing pointless partisanship. Although matters of philosophy and implementation do frequently divide Senators on this side of the aisle from those on the other side, the country has a right to expect that we will seize every chance to work together.

I would have thought that national service provided a perfect opportunity for that common ground. Republicans

and Democrats alike have called for greater personal responsibility, for increased involvement of citizens in our communities, for people pitching in to do what needs to be done to make America as smart and safe and strong as we have dreamed it could be.

These are the very same goals of AmeriCorps, the new domestic Peace Corps established by Congress only 2 years ago. Just this past week, the first 20,000 AmeriCorps members completed their service in my State of Connecticut and all across the country. I know how much they have achieved in Connecticut.

Forty percent of the 300 students tutored by the University of Bridgeport AmeriCorps members have increased their levels of achievement in one or more areas. AmeriCorps members in the Leadership, Education and Athletics in Partnership [LEAP] program trained 600 children to volunteer at the Special Olympics when they were held in New Haven. Community Action for Greater Middlesex County was able to bring over 60 volunteers to Christmas in April, thanks to the presence of AmeriCorps members. They refurbished 15 bedrooms and 8 bathrooms at the Eddy Shelter and rehabilitated the home of 90-year-old Alice Taylor, who, in her own lifetime has taken care of over 1,000 foster children, as well as raised her own 8 children.

AmeriCorps offers an opportunity for young people and Americans of all ages. It makes the dream of a college education a reality for families who work hard and play by the rules—while meeting compelling human needs in our communities in a cost effective manner.

Independent analyses show just how cost-effective this initiative has been in its first year. The GAO said that the Corporation for National Service's resources total about \$17,600 per member, which is not only in line with the Corporation's estimate of \$18,800 per member but in line with what Congress authorized.

Mr. President, the only formal cost-benefit analysis of AmeriCorps, done by four conservative economists, estimated a return of \$1.60 to \$2.60 in direct benefits for every dollar AmeriCorps invests.

We need to build on this success, not walk away from it. The private sector poured \$41 million in resources into local AmeriCorps programs this last year, a tremendous feat when you consider that Congress had called for \$32 million in matching funds from all sources. We've got an impressive public/private partnership going here and we really need to nurture it.

We won't find common ground or reach higher ground if we turn national service into a partisan political football. We owe those 20,000 AmeriCorps members—and all Americans—better than that.

TRIBUTE TO JASON REESE

● Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I would like to take the time today to commend a very special Tennessean who has shown tremendous strength of character and a will to succeed. Jason Reese is an 18-year-old from Morristown, TN, who has just been named the Boys & Girls Club of America's 1995-96 National Youth of the Year for his commitment to community service, scholastic achievement, and leadership skills.

Jason entered the competition for National Youth of the Year when he became the Morristown Boys & Girls Club's Youth of the Month and later their Youth of the Year. He was then chosen Youth of the Year by the State of Tennessee and the southeast regional representative for the national competition. The finalists traveled to Washington, D.C. and were judged on their activities in their local Boys & Girls Clubs, their values and integrity, their academic achievements, their service to their communities, and their commitment to their families.

As the National Youth of the Year, Jason will have the opportunity to meet with youth from Boys & Girls Clubs throughout the country and discuss the impact the programs can have on one individual. For years, Jason lived without a male role model. But through drive and determination, Jason Reese overcame those obstacles, and he has become a role model for other youths.

Jason was abandoned by his father when he was a baby, and later his stepfather abandoned him and his two younger stepbrothers. Jason grew up quickly, holding a part-time job, working hard in school, and caring for his brothers at home while his mother worked and attended school. He also joined the Boys & Girls Club in Morristown, where he grew up in other ways. There, he served as a junior staff member, a member of the Keystone Leadership Club, and as a delegate to the club's board of directors. He took part in most of the club's programs, and he learned the social and leadership skills that he says gave him the motivation and self-esteem he needed to succeed in his school, community, and family.

Outside of the Boys & Girls Club, Jason has volunteered in nursing homes, helped refurbish a local park, and tutored younger children. Throughout that time, he maintained a 3.83 cumulative grade point average in his advanced and college placement curriculum at Morristown-Hamblen School West, and he took on enough responsibilities at home to allow his mother to work and graduate from college with a degree in psychology.

After 8 years in the Boys & Girls Club and a lifetime of his own dedication, Jason Reese has entered the University of Tennessee at Knoxville as a freshman honors student in engineering. In addition to being a National Merit Scholar and a UT Centennial Scholar, Jason will receive a \$10,000 scholarship

I encourage similar action throughout the international community. A cursory look will tell the casual observer that India is not one nation. Rather it is a conglomeration of many nations thrown together for administrative purposes by the British. With 18 official languages, India is doomed to disintegrate just as the former Soviet Union did. Freedom for Khalistan and all the nations living under Indian occupation is inevitable. The Sikh Nation's demand for an independent Khalistan is irrevocable, irreversible, and nonnegotiable. We have been denied our right of self-determination too long. India's lip service to the principle holds no water. The time is now for the international community to pressure India with economic sanctions to honor the freedom of Khalistan. The time is now for the Indian government to sit down with the Sikh leadership and formally recognize the clear boundaries which separate Khalistan from India. Sikhs have motto that says, "*Khalsa Bagi Yan Badshah*: Either the Sikhs rule themselves or they are in rebellion." The Sikh nation will not rest until freedom is ours. It is our tradition. We are secure in our right to self-determination, and we will allow no foreign power to determine our fate.

Thank you.

CENTRAL SYNAGOGUE HONORED FOR YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1995

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues one of New York City's great centers of Jewish religion and culture. Founded 156 years ago, the Central Synagogue in Manhattan has played an important role in the development and growth of New York's secular and religious life.

In addition to serving as a pillar of New York's Jewish community, the Central Synagogue plays an active role in the community at-large. The Synagogue, through its wonderful members and staff, provides one-on-one English lessons for recent immigrants, food for 350 homeless persons per week, and a city-wide AIDS service.

Completed in 1872, the Synagogue itself is one of New York's greatest landmarks. The imposing Moorish sanctuary was designed by Henry Fernbach, the first Jewish American architect, and was subsequently designated as a National Landmark.

Two years ago, the Synagogue embarked on one of the most ambitious capital revitalization projects in the congregation's history. On September 28, 1995, the first step in this revitalization program will be completed when the sanctuary is finally rededicated. Having meticulously restored the stain glass window and facade, the Central Synagogue will once again assume its position as one of the most beautiful and striking sights in New York.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal to be proud of in New York City. The majesty, history and vitality of the Central Synagogue is something that we can all take pride in. I congratulate the Synagogue on the restoration of its sanctuary and wish the entire congregation luck as it continues with its capital improvement campaign.

THE ETHIC OF SERVICE HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Leslie Lenkowsky, president of the Hudson Institute and member of the board of directors of the Corporation for National Service, has written a most enlightened and thoughtful article which was published by the Washington Times on August 4, 1995.

I insert the article in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 4, 1995]

THE ETHIC OF SERVICE

(By Leslie Lenkowsky)

Today, the General Accounting Office is scheduled to issue the draft report of its analysis of AmeriCorps, the 10-month-old national service program.

If some in Congress had their way, this year would be AmeriCorps' last—the House voted Monday to provide no further funding. The GAO report, and my own experience as a member of the board of directors overseeing AmeriCorps, suggest the Senate should take a second look.

Here's what GAO concludes: AmeriCorps itself is investing slightly less per participant than originally estimated. Other parts of the federal government are also providing support, in nearly exactly the amounts AmeriCorps had predicted.

Parts of the GAO Report will trigger debates between supporters and directors of AmeriCorps—including whether private sector contributions, or state and local support, are a valuable benefit or just an addition to cost. But the bottom line for Congress' consideration should be that over which it has responsibility—the federal contribution—and there, AmeriCorps is right on budget.

GAO suggests that AmeriCorps is also on mission. The audit teams found local programs doing exactly what Congress had intended: rehabilitating housing, tutoring, analyzing crime statistics and developing prevention measures, strengthening communities, encouraging responsibility and expanding opportunity.

These findings track an earlier cost/benefit study done by an impressive team of economists. Like GAO, the economists didn't establish either AmeriCorps' costs or its benefits—but did present a well-reasoned estimate of what AmeriCorps may produce, if programs are held to their contractual objectives.

Therein lies Congress' challenge. GAO shows that it would be disingenuous to kill AmeriCorps on the basis of cost. It isn't costing the taxpayer any more than was intended, and it is difficult to premise fiscal salvation on a savings that amounts to less than one-thirtieth of a penny on a tax dollar.

Nor is it fair to attack AmeriCorps as the death-knell of selfless charity. AmeriCorps is too small for that, and Americans are too big. In the main, AmeriCorps members provide local charities with useful resources that can make more effective the voluntary assistance you and I can provide.

So should we worry about AmeriCorps being a political Trojan Horse—or at least a stalking horse for Clinton-Gore '96. I have to admit that I have been watching this topic very carefully. One test of intent and not rhetoric came in the willingness to examine the activities of ACORN Housing Corporation, an investigation I pushed for as a Board Member. The Corporation for National Service did the right and thorough thing—and even the Washington Times praised the outcome.

Politics can be expected to intrude upon nearly every policy debate. But Republicans have alternative to killing AmeriCorps. They can recognize that the initiative's foundations—responsibility, opportunity and citizenship—are distinctly Republican ideals (advanced with eloquence in William F. Buckley's "Gratitude," although not an endorsement of a new program). And AmeriCorps' structure places the bulk of the money and much of the decisionmaking in the hands of the states—thanks to Republican efforts when the legislation was drafted in 1993. Finally, despite the fracas within the Beltway, in the heartland this thing is wildly popular—with Republican governors like New Hampshire's Steve Merrill and many others; with businessmen who like the results they see in their own markets; with ordinary voters who (in Wall Street Journal polls) have wanted to defend AmeriCorps even more than Big Bird.

No, AmeriCorps won't revolutionize America—whether it's Newt Gingrich's revolution or Bill Clinton's. But it is making a difference for America in a distinctly American way. And it deserves both time and constructive criticism. As the Congress and the president do the job they have been elected to do—set national budget priorities—I would encourage them to emphasize innovative ways of using government to strengthen (not overpower) communities and encourage the ethic of service. Those goals can provide real meaning to the search for common ground.

TRIBUTE TO THE 1995 INDUCTEES TO THE ENTREPRENEURSHIP HALL OF FAME

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1995

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the entrepreneurial achievements of a select group of leaders from the Chicago metropolitan business community. I am proud to salute these entrepreneurs and founders of small and mid-sized businesses for their induction into the 11th Annual Entrepreneurship Hall of Fame, Thursday evening, October 19, 1995, in Chicago.

The Institute for Entrepreneurial Studies in the College of Business Administration at the University of Illinois at Chicago cofounded and continues to sponsor the Entrepreneurship Hall of Fame, honoring outstanding business leaders whose spirit and success help keep America's business community strong and vital.

The sponsors, the Arthur Anderson Enterprise Group, William Blair & Company, LaSalle National Bank, Lord Bissell & Brook, and the University of Illinois Chicago, have enabled the university to cement this partnership and recognize outstanding entrepreneurs. The program is exceptional because it creates an active partnership between the academic and business communities. Students and entrepreneurs alike benefit from an exchange of knowledge, experience and creativity.

Today, I would like to congratulate these leaders, each of whom is listed below, for using their imagination and resources to foster an excellent program which enhances the quality of higher education and underscores the value of entrepreneurship in America. I am sure that my colleagues join me in recognizing

In my judgment, the questions raised by analysts about reducing the savings deduction by the amount of tax-exempt income can be resolved when the actual writing of tax reform legislation occurs in the future. It is my intention during those deliberations to make sure that municipal bonds retain a preference.

It is important to recognize that if the USA tax plan were to be enacted it would include significant incentives for savings and investment—the unlimited savings allowance—which defers Federal income taxes on any income saved or invested. As individuals change their behavior to save and invest more, the national savings pool will increase. In addition, the USA tax removes the bias for companies to use debt financing instead of equity financing. More companies may choose equity financing. These changes in the business Tax Code may lower the demand for borrowing. Increasing the savings pool will lower interest rates and the cost of capital. Lower interest rates will benefit all Americans who have to borrow. Since States and municipalities are big borrowers because they issue large quantities of bonds, lower interest rates should significantly benefit them, separate and apart from the specific USA tax provisions dealing with the tax treatment of municipal bonds.

I hope that this statement clarifies matters for participants in the municipal bond market who may fear that either the USA tax plan would penalize them, or will make issuance of municipal bonds for legitimate governmental purpose more expensive in the future. Neither of those outcomes is the intent of this Senator and I will do all I can to insure that neither occurs.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I would like join my good friend from New Mexico in trying to alleviate the fears of those concerned about the USA tax proposal's treatment of municipal bonds. In crafting our proposal, we explicitly elected to retain a preference for investments in municipal bonds, and we did so primarily to preserve the ability of State and local governments to obtain capital for needed infrastructure improvements. It was never our intention to undermine our country's municipal bond market.

As Senator DOMENICI pointed out, some analysts believe the manner in which our proposal is crafted could erode substantially the current tax preference for municipal bond investments. Others, including an editorial at the Bond buyer, take a much more optimistic view and equate our proposal as being far too generous in its treatment of municipal bonds. I believe the truth falls somewhere in between these two analyses.

In the USA proposal, we have essentially equalized the tax treatment of all investments, including those investments in municipal bonds. All investments under the USA proposal are tax-deferred. However, the USA proposal makes an important distinction about the tax treatment of the returns from

these investments. The returns from investments other than municipal bonds would not be tax exempt unless the returns are reinvested in their entirety. On the other hand, returns from municipal bonds would be tax exempt and could be spent or reinvested without future income tax consequences. I believe this is an equitable outcome regarding the tax treatment of municipal bonds. If another approach, consistent with the overall goals of the USA proposal, especially revenue neutrality, can be found in this area, I am more than willing to consider such proposals.

Mr. President, before yielding the floor, I would like to raise a final point. I find it very interesting about the absence of any concern about the elimination of any, I repeat any, preference for municipal bonds under either the flat tax or the national sales tax proposals. I do not mind the criticism of our proposal. Constructive criticism is useful and can work to improve our proposal, but it would be refreshing to have an informed, factual comparison of all the tax replacement proposals and their tax treatment of municipal bonds, rather than a Chicken Little approach often evident today.

MATCHING AWARDS FOR EDUCATION GRANTS TO AMERICORPS GRADUATES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I want to share with my colleagues an extremely exciting and momentous development in regard to the AmeriCorps Program. Today, eight of Rhode Island's colleges and universities are announcing that they have each agreed to match the \$4,725 education grant for every Rhode Island AmeriCorps participant who successfully completes AmeriCorps service and attends one of the participating Rhode Island institutions. As a result of this commitment, the education benefit for successful AmeriCorps participation will be at least \$9,450.

As one of the first proponents of national service and of linking successful completion of service to an education benefit, I believe this is a remarkable and praiseworthy commitment to the concept of community service.

I take special pride in commending each of those institutions for this superb commitment. They include: the University of Rhode Island, the Community College of Rhode Island, Brown University, Bryant College, Johnson and Wales University, Salve Regina University, the Rhode Island School of Design, and Providence College. I might add that several other institutions in Rhode Island are currently exploring this idea, and the number may well grow.

I also want to pay special tribute to Mr. Lawrence Fish, chief executive officer of Citizens Financial Group in Providence, RI, who, as chair of the Rhode Island Commission on National Service, spearheaded the effort that re-

sulted in this truly historic achievement.

FEDERAL EXPRESS HUB AT SUBIC BAY

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Federal Express Corp. on the opening last week of its new cargo hub at Subic Bay in the Philippines. This is a very favorable development for consumers of shipping services on both sides of the Pacific.

As many will remember, Federal Express had intended that its Subic Bay hub be fully operational in July. Unfortunately, even though the United States/Japan bilateral aviation agreement clearly authorized Federal Express to do so, the Government of Japan refused to permit Federal Express to operate several flights from Japan which were integral to its hub operation. In late July, Japan reversed its position and thereby enabled the Subic Bay hub, the cornerstone of Federal Express' intra-Asian network, to become fully operational.

As a result of the Subic Bay hub operation, consumers will be able to rely on expanded intra-Asian and trans-Pacific service. However, consumer choice will not be the only benefit. A recent article from the Journal of Commerce predicts this expanded service will come at a reduced cost to consumers. One economist estimates the price of intra-Asian shipping may drop by as much as 25 percent as a result of competition from Federal Express' intra-Asian network. I am confident the Federal Express experience in Subic Bay will again prove U.S. air carriers can compete effectively in any international market they have a chance to serve.

With respect to the widespread benefits of the Subic Bay hub, the Journal of Commerce article points out a very interesting irony. By violating the United States/Japan bilateral aviation agreement, the Government of Japan tried to prevent the Subic Bay hub from opening. Yet, Japanese companies are among the first flocking to the Subic Bay area to set up operations so they can benefit from Federal Express' superior air delivery services. For example, the Japan International Development Organization is planning a 450-acre industrial park in the area which will serve as a research and manufacturing center for 10 Japanese companies.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Journal of Commerce to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, on several occasions during the pendency of the United States/Japan cargo aviation dispute I cautioned that the economic stakes in that dispute were very

September 12, 1995

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H8787

meaning your debt will go up by 25 percent, and instead of owing \$100,000 at the end of your years in school, you will owe \$125,000. That is being cut.

Finally, the father in that family, say he is one of those unfortunate shipyard workers that our friend from Maine talked about or he is one of the workers at a Federal military installation, gets laid off in the latest round of base closures. They are happening from California to Maine, all over the country. And what that family decides is that one of them would like to go back to school and learn how to be a computer repair person or a person who works a blood testing machine at a hospital, and it takes money to do that, \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000 to go back in the middle of your life, when you are 45, 47, 51 years old, and try to learn a new skill in a job market that says you are too old to start all over again, but not old enough to retire.

That is being cut. So if you want to talk about where the cuts are in this bill, they go almost from cradle to grave. The reading teacher for the kid in the first grade, cut. The auto mechanic class for the 16-year-old, cut. The student loan for the person who is smart enough to go to the finest school, cut, because she has to start to pay her loan back the first day when she graduates. We did not have to do that, as my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], pointed out, but she will.

The graduate school student who wants to go on and do something has to pay interest in school. Finally the dad or mom in that family, the latest person to get a pink slip in the unending hemorrhage of pink slips in this economy today, tries to go to school to learn a skill, that gets cut.

Mr. Speaker, I know there have to be cuts in the budget and specifically cuts in education, I understand that. But imagine how angry our constituents were when they picked up the newspaper last week and read the following story. The Secretary of Interior of this country, under duress and protest, signed a deed conveying \$1 billion worth of mineral rights owned by the people of the United States of America, signed a legal document giving those 1 billion dollars' worth of public assets to a Danish mining company for the sum of \$265, under a law passed here in 1872.

Mr. Speaker, I want to balance the Federal budget. I understand there are ways education could be cut to balance the Federal budget. I may disagree with some of my Democratic colleagues as to how to do that. But all of us ought to understand that in an environment where we are saying to that kid, no reading teacher, no shop teacher to teach auto mechanics, got to pay your loan back the day after you graduate from school, too bad you have to let the interest accumulate, and dad, you lost your job, you need retraining, too bad, look in the want ads, that is what we are saying in this budget. And

we are giving away 1 billion dollars' worth of public assets to a foreign company because the majority would not change a law that was passed in 1872?

□ 2100

That is the priorities we have in this body today. It is wrong. And you have given us a chance tonight to talk about that. Let us do more than talk about it, though. Let us vote this way. Let us convey this message to the American people, and let us hope they remember in November of 1996 what is going on.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank you. You really have said it all. In addition to reading the paper about giving away our land and at what price and what we are cutting, there are numerous other examples.

When you take a look at just repealing the alternate minimum tax, which was not requested, was not asked for, put in by Ronald Reagan so the richest corporations in this country could pay the 20 percent rate, repealing that, giving the biggest, giving the richest corporations in this Nation, and we want to have them have a tax break so that they can invest and do this, but taking away all tax obligation to the richest corporations in this country. And then you say to folks who are every day playing by the rules, who are doing three or four jobs, parents, my parents, Congressman WARD's parents, MAJOR OWENS' parents, all of the folks who are here today, they are willing to work those three or four jobs to give their kids the opportunity. But when they are working three or four jobs and then you deny them the opportunity, that is why they are angry.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let me just say one more thing. My mother did not graduate from college. My father did not graduate from high school. But they sure were smart enough to know that something is amiss in a country's priorities when we cannot afford to help pay for reading teachers for children in schools across this country we can afford to guarantee \$30 billion of debt of the Government of Mexico. There is something very wrong with what is going on here.

Ms. DELAURO. There is another issue which I hope my friend from Kentucky will mention, is to provide an exclusion from taxes for billionaires, an issue on which he has really been a leading fighter to close that loophole so that those folks who are billionaires can pay their fair share of taxes. Let me have my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. WARD] share his own life experience with us on this issue of education and student loans.

Mr. WARD. I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut very much. I appreciate this opportunity to participate in her discussion on this very, very important issue.

I am a fellow who would not be here but for student loans. It was a situation when I was in college that I worked full time. My parents were able to help but just some. In order to get

the tuition paid, I had to take out loans.

If I had to face some of the challenges that we have heard about tonight, if I had to face immediate repayment, I would not have been able, I would not have been able to succeed and to get through the University of Louisville.

What we have here is a situation where maybe some who did have those opportunities, as we have heard from the gentleman from New Jersey, many, many of us here in this Chamber had the opportunity to get some help with student loans and grants and other kinds of assistance. But it seems that there are some of us who want to pull the ladder up behind them.

Of course this goes across the whole range of things, whether it is a GI loan that got people their first house or the GI bill that got them through school or other sorts of small government assistance, small assistance that made the difference, because none of us tonight is talking about the government paying the whole way. None of us is talking about throwing money at a problem. Each of us is talking about government helping to bridge the gap, to make the difference, to do that little bit extra that can help, that can mean the difference between success and failure.

There is no question when you look at the barometers of success and the indicators of what opportunities someone will have in our society, the one thing on which there is total agreement is that important part of the makeup of a person who succeeds is education.

What really surprises me and grates on me is that the very issue that we have talked about, people taking care of themselves, people taking responsibility for themselves, is left out of this discussion. It is these very people who have gotten themselves into a position of getting into college, of going through college, of making that commitment of work and sacrifice who are going to be affected by this.

So as one who had the opportunity, who spent 10 years paying back his loans, I can only say I cannot be part, I cannot imagine being part of an institution that says to everyone else, we are pulling up the ladders because we have got ours.

With that I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me this opportunity to participate in this special order.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank my colleague very, very much. I just want to, before I introduce my colleague from New York, MAJOR OWENS, just mention a couple of things.

One of the things that is going to be eliminated here is something called the direct loan program. And really by targeting the extinction of that initiative, what we are seeing is the Republican leadership in this House throwing away about \$6.8 million in taxpayer savings.



We ought to be trying to take a look at expanding a new streamlined approach to processing student loans. What we have tried to do here, and the program is working, is to take the bank out of this equation and, with the institution and the family working together, thereby making it more affordable to deal with the loan, what we should not be doing is limiting the growth of such a direct loan program or totally eliminating it after 1 year.

There is just one other program that I want to mention, and that is the national service program, AmeriCorps. We often fault young people today when we say to them, you have got advantages, you do not give anything back, that you are taking only, that it is the me generation, you are focused, self-centered on yourself, give something back to your communities.

My God, the national service program is exactly what was tailor made to say to young people, you commit to doing things in your community, helping in your community, providing a real service, not make-work, not a no-show, but providing a real service and taking an interest in your community. We will provide you and your family with some assistance in order for you to have an education.

The Republicans want to totally eliminate AmeriCorps, national service, and the 4 million new service opportunities in the next 4 years alone.

I would like to bring into the conversation someone who has spent a long time warring about a number of these issues and trying to expand opportunity for young people. That is my colleague from New York, Mr. OWENS.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for this special order.

I associate myself with the remarks of my previous colleagues and will try not to be repetitive. I have served on the education committee for the whole 13 years that I have been in Congress. H.G. Wells said that civilization is a race between education and catastrophe. That may not be the exact quote but that is the gist of it. Catastrophe has stared us in the face as we go forward with these reckless cuts that have been proposed by the Republican majority in this House.

Speaker GINGRICH says his objective is to remake America. And in this process of remaking, this behavior has become very reckless. Education, which is the cement, the glue, the adhesive which helps to hold our society together, is being destroyed. We have proceeded step by step, starting with Ronald Reagan who offered the report or commissioned the report called "A Nation at Risk" and moving from that to George Bush, "America 2000," and moving from that to President Clinton's "Goals 2000," all of which had some continuity. We were moving in the right direction.

Suddenly the Republican majority proposes to wreck all of that. Instead of remaking America, we are going to

destroy America because we do not recognize the critical role of education. These cuts are very mean, they are very extreme. They are very dangerous.

The Republican majority in the House of course proposes to wipe out the Department of Education totally. Only the Senate prevailed and has slowed the process down, but they are still moving with legislation to wipe out the Department of Education; a modern society in this complex world of ours would not have some central direction from a Department of Education.

A Department of Education at the Federal level plays a small role compared to the role played by centralized departments of education in other industrialized societies, but that is a very key role. It is a critical catalytic role. Only about 7 percent of the total budget spent for education is Federal money. But it is key in terms of stimulating, in terms of pushing for reform, and it is all very well packaged in "Goals 2000," in title I and Head Start. It is all very well packaged, but they have taken a sledge hammer to it all, and they are destroying it all in the process. In the process they will destroy the country.

We cannot have a society able to compete in this very complex and competitive industrialized world of ours, a global economy, without having great emphasis on education. I applaud President Clinton's proposal to make education a priority. When he laid out his 10-year budget proposal, education receives increases in that budget of \$47 billion over the 10-year period. Similar to the Congressional Black Caucus before where we increased over a 7-year period the education budget by 25 percent. Education deserves the priority. It has to have a priority. Not only should we not have these cuts, we should be moving forward with increases.

The civilization of New York City once boasted of having free universities. The city universities were free without tuition when I moved there in 1958. We do not have that any longer. But we are instead going rapidly backwards where not only do we have free universities but even with all of the aid that is offered by the State and the city and the aid available from the Federal Government, with it being cut so drastically and forcing tuition costs up, large numbers of people in New York City who want to go to college will not be able to go to college in New York City.

These same city universities compete with Ivy League schools in terms of the number of Nobel Prize winners. Nobel Prize winners have come out of these city universities. The numbers of Ph.D.s that have come out of our city universities are as great as the Ivy League schools when you take a look at it and add it all up. So all of this is being wrecked when they say they are

going to remake America. What they are doing is destroying America.

Unfortunately, the powerful juggernaut approach that is being taken here will wreck education right across the country. It is most unfortunate. American voters, taxpayers should rally to stop the destruction of our civilization, and the first place that we should focus on is to stop the cuts in education.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank my colleague, Mr. Speaker. My colleague has spent a lifetime and his professional lifetime in this body focused in on this area of being part of the education committee.

It is truly hard to believe sometimes that we would wreck education, which is, as we know, the key to the future, to the success of this Nation, to the success of individuals. Each succeeding generation has wanted to pass on increased opportunities in this area. We are finding ourselves in the position, I think, parents are finding themselves in the position today where they are saying that their kids are not going to have the same kinds of opportunities that they had.

Chief among those opportunities are the opportunities to increase their ability through education, whether it is higher education or whether it is vocational education, but a route in which we allow people to aspire and to dream, if you will.

I am really proud to stand with my colleagues here tonight in staunch opposition to the Republican leadership's plan to shut the door on educational opportunity to America's working families. Speaker GINGRICH likes to portray the Republican budget as part of a revolution. There is nothing new here. This is, it is not the least bit revolutionary. It is nothing new, and it is not revolutionary. It is, quite honestly, the same old trickle down economics of old, which is that you provide a tax break for the wealthiest in our Nation, and that is paid for by limiting the opportunities of working middle-class families in this country.

□ 2115

I started this hour by telling my own story, which is about my folks and their beginnings. My dad is an immigrant; my mother working in the old sweatshops and her admonition to me which was: Take the opportunity for an education, so that you will not have to do this.

That is essentially what we are denying to parents today; their ability to help and provide their kids with a future. That is wrong. That is something all of us here tonight are going to oppose and we hope that the American public will join us in that opposition.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleagues for participating in this conversation tonight.

ISSUES OF IMPORT TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

new programs so that schools can offer an alternative to the street for our Nation's unsupervised youth. This companion program would complement the Community Schools Program.

My second amendment would require parents to sign a parental responsibility contract that would demand, in exchange for benefits, that parents take an active role in the supervision and education of their children.

Mr. President, these two amendments are only first steps. But they are steps in the right direction: toward the brighter future of this Nation.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendments.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. There is no objection on this side. To the contrary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the en bloc amendments.

The en bloc amendments (Nos. 2662 and 2664) were agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the majority leader and thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. DOLE. As I understand it, the Senator from California has a demonstration amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 2479

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2479.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2479.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in the Friday, September 8, 1995, edition of the RECORD.)

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, what this amendment does is essentially assures that, in those large counties or groups of counties with a population greater than 500,000, that there be provision, with permission of the State—this is the modification in the amendment—that the money, the block grant, go directly to the county. So we have modified the amendment from its original presentation. My understanding is that it is agreeable to both sides.

The purpose of the amendment is, really, so many of the innovative demonstration projects that are initiated by counties, which I pointed out in my opening remarks on this amendment, can go ahead without an additional element of bureaucracy.

Again, the State would have to approve this, but for those counties that

do their own administration, this would continue to be the case.

Mr. DOLE. Has the modification been sent to the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reports the modification does not appear to be at the desk.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. 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. LEVIN. 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. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amendment of the Senator from California be temporarily laid aside so I can make a unanimous-consent request and have my amendment considered. It has been cleared.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2486, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that a modification to my amendment, No. 2486, be sent to the desk and be in order.

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

The amendment (No. 2486), as modified, is as follows:

On page 12, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

(G) COMMUNITY SERVICE.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, consistent with the exception provided in section 404(d), require participation by, and offer to, unless the State opts out of this provision by notifying the Secretary, a parent or caretaker receiving assistance under the program, after receiving such assistance for 6 months—

(i) is not exempt from work requirements; and

(ii) is not engaged in work as determined under section 404(c), in community service employment, with minimum hours per week and tasks to be determined by the State.

Mr. DOLE. As I understand, the amendment, as modified, is acceptable on this side.

Is that correct?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. It most assuredly is on our side.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, if I could spend 30 seconds, I have long believed that work requirements should be clear, strong, and applied promptly. For too long we have permitted welfare dependency to undermine the potential productivity of too many able-bodied Americans. We have allowed too many able-bodied welfare recipients not to work. That is wrong.

The amendment which I am offering would add a requirement that welfare recipients be in job training and school or working in private sector jobs within 6 months of receipt of benefits, and if private sector jobs could not be found they be required to perform some type of community service employment. The requirement would be

phased in over 3 years to allow States the chance to adjust administratively. We have added in this modification an opt-out provision for States by notification of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and also to make clear the intent to conform to the modifications which Senator DOLE made to his amendment No. 2280 last week.

The bill before us requires recipients to work within no more than 2 years of receipt of benefits. Why wait that long? Why wait 2 years? Unless an able-bodied person is in school or job training, why wait longer than 6 months to require that a person have a private job or be performing community service?

My amendment says 6 months instead of 2 years.

There is no doubt that there is a great need in local communities across the country for community service workers. Last year, the demand for community service workers from the President's AmeriCorps Program was far greater than the ability to fund them. According to AmeriCorps, of the 538 project applications requesting approximately 60,000 workers, only applications for about 20,000 workers could be funded. Projects ranged from environmental cleanup, to assisting in day care centers, to home health care aides. It is clear that there is no shortage of need for workers in community service.

The Daschle amendment which was narrowly defeated last week contained a similar provision which was added as a modification at my request. It would require that recipients work in community service employment if not employed in the private sector, engaged in job training or in school, and it would require that States offer the community service option to such recipients.

Mr. President, I have long been concerned about the cycle of dependency and the need to return welfare recipients to work. As long as 14 years ago, in 1981, I was the author, along with Senator DOLE, of legislation which was enacted into law that put some welfare recipients back to work as home health care aides, thereby decreasing the welfare rolls and increasing the local tax base.

This demonstration project called for the training and placement of AFDC recipients as home care aides to Medicaid recipients as a long-term care alternative to institutional care, and was subject to rigorous evaluation in both the demonstration and post-demonstration periods.

The independently conducted program evaluation found that during six of the seven demonstration projects, trainees' total monthly earnings increased by 56 percent to more than 130 percent. Evaluations in following years indicated similarly positive and significant income effects. Consistent with the increase in employment, trainees also received reduced public benefits. All seven States moved a significant proportion of trainees off of AFDC. In

four of the States, a significant proportion of the trainees also were moved off of the Food Stamp Program or received significantly reduced benefit amounts.

Additionally, the program evaluation indicated that it significantly increased the amount of formal in-home care received by Medicaid clients and had significant beneficial effects on client health and functioning. The evaluation also indicated that clients benefited from marginally reduced costs for the services they received.

As the 1986 evaluation shows, this type of demonstration had great potential in allowing local governments to respond to priority needs and assist members of their community in obtaining the training necessary to obtain practical, meaningful private sector employment and become productive, self-sufficient members of their community.

Mr. President, I want to highlight a particularly wise provision in Senator DOLE's bill. It is a provision which states that any recipient may be treated as participating in community service employment if that person provides child care services to other individuals participating in the community service program. This is a good idea. It opens a way for many able-bodied persons currently on welfare, to provide a service to others, meet work requirements, and, at the same time, free others to work who may otherwise have difficulty locating affordable child care. I hope that many States will vigorously exercise this provision and that recipients will heed the encouragement to provide child care services as a way of engaging in community service employment.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that in the 104th Congress, we will take the necessary steps to get people off welfare and working, in the private sector, if possible, but in community service, if necessary. Experience has shown we must be more aggressive in requiring recipients to work. I believe my amendment is a firm step in the right direction.

Mr. President, I thank Senator MOYNIHAN and Senator DOLE and their staff for working with us on this.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The amendment (No. 2486), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. 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. DOLE. 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. DOLE. Mr. President, I think they are working out a modification on the amendment of the Senator from California, Senator FEINSTEIN. I understand there are four or five amendments that will be cleared here momentarily.

I would like to indicate that I will consult with the Democratic leader and hopefully have a cloture vote here within the next hour. I do not think we are going to reach an agreement. And we are not going to pass the bill if we have to accommodate every request from the other side.

So I am prepared to have a cloture vote. If we do not get cloture, this bill will go into reconciliation.

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. MOYNIHAN. 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. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I see the Senator from California has risen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 2479, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I send a modification to amendment No. 2479 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 2479), as modified, is as follows:

On page 69, strike lines 18 through 22, and insert the following:

"SEC. 413. STATE AND COUNTY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.

"(a) NO LIMITATION OF STATE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Nothing in this part shall be construed as limiting a State's ability to conduct demonstration projects for the purpose of identifying innovative or effective program designs in 1 or more political subdivisions of the State providing that such State contains more than one country with a population of greater than 500,000.

"(b) COUNTY WELFARE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly enter into negotiations with all counties having a population greater than 500,000 desiring to conduct a demonstration project described in paragraph (2) for the purpose of establishing appropriate rules to govern the establishment and operation of such project.

"(2) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT DESCRIBED.—The demonstration project described in this paragraph shall provide that—

"(A) a county participating in the demonstration project shall have the authority and duty to administer the operation of the program described under this part as if the county were considered a State for the purpose of this part;

"(B) the State in which the county participating in the demonstration project is located shall pass through directly to the county the portion of the grant received by the State under section 403 which the State

determines is attributable to the residents of such county; and

"(C) the duration of the project shall be for 5 years.

"(3) COMMENCEMENT OF PROJECT.—After the conclusion of the negotiations described in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize a county to conduct the demonstration project described in paragraph (2) in accordance with the rules established during the negotiations.

"(4) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the termination of a demonstration project operated under this subsection, the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Congress a report that includes—

"(A) a description of the demonstration project;

"(B) the rules negotiated with respect to the project; and

"(C) the innovations (if any) that the county was able to initiate under the project.

"(5) eligible counties are defined as:

"(A) a county that is already administering the welfare program under this part;

"(B) represents less than 25% of the State's total welfare caseload."

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I believe, Mr. President, that these modifications have been cleared, and are as I reported earlier.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I believe that is the case on our side, Mr. President.

Mr. DOLE. The amendment has been cleared on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2479), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in an effort to protect the rights of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], I ask unanimous consent that in the event of a cloture vote, if cloture was invoked, his amendment would still be in order under the same conditions, the same time limit as previously ordered.

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

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his usual gracious consideration.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2578, 2481, 2670; 2542, AS MODIFIED; 2551, AS MODIFIED; 2601, AS MODIFIED; 2507, AS MODIFIED; AND 2280, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the following amendments en bloc, that the

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHT

House passed Federal acquisition reform bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S13555-S13626

Measures Introduced: Four bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1240-1243.

Page S13620

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Special Report entitled "Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 1996". (S. Rept. No. 104-141)

H.R. 1976, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 104-142)

H.R. 1868, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 104-143)

Page S13620

Family Self-Sufficiency Act: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 4, to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence, with a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, taking action on amendments proposed thereon, as follows:

Pages S13558-75, S13581-S13617

Adopted:

(1) Wellstone Modified Amendment No. 2584 (to Amendment No. 2280), to exempt women and children who have been battered or subject to extreme cruelty from certain requirements of the bill.

Pages S13561-62

(2) Dorgan Amendment No. 2535 (to Amendment No. 2280), to express the sense of the Senate on legislative accountability for the unfunded mandates imposed by welfare reform legislation.

Page S13565

(3) McCain Amendment No. 2589 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for child support en-

D 1092

forcement agreements between the States and Indian tribes or tribal organizations.

Pages S13565-67

(4) Nickles Modified Amendment No. 2556 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for the transmission of quarterly wage reports in order to relay information to the State Directory of New Hires to assist in locating absent parents.

Page S13567

(5) By 94 yeas to 6 nays (Vote No. 424), Exon Modified Amendment No. 2525 (to Amendment No. 2280), to prohibit the payment of certain Federal benefits to any person not lawfully present within the United States.

Pages S13567-69

(6) Feinstein Amendment No. 2470 (to Amendment No. 2280), to impose a child support obligation on paternal grandparents in cases in which both parents are minors.

Page S13569

(7) Kerry Amendment No. 2662 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide demonstration projects for using neighborhood schools as centers for beneficial activities for children and their parents in order to break the welfare cycle.

Pages S13569-71

(8) Kerry Amendment No. 2664 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require applicants for assistance who are parents to enter into a Parental Responsibility Contract and perform satisfactorily under its terms as a condition of receipt of that assistance.

Pages S13569-71

(9) Feinstein Modified Amendment No. 2479 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for State and county demonstration programs.

Pages S13571-72

(10) Levin Modified Amendment No. 2486 (to Amendment No. 2280), to require recipients of assistance under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to participate in State mandated community service activities if

they are not engaged in work after 6 months of receiving benefits.

Pages S13571-72

(11) D'Amato Amendment No. 2578 (to Amendment No. 2280), relating to claims arising before effective date.

Pages S13572-73

(12) Feingold Amendment No. 2481 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for a demonstration project for the elimination of take-one-take-all requirement.

Pages S13572-73

(13) Kerrey Amendment No. 2670 (to Amendment No. 2280), to allow a State to revoke an election to participate in the optional State food assistance block grant.

Pages S13572-73

(14) McCain Modified Amendment No. 2542 (to Amendment No. 2280), to remove the maximum length of participation in the work supplementation or support program.

Pages S13572-73

(15) Kohl Modified Amendment No. 2551 (to Amendment No. 2280), to expand the food stamp employment and training program.

Pages S13572-73

(16) Faircloth Modified Amendment No. 2601 (to Amendment No. 2280), to integrate the temporary assistance to needy families with food stamp work rules.

Pages S13572-73

(17) Wellstone Modified Amendment No. 2507 (to Amendment No. 2280), to exclude energy assistance payments for one-time costs of weatherization or repair or replacement of unsafe or inoperative heating devices from income under the food stamp program.

Pages S13572-75

(18) Pryor Modified Amendment No. 2495 (to Amendment No. 2280), to modify the penalty provisions.

Pages S13583-84

(19) Gramm Amendment No. 2614 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for increased penalties for failure to meet work requirements.

Page S13584

(20) By 93 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. 425), Shelby Amendment No. 2526 (to Amendment No. 2280), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable credit for adoption expenses and to exclude from gross income employee and military adoption assistance benefits and withdrawals from IRAs for certain adoption expenses.

Pages S13584-88, S13603

(21) Conrad Modified Amendment No. 2528 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide that a State that provides assistance to unmarried teenage parents

under the State program require such parents as a condition of receiving such assistance to live in an adult-supervised setting and attend high school or other equivalent training program.

Pages S13562-63, S13598-S13602

(22) Bradley Amendment No. 2496 (to Amendment No. 2280), to modify the provisions regarding the State plan requirements.

Pages S13602-03

(23) DeWine Modified Amendment No. 2517 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for quarterly reporting by banks with respect to common trust funds.

Pages S13594-96, S13604

Rejected:

(1) By 17 yeas to 83 nays (Vote No. 422), Faircloth Amendment No. 2609 (to Amendment No. 2280), to prohibit teenage parents from living in the home of an adult relative or guardian who has a history of receiving assistance.

Page S13562

(2) By 37 yeas to 63 nays (Vote No. 423), Jeffords Amendment No. 2581 (to Amendment No. 2280), to strike the increase to the grant to reward States that reduce out-of-wedlock births.

Pages S13563-65

(3) By 34 yeas to 64 nays (Vote No. 426) Mikulski Amendment No. 2669 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for the development of a program that encourages participation of both parents in the parenting of children and encourages two-parent families.

Pages S13588-90, S13603-04

(4) By 37 yeas to 61 nays (Vote No. 427), Feinstein Amendment No. 2478 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide equal treatment for naturalized and native-born citizens.

Pages S13590-93, S13604-05

(5) By 20 yeas to 78 nays (Vote No. 428), Feinstein Amendment No. 2513 (to Amendment No. 2280), to limit deeming of income to cash and cash-like programs, and to retain SSI eligibility and exempt deeming of income requirements for victims of domestic violence.

Pages S13596-98, S13605

Pending:

Dole Modified Amendment No. 2280, of a perfecting nature.

Pages S13558-75, S13581-S13617

Subsequently, the amendment was further modified.

Pages S13572-73

Daschle Amendment No. 2672 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for the establishment of a Contingency Fund for State Welfare Programs.

Page S13558

Faircloth Amendment No. 2608 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide for an abstinence education program.

Page S13558

Simon Amendment No. 2509 (to Amendment No. 2280), to eliminate retroactive deeming requirements for those legal immigrants already in the United States.

Pages S13606-09

Simon Amendment No. 2681 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide grants for the establishment of community works progress programs.

Simon Amendment No. 2468 (to Amendment No. 2280), to provide grants for the establishment of community works progress programs.

Page S13609

Graham Amendment No. 2568 (to Amendment No. 2280), to set national work participation rate goals and to provide that the Secretary shall adjust the goals for individual States based on the amount of Federal funding the State receives for minor children in families in the State that have incomes below the poverty line.

Page S13609-10

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill, certain amendments pending thereto, and certain further amendments to be proposed, on Friday, September 15, 1995.

Page S13606

Messages From the House:

Page S13619

Measures Referred:

Pages S13619-20

Communications:

Page S13620

Statements on Introduced Bills:

Pages S13620-23

Additional Cosponsors:

Page S13623

Notices of Hearings:

Page S13623

Authority for Committees:

Pages S13623-24

Additional Statements:

Pages S13624-26

Record Votes: Seven record votes were taken today. (Total—428)

Pages S13562, S13565, S13569, S13603-05

Recess: Senate convened at 9:15 a.m., and recessed at 10:58 p.m., until 9:15 a.m., on Friday, September 15, 1995. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's RECORD on page S13626.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—AGRICULTURE/D.C./FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:

H.R. 1976, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, with amendments;

H.R. _____, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996; and

H.R. 1868, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, with amendments.

APPROPRIATIONS—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the District of Columbia concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the government of the District of Columbia, after receiving testimony in behalf of funds for their respective activities from Annice M. Wagner, Chief Judge, District of Columbia Court of Appeals; Eugene N. Hamilton, Chief Judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia; Andrew F. Brimmer, Chairman, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority; Wilma R. Harvey, President, District of Columbia Board of Education; and Franklin L. Smith, Superintendent, District of Columbia Public Schools.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING REFORM

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded hearings on proposals to privatize the public broadcasting system, after receiving testimony from Frederick M.R. Smith, CS First Boston, New York, New York; George L. Miles, Jr., WQED Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Delano E. Lewis, National Public Radio, and Kenneth Robinson, both of Washington, D.C.; Burnhill Clark, KCTS Television, Seattle, Washington; and Newton N. Minow, Carnegie Corporation, Chicago, Illinois.

is bipartisan, called the Republican plan "the mother of all unfunded mandates." This is not something I dreamed up or the Democratic Policy Committee came up with in some cute little phrase. This comes from the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which is a bipartisan group. He called the plan "the mother of all unfunded mandates."

For example, in order for States to meet the new work requirements prescribed in the Republican bill, by the year 2000—fiscal year 2000—the Congressional Budget Office analysis estimates that the States would have to find up to \$4.3 billion extra—more than the current State and Federal expenditures—to meet the new child care costs alone. Overall, the unfunded work requirements would result in \$35 billion in additional cost to the States over the next 7 years; \$35 billion. Everybody within the sound of my voice should understand that this is a lot of money that is going to be picked up by State and local governments. For the State of Nevada, the unfunded mandate will result in costs upwards of \$110 million, as we now see it, at least.

Finally, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that a majority of the States will not be able to meet the work requirements included in the bill. In fact, CBO assumes that given the cost and administrative complexities, States would choose to accept a penalty of up to 5 percent of the grant rather than implement the requirements.

My primary concern with the underlying bill and the block grant plan in it is its unfairness and insufficiency. The plan simply shifts the problems of the current welfare program to the States, with limited Federal funding. This plan is inadequate for high-growth States like Nevada. In fact, Nevada may be the best example of how unfair a block grant frozen at fiscal year 1994 will be—frozen for 5 years. Nevada is the fastest-growing State in the country, with the fastest-growing city in the country, Las Vegas. It will not take long for high-growth States like Nevada to run out of money. And then they will be forced, under the terms of this bill, to borrow money from a so-called "emergency loan fund" which this plan provides. The loan is limited to 10 percent of the State's grant, and the State is required to repay the loan, with interest, within 3 years.

Of course, if the State does not have the money to repay the loan, what happens? We know what happens. The costs will be shifted to the State's residents in the form of increased taxes. There is no other alternative. This plan has a very real potential of forcing States into playing a catch-up game that they will never win. This is not my definition or, I think, anyone's definition of State flexibility. It is the definition of State destruction.

To add to this disturbing scenario is the fact that the underlying bill cuts back on welfare funding in order to give \$270 billion of tax cuts. The block

grant method proposed is particularly harsh on a State like Nevada. Nevada, I repeat, is rapidly growing. From 1993 to 1994, Clark County, NV, which is Las Vegas, grew by 8.2 percent. That is tremendous in 1 year.

This equates to about 75,000 new people coming to Las Vegas in 1 year. Our growth rate is on the rise and shows no sign of slowing. The growth rate in Clark County is expected to increase 23 percent over the next 5 years. We are going to have moneys frozen at the 1994 level for 5 years?

Meanwhile, this block grant under this underlying bill would freeze funding, as I said, at the 1994 fiscal level. As Nevada's population soars, the funding for welfare will remain fixed with no consideration of changing it under conditions of population growth or even inflation. This rationale simply does not make sense and is not fair.

I have been listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak about giving the States flexibility and that one size does not fit all. Well, I agree. States should have flexibility, but the plan that is now being debated here, that is, the underlying Republican plan, does not allow this flexibility. They provide an insufficient amount of money to the States expecting to fill the requirements tied to that money. This is not flexibility. This is an unfunded mandate. I agree that one size does not fit all. We do not live in a static society. Each State is changing rapidly.

The City of Las Vegas grows 75,000 a year. Why does this Republican plan keep the funding level at the 1994 level for 5 years? Block grants are not fair and they do not make sense.

Some would have us believe that this block grant program is some new idea. We are going to do the right thing, and we have come up with the great idea of block grant. I do not know when block grants first started, but in the Nixon years they had block grants. We tried them in a number of different areas. Most of them we got rid of, for reasons just like I talked about, because block grants are an easy way to do things.

It is like we talked about balancing the budget. It is easy to balance a budget if you use welfare, Social Security moneys, and do not make some of the hard choices we have been forced to make this year with the balanced budget resolutions that now have passed. Those are tough decisions.

Block grants are an easy way, a buck passer for the Federal Government. Bundle up all the problems in a nice little bundle and ship them to the States. That is what we are doing with welfare.

Another primary concern of mine is the so-called child exclusion provisions. Under the majority's plan, States would have the option to deny assistance to unmarried minor parents and their children. States would also be given the option to deny additional assistance to families who give birth to a child while on assistance or who have

received assistance any time during a 10-month period.

These provisions directly punish and hurt children for merely being born, over which they of course have no control. The concept behind these provisions seems to be that if women know they will not receive money for additional children, they will not get pregnant.

This simply is not the case. To quote the Senator from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, "Anyone who thinks that cutting benefits can affect sexual behavior does not know human nature."

The family cap provisions were enacted in New Jersey, I think in about 1992. After a study of mothers who are penalized if they had more children while on welfare, a Rutgers University study recently found there is no reduction of birthrate of welfare mothers attributable to the family cap. Further, last month New Jersey officials announced that the abortion rate among poor women has increased since the passage of their policy.

I do not know the precise cause of this increase, but I think common sense dictates that it could be a result of the message which is sent to poor women under these provisions which is, "Do not get pregnant. But if you do, you better do something about it because you will not get any money to feed that child."

Obviously, many young people will turn to abortion rather than having a child that they will not be able to feed and clothe. Withholding welfare benefits to prevent pregnancy is not the answer to illegitimacy problems.

The Democratic proposal does deal with teenage pregnancy—and we will talk about that a little later—in a firm, concise, and compassionate way.

Furthermore, the family cap provisions are focused on the actions of women. What about the father of these illegitimate children? Should we talk about them at all? Should they be part of this major legislation reform? Of course they should be.

National Public Radio this morning had on its program Prof. Richard Moran of Mount Holyoke College. Now, I ask my learned friend from the State of New York, is this a New York institution, Mount Holyoke?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Massachusetts.

Mr. REID. Thank you. Professor Moran stated what most believe is simply common sense. He said if we can change the behavior of adult men who father illegitimate children, we could make a substantial dent in the rate of teenage illegitimacy. Instead of trying to limit teen pregnancy by reducing welfare benefits for the girls, public policy, according to Moran, should focus on holding adult males financially responsible for their children.

I think that is pretty sound reasoning. It is common sense and our bill does that.

Professor Moran went on to explain that 25 years ago, two-thirds of expectant teenage mothers married. Today,



less than a third marry. Of course, no one is saying that early marriage is a solution to out-of-wedlock births.

A new national study indicates fully one-half of the fathers of the babies born to mothers are adults. This is not a situation of teenagers having sex. The facts are that these young girls are being impregnated by adult males, and they should be held responsible for their actions. They should pay.

These statistics show that the problem of illegitimacy is not going to be solved in an easy fashion. We must focus on the family and do it in a way that is intelligent.

The Democratic Work First program is called Work First—that is the amendment pending before the body at this time—because that is what it is about. The Democratic Work First welfare plan will change the current welfare system dramatically by replacing the current system with a conditional entitlement program of limited duration requiring all able-bodied recipients to work, guaranteeing child care assistance, and requiring both parents to contribute to the support of their children.

The Work First plan is a plan where assistance is continual. Assistance is time limited. I think it is important that after 2 months we recognize clients who have signed the contract, the Parent Empowerment Contract, are working toward objectives and can continue to receive assistance.

After 2 years, if the individual is not working, States will be required to offer welfare or community service. Again, tough sanctions arise to those who refuse to participate in this welfare program.

The Democratic plan requires work and establishes the Work First employment grants if States focus on work, providing the means and the tools needed to get welfare recipients into jobs and to keep them in the work force. All able-bodied recipients must work.

There are successful programs now. We do not know how successful; they have not been in existence long enough. We have a great program in Riverside, CA. They have sorted clients into two streams. Most programs put everybody in the same stream. What they have done is they sort clients into two streams: one, those that need educational assistance; and those that are job ready.

It is a program we can look to see if it will have long-term benefits. We have a program in Iowa that has received some rave reviews. It is a family investment type program designed to move families off welfare into self-sufficient employment. The State of Oregon has a program. There are a lot of programs that States, if they have resources, which will be given in this bill that we have submitted in the form of an amendment, States can do some type of innovative programs.

Our program does not say, States, you must do it this way. But we are

saying people must work and that we are going to give you some financial assistance so that you can accomplish some of these things.

I repeat, States are provided resources for the work requirement. Under our plan, States are given the resources so welfare recipients not only get a job but remain in the work force. See, getting a job is not the key to everything because you have to keep them in the job. States have the flexibility that I have outlined before.

One of the key facets of the Democratic proposal that is not in the Republican proposal is child care. That is, to help recipients keep a job, child care assistance will be made available to all those required to work or prepare for work. There are three current child care programs. They would be consolidated into one program. We have had good work by Senator DODD and Senator HATCH on this in years gone by. I conducted hearings in the State of Nevada on child care and how important it was. I learned firsthand, in hearings I held in Reno and Las Vegas, how critical it is, if we are going to have a successful welfare program, to have some child care components.

We also have to encourage clients to stay in jobs by making employment more attractive than welfare. We have talked about the importance of child care. We also have to talk about the importance of health care. Under our program, an amendment we will vote on tomorrow afternoon at 4 o'clock, Medicaid coverage will be extended by an additional 12 months beyond the current 1-year transition period. It is needed. If you are going to give people incentives to keep working and save the Federal Government money, then they must have the ability to have child care and health care.

Also, we have to make sure the statistics are not phony. Our program counts actual work. As I have indicated earlier, the underlying bill is kind of a moving target because it keeps changing for reasons we have all read about in the newspapers. But we must have a work performance rate that is a real work performance rate.

I have talked about fathers, how they also must be part of the program if we are going to do something about absent parents. The burden has been on women. We have to divert the attention to make it a responsibility of parents, and parents includes the man. That is usually the one who avoids responsibility. Absent parents who are delinquent on child support payments, under our legislation, must choose to enter into a repayment plan with the State, community service, or try jail. That is in our legislation, and I think that it is fair.

Under our legislation, we are going to try to keep families together. Unlike the current system under which women and children receive more assistance if parents are separated or divorced, the Work First plan encourages families to stay together to work their

way off welfare. Our plan eliminates the man-in-the-house rule, which prohibits women from receiving benefits if they have a spouse living in the same house who is working full or part time. Let us have this a family friendly welfare package.

We have talked about teen parents. Under our plan the message to teen parents is clear: Stay at home and stay in school. Stay at home and stay in school. No longer will a teenage parent be able to drop out of school and establish a separate household, creating the cycle of dependency that is difficult to break. Custodial parents under the age of 18 would be required to live at home or, if there is some reason because of an abusive situation or whatever other reason that is meritorious that they should not live at home, then there would be an adult-supervised group home where parenting skills would be taught, where there would be employment opportunities available.

I say to my friends, a program like this is not impossible. A few months ago I went to Fallon, NV. Fallon, NV, is about 60 miles from Reno. It used to be an agricultural community and it still is. The largest naval training facility for airplanes in the world is there, Fallon Naval Air Training Center. It is a great facility.

I had been asked to visit a Lutheran Church in Fallon, because it was part of the AmeriCorps project. I went there and met with the priest who had moved to Fallon several years before. He was contacted first by the school across the street from his church, saying we have all these teenage pregnancies, could you help us? He did not know how to help. He said, "I cannot. I do not know what to do." Then he was contacted by the State Welfare Department. Finally, somebody said, "We have this AmeriCorps project. Why do we not make a grant and see if we can get a program to help teenage pregnant girls." They made an application. There is an AmeriCorps project there.

It brings tears to your eyes to go there. Mr. President, there is not a single person now on welfare who has been through this program. It is right across the street from the high school. The pastor, who came there to care for his flock, has now become devoted. His whole church is involved in taking care of these teenage girls who become pregnant. They are being educated. They are getting their high school diplomas. There are people who are working in the program, earning money so they can use the money to go to college. It is a wonderful program.

There are programs we can come up with to help teenage pregnant girls. But these programs require funding.

So I ask everyone to take a close look at our bill. It is a good bill. If this amendment is defeated tomorrow afternoon at 4 o'clock, I hope we will have an opportunity to vote on an amendment dealing with child care and the many other problems involved in

welfare reform, which are not properly addressed by the Dole bill.

The Democratic plan addresses the problem of teenage pregnancy by including grants to States for design and implementation of teen pregnancy prevention programs. I will not go into more detail right now, but it is extremely important.

Paternity establishment is in our bill. We cannot let these men escape their responsibility, as they very often do. Child support enforcement is in our legislation.

Also, I want to talk a little bit about the provision in our legislation dealing with food assistance reform—food stamps—major provisions. We have one strengthening compliance, reducing fraud and abuse. It is an effort to clamp down on the egregious abuses of the program. The Work First Program provides the following:

The Secretary of Agriculture may establish specific authorization periods so that stores have to reapply to continue to accept food stamp coupons and may establish time periods during which stores have their authorization revoked or, having had their application for authorization denied, will be ineligible. Stores may be required to provide written verification of eligibility. The Secretary shall be required to issue regulations allowing the suspension of a store from participation in the program after the store is initially found to have committed violations.

Now they commit violations and, in effect, thumb their noses at the authorities because nobody can stop them from taking food stamps. Our bill changes this.

Stores that are disqualified from the WIC Program shall be disqualified from participation in the Food-Stamp program for the same period of time. Retail stores are disqualified permanently from the Food-Stamp Program for submitting false applications. There are other things that are important to strengthen this provision: enhancing electronic benefit transfer, strengthening requirements, and penalties. There are a number of things that really make this legislation more important.

I want to close by talking about a couple of things, in effect, to set the record straight. People who oppose this amendment charge that the Work First plan is weak on work. This claim comes from the same people who only a short time ago approved and reported a plan out of committee with no participation requirements.

So I say in response to that charge that their plan was not even about workers; it was about shoveling people from one program to another with no emphasis on work, with no emphasis, no work requirement at all, and now they have dropped their participation requirements and instead have adopted our work standards, the standards in this amendment pending before this body. So try to explain to me how the Democrat plan is weak on work when

the underlying Dole amendment picks up our plan.

There is also a charge that the Democratic substitute is weak on State innovation. The Democrat Work First plan provides States unprecedented flexibility. The States set benefit levels. States set allowable asset limits. States set income. Disregard policies. States design their own work programs. In fact, there is a lot of similarity here between the Democratic and Republican plans. So why do they charge Work First as being weak on State innovation? It simply is not true.

Another charge: The Democrat plan is weak on savings.

Mr. President, the Democratic Work First plan saves over \$20 billion. It is not weak on savings. The Breau-Mikulski plan saves as much as the Republican plan, or as close. But it also does not include a \$23 billion unfunded mandate to the States; that the States are going to rue the day that this underlying legislation passes. They will rue the day. As the Conference of Mayors said, this will be the "mother of all unfunded mandates." The Democratic plan will result in deficit reduction without unfunded mandates to the States.

Let me close by saying, yes, we should change the present way welfare is handled. But we should not throw the baby out with the bathwater. We have to do a better job of being compassionate but also have a bit of wisdom in what we are doing with so-called welfare reform.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, may I first thank the Senator from Nevada for a careful and a thoughtful and, to this Senator, a wholly persuasive argument.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SENATOR EDUARDO MATARAZZO SUPPLY OF BRAZIL

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, by a happy circumstance, we have a visitor on the floor today, Senator Eduardo Suplicy of the Brazilian Senate, who is the author of legislation in that Senate which will establish a guaranteed national income in Brazil and is now in debate in that assembly. It is a matter that has been discussed on this floor today. So it is very serendipitous indeed.

RECESS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate might stand in recess for 1 minute in order to welcome our colleague from Brazil, Senator Eduardo Suplicy.

[Applause]

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:12 p.m., recessed until 6:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. DEWINE].

RECESS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for a period of 20 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:15 p.m., recessed until 6:33 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. DEWINE].

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, a recent paper by the Progressive Policy Institute leveled three criticisms at the Republican welfare reform plan. It is to generate short-term budget savings, the first charge leveled; to satisfy GOP Governors' demands for flexibility; and, lastly, to avoid making tough decisions.

Now, obviously, that last statement is most ludicrous that the Progressive Policy Institute leveled against us because we have seen the Federal Government fail on welfare reform. You know, there was a massive effort made in 1988 at the Federal level to move people from welfare to work, to save the taxpayers money. We have seen 3.1 million more people on welfare now than before we passed our so-called welfare reform plan in 1988.

In the meantime, we have seen States like Missouri, my State of Iowa, the States of Wisconsin, Michigan, Massachusetts, New Jersey—and I suppose there are a lot of others that ought to be named—reform welfare in a very ambitious way and in an ambitious way that we have not had the guts or the will to do here in Washington, DC, at the congressional level. And we have seen through State action people move from welfare to work and saving the taxpayers money. In my own State of Iowa we have 2,000 less people on welfare than 3 years ago when we passed the welfare reform plan. We have seen our monthly checks go from an average of \$360 down to \$340. And we have seen the highest percentage of any State in the Nation of people who are on welfare moving to work, at 35 percent.

So can you believe it, Mr. President, that the Progressive Policy Institute would level a charge that we are trying to avoid making tough decisions when we have failed at tough decisions or we

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Department of Defense Authorizations, 1996.

House passed Legislative Branch Appropriations conference report.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S12649-S12751

Measures Introduced: Eighteen bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1201-1218. **Pages S12715-16**

Measures Passed:

Department of Defense Authorizations, 1996: The Committee on Armed Services was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1530, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces and, by 64 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. 399), the bill was then passed, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of S. 1026, Senate companion measure, as amended, and after taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows:

Pages S12649-76

Adopted:

(1) Warner Amendment No. 2461, to state the sense of the Senate on negotiations between the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, and the Governor of the State of Idaho regarding the shipment of spent nuclear fuel from naval reactors.

Pages S12649-51

(2) Nunn (for Levin) Amendment No. 2462, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to use leasing in the acquisition of commercial vehicles when such leasing is practicable and efficient.

Page S12651

(3) Warner (for Kyl) Amendment No. 2463, to place a limitation on the use of funds for cooperative threat reduction for dismantlement and destruction of chemical weapons.

Pages S12651-53

(4) Warner (for Thurmond) Amendment No. 2464, to make technical corrections.

Page S12653

(5) By 85 yeas to 13 nays (Vote No. 398), Nunn Amendment No. 2425, to establish a missile defense policy.

Pages S12649, S12653-68

Senate insisted on its amendment, and requested a conference with the House thereon. **Page S12675**

Subsequently, S. 1026 was indefinitely postponed.

Page S12675

Department of Defense Authorizations, 1996: Senate passed S. 1124, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, and to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof Division A of S. 1026, as amended.

Page S12675

Military Construction Authorizations, 1996: Senate passed S. 1125, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military construction, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof Division B of S. 1026, as amended.

Page S12675

Energy National Security: Senate passed S. 1126, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof Division C of S. 1026, as amended.

Page S12675

Family Self-Sufficiency Act: Senate resumed consideration of H.R. 4, to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence, with a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows:

Pages S12680-S12715

Pending:

(1) Dole Modified Amendment No. 2280, of a perfecting nature.

Page S12680

(2) Daschle Modified Amendment No. 2282 (to Amendment No. 2280), in the nature of a substitute. **Page S12682**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill on Thursday, September 7, 1995, with a vote on the pending Daschle Amendment No. 2282 to occur at 4 p.m. **Page S12706**

Removal of Injunction of Secrecy: The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following treaties: Investment Treaty with Albania (Treaty Doc. No. 104-19).

Treaty with Hungary on Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters (Treaty Doc. No. 104-20); and

Treaty with Austria on Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters (Treaty Doc. No. 104-21).

The treaties were transmitted to the Senate today, considered as having been read for the first time, and referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed. **Page S12750**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting the report of the activities of the U.S. Government in the United Nations during calendar year 1994; referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (PM-77). **Page S12715**

Transmitting the report on Federal Advisory Committees for fiscal year 1994; referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs. (PM-78). **Page S12715**

Messages From the President: **Pages S12715-16**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S12716-36**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S12736-37**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S12737-45**

Authority for Committees: **Page S12745**

Additional Statements: **Pages S12745-50**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—399) **Pages S12668, S12675**

Recess: Senate convened at 9:15 a.m., and recessed at 7:43 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, September 7, 1995. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's RECORD on page S12750.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

RUBY RIDGE INCIDENT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee began hearings to examine certain Federal law enforcement actions with regard to the 1992 incident at Ruby Ridge, Idaho, receiving testimony from Randall and Sara Weaver, both of Grand Junction, Iowa.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 15 public bills, H.R. 2259-2273; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 99-100, and H. Res. 213-214 were introduced. **Pages H8596-97**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 1815, to authorize appropriations for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for fiscal year 1996, amended (H. Rept. 104-237, Part I, filed on August 4, 1995);

H.R. 1594, to place restrictions on the promotion by the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies and instrumentalities of economically targeted investments in connection with employee benefit plans, amended (H. Rept. 104-238, filed on September 1, 1995); and

H.R. 2150, to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to reduce the cost to the Federal Government of guaranteeing certain loans and debentures, amended (H. Report 104-239). **Page H8596**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designates Representative Everett to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H8539**

Recess: House recessed at 1:31 p.m. and reconvened at 4 p.m. **Page H8555**

Legislative Branch Appropriations: By a recorded vote of 305 ayes to 101 noes, Roll No. 638, the House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1854, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996. **Pages H8572-78**

bill in this Congress should the latest diplomatic efforts to resolve the case founder.

Much has been written about the Prinz case, but a superb column by Eric Beindel, editorial page editor of the New York Post, describes the Prinz story in especially eloquent and dramatic detail. Entitled "Germans stick to 'principle'—and the price is decency," it was published in the Post on January 19, 1995. Mr. Speaker, I ask its inclusion in the RECORD and urge my colleagues to read it.

I want to underscore one point made by Mr. Briendel. He rightly praises the key role in the Prinz matter played by William R. Marks, a D.C. attorney, and his firm, Atlanta-based Powell, Goldstein, Frazer & Murphy. Mr. Marks and Powell, Goldstein—led in this effort by partner Simon Lazarus—have been tireless champions of Mr. Prinz since they took the case on 20 months ago. They have so successfully raised its profile on the political, diplomatic and media fronts that a breakthrough may finally be possible. And that they accepted the case *pro bono* is a true testament to their commitment to resolving this unique humanitarian issue. I commend Mr. Marks, Mr. Lazarus, and Powell, Goldstein, and look forward to continued work with them and with Steven Perles, Mr. Prinz' top-notch litigation attorney, as we try and bring this case to a successful conclusion.

[From the New York Post, Jan. 19, 1995]
GERMANS STICK TO "PRINCIPLE"—AND THE
PRICE IS DECENCY
(By Eric Beindel)

Tuesday's refusal by the U.S. Supreme Court to hear the case of Hugo Prinz—a 72-year-old Holocaust survivor who wants to sue the German government in an American court—will be hailed by well-meaning lawyers as a victory for the ancient principle of "sovereign immunity."

In fact, Hugo Prinz's story represents a case study in the abandonment of ordinary decency for abstract principle.

The Prinz affair is almost a Manichean morality play. Prinz himself, who endured the ultimate in barbarism as a Jewish inmate at Maidanek, Auschwitz and Dachau, is driven by a quest to realize some semblance of justice—to make his tormentors pay, if only in a meager, monetary way, for abusing him and murdering his family.

The Germans are animated in part by parsimony and in great measure by a determination to close the book on a past they've never fully been willing to face. Meanwhile, handicapped by an addiction to absolute order and an aversion to creative problem-solving, Berlin refuses to recognize that dealing with Hugo Prinz as a special case would have spared Germany a good deal of unhappy publicity.

Notwithstanding the Supreme Court's ruling, the Prinz story isn't over—largely because the aging survivor has managed to find vocal champions. Two of them stand out Rep. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) and William R. Marks, a young, Washington-based lawyer who's taken on Prinz as a *pro bono* client.

Marks, a graduate of Harvard and Georgetown, persuaded his law firm colleagues that Prinz's struggle against the German government deserved attention for humanitarian reasons. Schumer, a powerful House Democrat and skillful parliamentarian, means to introduce legislation that would strip Germany of its sovereign immunity for "acts of genocide" committed against American citizens. The bill, in short, would apply only to Prinz. There is not other living American who survived the Nazi Holocaust as a U.S. citizen.

Prinz and his family were American nationals living in Slovakia in 1942 when the German SS—assisted by Slovak Collaborators—sent them to the Maidanek death camp in Poland because they were Jewish. Twenty years old at the time, Prinz had been born an American citizen. The Prinz family—blessed with valid U.S. citizenship papers—should have been able to join a Red Cross prisoner-exchange transport. But in the night and go of war, Prinz, his parents and five siblings were hustled onto Maidanek-bound cattle cars.

It's well to note that Prinz and his father tried many times to secure appropriate papers for passage to America during the course of 1938 and 1939; despite their desperate circumstances—as Jews under impending Nazi rule—they were rebuffed by the U.S. embassy in Prague.

Apart from the curious fact of their nationality, the Prinz family's fate was akin to that experienced by most East European Jews. Both his parents and his three sisters were shipped to Treblinka from Maidanek and gassed on arrival. Hugo and his brothers spent most of the war as slaves at Auschwitz. Both brothers perished. Prinz himself was tasked with stacking the bodies of his fellow Jews after they were murdered. Near the war's end, he was marched into the German interior and wound up as a slave laborer at Dachau—where he was liberated in 1945 by U.S. troops.

As an American, Prinz was spared internment in a Displaced Persons camp: After recuperating in a U.S. military hospital, he came to the U.S.—finally—in 1946.

This circumstance caused the German government to reject his original 1955 application for reparations: Insofar as he hadn't been either a German national or a DP, Prinz was declared ineligible, notwithstanding Germany's professed willingness to recognize its moral obligation to make restitution to Holocaust survivors.

After 37 years of humiliating application and reapplication, Prinz filed suit in federal court in 1992. The German government had broadened its eligibility criteria in 1965, but failed to notify Prinz. When he finally submitted new forms, the long-suffering survivor was told that the statute had lapsed. Prinz's lawsuit required him to advance a serious damages claim—thus, he's seeking \$17 million for "false imprisonment; assault and battery and infliction of emotional distress." (It's wrenching to see the Holocaust reduced to the language of tort law.) He also seeks payment from private German firms for the slave labor he performed.

The real debt may not be \$17 million, if it's calculated in accordance with what other survivors were awarded. (Prinz insists that his goal is retroactive parity.) Still, the debt is a good deal larger than the \$3,400 lump-sum payment, plus a \$340-per-month stipend, that Germany's lawyers offered Prinz Tuesday after the high court ruled against him.

The Germans claim they can't strike an entirely separate deal with Prinz, lest doing so invite additional litigation. ("The concern is groundless. Prinz's circumstances are entirely unique.") On a less than compelling note, the Germans contend that the settlement they're now offering is "all the German government can afford."

This sordid business has gone far enough. If Berlin can find funds to pay military pensions to ex-members of the murderous Latvian SS, it should be possible to locate money to "compensate" Hugo Prinz.

Schumer's bill—which has lots of cosponsors and supporters on both sides of the aisle and in both houses of Congress—may help concentrate Berlin's mind and promote a focus on settling the case. After all, it's hard to imagine that Germany wants to see a gen-

uine Holocaust trial take place in an American courtroom.

COMMENDING NATIONAL SERVICE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in light of the continuing debate about increasing Federal fiscal responsibility, it is extremely important that we recognize those programs that offer a substantial national return on the Federal investment. One such initiative, the National and Community Service Program, is a successful Federal program which provides volunteer placements for young people who choose to perform thousands of hours of work serving their country in return for educational assistance. Unfortunately, this program is also one of the many victims of misplaced Republican budgetary cuts.

As my colleagues are aware, the National and Community Service Program took a large hit in the recent House-passed rescissions bill. In response to this action, I would like to draw your attention to Mary McGrory's article in today's Washington Post which complements the program as a "model enterprise." The article describes "ramping Republicans" in the House who would like to eliminate National Service even though the program is overwhelmingly supported by both Democratic and Republican Governors across the Nation and by the communities that are recipients of the valuable work performed.

In 1994, approximately 20,000 AmeriCorps volunteers worked to confront unmet human, educational, environmental and public health needs. Roughly 350 of these volunteers worked in eight units of the National Forest System to combat the severe backlog of maintenance, improvement, and rehabilitation needs—work which is important but far from glamorous. The task undertaken on our public lands are those which are too undesirable or too costly for Forest Service personnel or contract employees to perform. Yet, this work directly benefits all Americans. Some of the AmeriCorps' accomplishments in the national forests include:

In San Bernardino National Forest, in California, AmeriCorps volunteers have taken important steps to prevent erosion by rehabilitating 12,000 acres of land burned by fires;

In Six Rivers National Forest, also in California, National Service volunteers have rehabilitated 3.5 miles of hiking and horse trails and reforested and restored wildlife habitat on 10 acres of land which was once a gold mine waste area;

Volunteers planted 2,390 trees in several campgrounds, enhanced fish habitat, built a nature trail, and improved timber stands in the Rouge River National Forest in Oregon. AmeriCorps volunteers have also improved overall forest health on 55 acres by pruning second growth trees;

In Washington's Olympic National Forest, AmeriCorps volunteers have maintained 4 miles of trails, rehabilitated campground sites, completed handicapped access in six recreation sites, completed restoration of two historic sites, surveyed species habitat, and pruned 120 acres of timber stands;

In the Arizona National Forests, volunteers maintained 15 miles of trails, rehabilitated 10 campground sites, improved wildlife habitat on 300 acres, and obliterated 2 miles of road, returning the land to its natural state; and

AmeriCorps volunteers improved paths and maintained roads in Bienville National Forest in Mississippi.

These accomplishments represent only some of the projects AmeriCorps participants have completed. Elsewhere across the Nation, AmeriCorps volunteers have performed emergency response work to mitigate the effects of floods, fires and earthquakes, cleaned up our urban areas, increased disaster prevention efforts and worked with citizens to improve their quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues remember that the entire Nation reaps the benefits of the National Service Program.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 23, 1995]

CRIB DEATH FOR NATIONAL SERVICE

(By Mary McGrory)

The House Republicans' strangling of national service in its crib has to be seen not as a criticism of the agency's performance but simply as another expression of the party leadership's notion that no government program is worth a damn.

If they were going by performance, the Republicans might have to applaud AmeriCorps as a model enterprise. It is modestly funded, locally directed and dramatic evidence that American youth is not cynical or self-serving. AmeriCorps has had rave reviews from coast to coast for its 20,000 volunteers, who are doing things nobody else tackles, everything from helping to build housing for the poor and tutoring inner-city school pupils to cleaning polluted streams in Baltimore's watershed.

A case in point is Howard Hogin, a 1994 graduate of Georgetown University. He is living in a cramped barracks at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds. He spent September fighting forest fires in Idaho and much of the fall in helping build a riding ring for disabled children. Now he's trying to clean up Maryland's polluted streams. He hopes to pay off his college loans, AmeriCorps pays its workers a minimum wage and an annual \$4,725 toward college expenses.

Service is in Hogin's genes, and by his family's standards, he is a big success. His parents are both social workers and his ancestors experienced big trouble, like the Irish famine and the Holocaust. He says lots of his Georgetown classmates have the same impulse to leave the country a better place but "just can't afford to do it."

Hogin is tactful about the mugging AmeriCorps suffered when the House cut \$416 million, or 72 percent, from its \$575 million budget. He was voted outstanding teenage Republican in his high school class. "I understand that we have tremendous deficits and the taxpayers are heavily burdened, but if we give up what is best about America, what kind of a legacy do we leave?"

No such considerations figured in the thinking of House Republicans. The rap on AmeriCorps was not just that it was a government program, it is Bill Clinton's favorite program. Said Rules Committee Chairman Gerald B.H. Solomon, "It's get-even time."

It is also get-nervous time for the rampaging Republicans. They are winning victory after victory on the floor, but they are losing in public opinion. They have long since maintained that they know exactly what Nov. 8 was about, that the country wanted government to be shrunk and ordinary people, especially the poor, to pull up their

socks. But a recent Washington Post-ABC poll shows that the public thinks Republicans have gone too far. And in his effort to save programs for the poor, Clinton has picked up some unexpected allies; the Roman Catholic bishops. They were reserved about him during the campaign because of his abortion rights stand. But they think now that pitiless Republicans pose a worse threat of increased abortions.

The Republicans' greatest tactical mistake was to meddle with the school lunch program, a popular and scandal-free operation that has helped many a hungry child get through the school day. In vain, the Republicans protested that they had not cut the funds but merely slowed the increase in the growth rate. Nonetheless, the ranks have begun to wince in the iron corset of the contract, and this week, 102 members rebelled against tax breaks for the rich.

The Democrats, who have been having their best week since the calamity of Nov. 8, were sporting "Save the Children" neckties on the House floor.

Eli Segal, the chief executive officer of the National Service Corps, has been summoned before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development and Veterans Affairs for a discussion of the 1996 budget, which since the House action stands at \$159 million, a sum that prohibits serious action.

He has been traveling the country inspecting the workers, deriving solace from moderate Republican governors who are keen about the corps' activities in conflict resolution, environmental cleanup, tutoring and other contributions to urban peace. They agree with him that pulling the plug after less than a year is bad practice. Segal's hope is that they will transmit their enthusiasm to their brother moderates in the Senate, which has become the haven for storm-tossed programs.

Republican Christopher Shays of Connecticut was the only member of his party to vote against the amendment that mortally wounded national service. He is a Peace Corps alumnus and believes passionately in the importance of youthful involvement.

"A colossal mistake," he calls his party's action. "I hope the president has the fortitude to veto the bill. I would support his veto."

REAL FOUNDER OF SPECIAL OLYMPICS HAPPY WITH SELECTION OF SHRIVER

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, if one were to say that President John F. Kennedy launched the Peace Corps, one would be right. But if one were to say that President John F. Kennedy thought up the Peace Corps, one would be mistaken. The author was Hubert Humphrey.

If one were to say that the nobly civil minded Eunice Kennedy Shriver brought her considerable talents to bear in order to launch the Special Olympics nationally, one would be right. But if one were to say that Ms. Shriver thought up the idea of a Special Olympics, one would be mistaken. Judge Ann McGlone Burke is the author of the idea.

As Judge Burke has generously said, she is happy that Ms. Shriver is being honored by the 1995 Special Olympics Silver Dollar Com-

memorative. But it is worthwhile too for all Americans to know that Judge Burke should also be honored as the author.

REAL FOUNDER OF SPECIAL OLYMPICS HAPPY WITH SELECTION OF SHRIVER
(By Michel E. Orzano)

The woman who founded the Special Olympics in 1968 is pleased that the games for mentally and physically handicapped children and adults will be recognized with a commemorative coin.

But her portrait won't be the one on the 1995 Special Olympics silver dollar commemorative. That's because Anne Burke of Chicago—former Chicago physical education teacher, retired lawyer and judge—not Eunice Shriver Kennedy, is the real founder of the games.

The law authorizing the coin permits the striking of 800,000 silver dollars and each will bear a \$10 per coin surcharge going to the Special Olympics. The Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee rejected the idea of a portrait of a living American but Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin approved the design choice. Shriver will become the first living American woman to have her portrait on a coin and only the fifth living American to bear that distinction.

Chicagoan Burke, who now serves as special counsel on child welfare to Illinois Gov. Jim Edgar, told *Coin World* that she's pleased the program she started will benefit from the coin. But as far as the claim of founder goes, that resides with Burke.

In 1965, Burke, then Anne McGlone, was a young physical education teacher who taught mentally retarded youngsters in a special summer program sponsored by the Chicago Park District. By 1967, she said, there were 10 locations throughout the Chicagoland area with 150 children participating in the free program.

Burke said she knew at the time there were probably more people out there who could benefit from involvement in sports and other activities because there wasn't mandatory education for mentally retarded people. But, she said, she also knew families of mentally retarded children and adults were often very protective of them and shunned involvement in public programs.

But by the end of the summer of 1967, after Burke and participants put on the play "The Sound of Music," Chicago Park officials were so pleased with the response they sanctioned her idea of a sponsoring a citywide track meet for mentally retarded youngsters the following summer.

Once she was given the official green light, Burke turned her attention to planning the event that fall and winter. Burke said while refining the idea, a professor she was working with at Southern Illinois University suggested she contact the Joseph P. Kennedy Jr. Foundation to request funding for the proposed program.

Shortly thereafter, Burke wrote to Shriver, she said, who was living in Paris with her husband, Sargent Shriver, then ambassador to France. Burke said Shriver was intrigued with the idea and suggested a meeting in Washington, D.C.

After meeting with Shriver, Burke said she re-wrote the proposal including Shriver's suggestion to involve children from other states and re-submitted her funding request. The foundation responded with \$25,000 for the program. Burke invited Shriver to attend the 1st National Chicago Special Olympics, which were held July 20, 1968. Children from 23 different states participated that year and, as Burke notes, "The rest is history."

She said she is still actively involved with the Special Olympics program in the Chicago area. Her concern for children has always seemed to touch her professional life as a

As of the close of business yesterday, Monday, April 24, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly \$4,839,548,467,525.15 or \$18,371.01 for every man, woman, and child on a per capita basis.

A NATIONAL DAY OF SERVICE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I commend Americans who are participating in the National Day of Service. Today, people all across this Nation are working together in community service. As we speak, people of all ages and backgrounds are using their hands and hearts to show their American spirit.

This day should remind us all of what it means to be an American, for today, our people are standing side by side. They are gathering, not to discuss their differences, but to pursue common goals.

Today, Americans are standing side by side immunizing infants. They are standing side by side tutoring school-age children. They are standing side by side restoring urban parks, feeding and sheltering the homeless, and rehabilitating housing and community centers. Today, we stand united as Americans.

In West Virginia, people in Braxton County will work together to create a nature trail near the Braxton County Middle School so students can learn more about their environment. In Welch, people are working to clean a vacant school so it can be converted in a facility to offer a safe shelter for victims of domestic violence by the local agency known as SAFE, Stop Abusive Family Environments. These activities for National Youth Service Day are just a few examples of important community work sponsored by the West Virginia Commission National and Community Service.

This day strikes a warm, familiar chord for me personally. From personal experience, I know the benefit of working with others to build better communities.

In 1964, the VISTA program brought me to a coal camp community in Emmons, WV. There, I followed Kennedy's call to service and worked with the people of Emmons, trying to do my small part in building a stronger community.

Together, we built a baseball field and a community center. We brought the people much needed preventative health care. We rallied to bring a schoolbus to Emmons and helped to keep Emmons' kids in school.

From personal experience, I know that community service benefits participants as much as it benefits communities. My work with VISTA taught me a very important lesson: That I can make a difference.

Today, the people of America celebrate that same lesson: Each and every American can make a difference.

Let us all be careful not to forget that important lesson at the end of the National Day of Service. Let us re-

member and reaffirm that lesson every day of the year.

Why must we remember the lesson every day of the year? The reason is simple: Community service programs work.

Just look at the resounding success of AmeriCorps. AmeriCorps gives thousands of young Americans the tools to make a difference in their own lives and in the lives of others.

AmeriCorps participants perform vital services in America. Just over 6 months ago, 85 West Virginians were sworn into AmeriCorps. Today they are working with 20,000 people nationwide to keep schools safe, restore natural resources, tutor teenagers, and more—all in exchange for education.

Programs like AmeriCorps simultaneously open doors to higher education and help build stronger communities. They allow Americans to help each other, and build trust, understanding, and hope.

Mr. President, I am proud to stand in support of the National Day of Service. I salute everyone working in community service. I congratulate each of them for making a difference.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID MARTIN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to David Martin, a distinguished public servant, an inquisitive adventurer, and a uniquely warm individual.

I came to know David when he served on the staff of my father, the late Senator Thomas J. Dodd. To my siblings and me, however, David Martin was much more than an employee of one of our parents. He was more like a beloved uncle and insightful teacher wrapped into one.

I recall spending a number of delightful evenings at David's home with my family engaged in stimulating conversation. One could not come away from talking with David Martin without learning something new. He was a gripping conversationalist.

He was very unassuming and did not aggressively advertise his superior knowledge. You had to probe to find that rich vein, but once you succeeded, your reward was real and immediate.

David had such a dynamic and engaging intellect that he was a magnet for some of the 20th century's foremost authors and thinkers. He counted Ralph Ellison, George Orwell, Norman Mailer, William F. Buckley, Jr., and Edward Teller among his friends.

David's biography is so varied and fascinating that it reads more like that of a protagonist in a novel than a real-life individual. He was a veteran, a war correspondent, a noted author of political science, a human rights advocate and a legislative expert. He even coordinated Richard Byrd's last expedition to the South pole. David Martin was a true renaissance man.

His three books on Yugoslavia are still required reading for anyone who wants to understand that troubled part

of the world. He was a passionate advocate for refugees, and as executive director of the Refugee Defense Committee from 1946 to 1947, he was instrumental in ending the inhumane practice of forcible repatriation of war time refugees to the Communist eastern bloc.

David was legendary in the Senate for the breadth and depth of his expertise. During the 11 years he served on my father's staff, David was a key mover behind the eventual adoption of the limited test ban treaty. He also advised my father on a range of foreign policy hot spots, from Germany to Africa, from the Dominican Republic to Southeast Asia.

After working for my father, David went on to the Senate Judiciary Committee, where he organized hearings on marijuana that are generally credited with alerting the public to the true danger of the drug.

David's first wife, Judy Asti, whom he married in 1947, died in 1971. He remarried in 1974 to Virginia Worek Levy. He is survived by Virginia, as well as his two children, Joe and Rebecca; his brother, Maurice Manson; and two stepsons, Ian and Raoul Levy.

Today we live in a better country and a better world thanks to David Martin. I think that is among the highest praise that can be given to an individual who has passed away, and in David Martin's case it is richly deserved.

ANNIVERSARY OF COL. CHARLES SHELTON CAPTURE IN LAOS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, Saturday, April 29 marks the 30th anniversary of Col. Charles Shelton's capture in Southeast Asia.

Colonel Shelton grew up in my hometown, Owensboro, KY, where you could find him playing football for the high school team, courting his wife, and developing the values that would later serve him so well as he served his country.

Like so many other dedicated American soldiers, the day he left the United States to fly secret reconnaissance missions over Laos, he put his life on hold, whether that meant the dreams and ambitions of an individual life, or the simple pleasure of watching his five children grow into adults.

But, when he was shot down on April 29 and captured, the notion of putting a life on hold took on a new and horrible dimension for Colonel Shelton and his family. That's because for the next 29 years, Colonel Shelton remained an official prisoner of war—the final U.S. military personnel to be so listed by the American Government.

Because of numerous reports of sightings and escape attempts well into the 1980's, it wasn't until 1994 that his children requested the Pentagon to change his status to presumed killed in action.

While we can't begin to imagine what this wait was like for Colonel Shelton or his family, we can pay tribute to his service and to the ordeal he and his

Even if the employer makes a good-faith effort to provide rescue services, he or she could still be hit with a prohibitive fine if it does not meet with OSHA's ambitious standard.

Mr. Speaker, now OSHA claims that the employers' compliance with this proposed revision will not be based solely upon a rescue service's actual performance during any single incidence, but rather upon the employer's total effort to ensure that the prospective rescue service is indeed capable in terms of timeliness and training and equipment of performing an effective rescue, but what we have seen in the past is that OSHA implements a rule or a standard that sounds very reasonable in the Federal Register or before a congressional hearing; however, when a rule is enforced out in the field, it is used as a big stick to harass hard-working Americans.

Is this just another way for OSHA to fine hard-working Americans and collect more money for the Federal Treasury? Not until a great outcry is heard does OSHA consider providing a clarification of its standards or rules in order to ensure that it is not used to harass hard-working Americans. OSHA has shown again and again that regulatory excess is an addiction and they just cannot seem to kick the habit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in this case, OSHA's enforcement of its rules does not cause more problems than it is intended to prevent. You can be sure that I will be watching and listening just in case this is not true.

OSHA is one agency that has turned a reasonable and an important mission into a bureaucratic nightmare for the American economy. Common sense was long ago shown the door over at OSHA. OSHA is one agency that needs to be restructured, reinvented, or just plain removed.

BE ALL YOU CAN BE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to take the well today wearing this ribbon which was given to me by the Girl Scouts, because the Girl Scouts today are asking adults to wear this ribbon and be the best that they can be. I think that that is a good motto for all of us as Americans. We probably ought to do it everyday, but this is a special day and I, as an ex-Girl Scout and a mother of a Girl Scout, am very, very proud to be here and be talking about that.

So I got to thinking, well, now, if you took this and applied it to the Federal Government in Washington, why do people get so frustrated with this and what would "be the best we could be" mean at the Federal level?

Well, it seems to me that one of the things that we don't do at the Federal

level is model what the average family does at their kitchen table. At the average family kitchen table when times get tough, the last thing they do to make budget ends meet is cut the children. They will try to hold the children harmless from budget cuts absolutely as long as possible, and yet this week, the first thing we are going to do as we try to find the first round of budget cuts, and these are just for big tax cuts and they are for disaster relief in California, we are going to cut children. That is going to be our very first thing, our very first budget cut act. Heaven only knows what we will do to them when we get to the next round where we are dealing with the deficit.

Now I remind you that children did not cause this deficit, nor are they asking for big tax cuts. They would just like a school lunch, thank you, and they did not cause the disaster in California or other places. But I think the thing that is really harming and the reason I think our priorities are so wrong right now is that while this body has been discussing risk assessment, risk assessment, risk assessment, and we were doing this all across the board when it came to regulations, and many people agree, yes, we should look at that, but why are we not looking at the risk assessment on the next generation of children which will people America's 21st century if we continue on with these budget cuts?

Now, what are some of the things that we know? When I chaired the Committee on Children, Youth and Families, we had all sorts of CEOs from corporate America join us looking at the cost-effectiveness of Federal dollars spent for children, and the best money you can save is investing in a young child, because you are saving it later on, saving it later on.

We got all sorts of incredible numbers that are a big surprise. If you vaccinate every child—and as you well know, America is way behind in vaccinating children, many Third World countries do a much better job—the studies we have been showed is that it is \$14 to the taxpayer later on. So one dollar for a vaccination, every one dollar spent on that saved \$14 later on. That is not a bad deal. I have never been able to invest my money like that in any other area.

When you put children into Head Start, for every dollar we spent on Head Start, you could show a \$6 saving in special education that the taxpayer would pick up. For feeding children, for every dollar you spent in WIC and for every dollar you were spending in child nutrition programs, you way more than made the money back in not having to spend it in Medicaid.

You know, we go around all the time, too, saying children must say no to this, children must say no to this, we must give them things to say yes to, and that is what we are doing. We are taking a lot of the same "yes to's" away.

We are totally taking away summer jobs. We are taking away many of the youth programs. We are cutting back many of the others so that localities are going to be really strapped, and I must say, as the prior gentlewoman from Oregon said, when you are taking 63 percent of these cuts out of a group of programs that only make up 12 percent of the discretionary budget. I think we are going down real heavy on the kids.

This is not across the board. We are not going after \$600 toilet seats. Oh, no, those are sacred cows. We are not going after other things. No no, those are sacred cows. Why? Because they have political action committees that can come protect them with all sorts of money for campaigns. They can organize and they can vote.

Children don't vote. They don't have political action committees, and I think if we are going to be the best that we can be, we have got to reconsider these cuts this week because I think it is really—maybe you think it is penny wise, but it is long term and pound foolish.

RESCISSION CUTS ON JOBS PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about two programs. First this week we will be considering a rescission bill and the activities that I was involved in over the weekend, but also talk a little bit about the School Lunch Program. But first let me talk about the rescission bill that Congress will be voting on this week.

This last Saturday in Houston, I had the opportunity to, at 8 o'clock in the morning, to go to our city hall in the city of Houston and see hundreds of young people and not so young people who were there at 8 o'clock on a Saturday morning getting prepared to go out and work in the community.

The rescission bill we are going to vote on this week will definitely cut part of the national service, the Americorps Program that serves Houston, and I have served Houston Program in Texas. We started with really no program last year and we have become such a great serving institution for the community.

Let me talk about the Corporation for National Service on a nationwide basis and then bring it down to how it affects Houston: AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve, and the Senior Corps. They work full or part-time in local organizations addressing community needs. We have 60 of them in Houston that serve Houston, 60 positions. I wanted more but we couldn't do it as a startup, 33,000 more with 1995 moneys and 47,000 more with 1996 moneys, but again, the rescission bill will cut us back.

This would complete the contract that a bipartisan Congress made with our young people with the National and Community Service Fund Act of 1993, but we cannot do it if we pass the rescission bill this week with those cuts.

Learn and Serve America, elementary and high school and college students participate in activities that address community needs and they enhance their own academic skills. Approximately 375,000 elementary and secondary school and college students participate, growing to over \$588,000 if we had the 1996 funds.

The Senior Corps, Americans 55 or older serve in local communities on a part-time basis and they provide, for example, modest stipends for foster grandparents, and I have received a lot of mail and phone calls this week from senior companions, 480,000 seniors participate today, and if we could take it out of the rescission bill, we would be able to increase that just a small amount to 510,000.

The cuts in the Americorps is wrong and should not be because it is one of the best programs we have. If we are really going to reform welfare, we need to make sure we reform it by giving people that job experience and those jobs.

Let me talk about another example of the Saturday I was with the Summer Jobs Program that is sponsored by Houston, works at the cooperative effort in a number of our local governments. We have 2,000 jobs in my district that are summer jobs that are part of that program, 6,000 in Harris County alone. And my concern, by the rescission bill that cuts those 6,000 jobs, we are going to lose out and three or four individuals who were there Saturday who were graduates of the Summer Jobs Program.

We have a young lady, Marilena, who now works at a radio station in Houston who got her start in the Summer Jobs Program. Wilbert, who now is a supervisor for the city of Houston in waste water, got his start in a summer jobs program. Laquista is a young lady who made the news in Houston who got her start working at a summer jobs program and now is supervising clean-up in our community for the city of Houston. Arti, who not only works in my office, but is also a student who got her start in the Summer Jobs Program.

Too often we hear that the majority party now says that there is no benefit to these summer jobs program, but there is a benefit, and Saturday morning I had four people who were graduates who are now productive citizens today because of the Summer Jobs Program. And to cut out 2,000 young people in my own district or 6,000 in the county or thousands all over the United States for a 6-week Summer Jobs Program is wrong because what we are doing is we are having some short-term savings that provides for some short-term tax relief; but in the long term, the American people in our country

will lose the values of those talents of those young people whether it be in the Summer Jobs Program and productive citizens or whether it be in the Americorps and Serve Houston where we are losing not only their talents now in helping our community, but we are going to lose the experience they are getting now through Serve Houston and through Americorps for the future of our country.

We cannot be penny wise and pound foolish and lose that effort right now. And that is my concern, that the Congress this week needs to make sure that we do not cut these programs out of the rescission package. We do not need to cut those programs now and say we are going to provide for additional tax cuts now and cut out those 2,000 young people in my own district who have a summer job for 6 weeks.

□ 1300

THE RESCISSION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was in Twinsburg, OH, in my district, Ohio's 13th District in northeast Ohio, visiting the community center and meeting with parents, children, teachers, and nurses and talking about the Women, Infants and Children's Program and the School Lunch Program.

Some of the people I met with, some of the parents, were unemployed. Most of them were working part-time or full-time, generally for minimum wage. Often many of these parents, basically all of those parents' children were getting school lunches, because their income was not high enough that they paid full price for these lunches.

Those parents, those teachers, those children, especially those nurses, could simply not understand why extremists in this body, in Congress, want to cut school lunches, want to cut senior nutrition, want to cut programs like Women, Infants and Children; Programs that have been in effect, in terms of the School Lunch Program, for literally five decades, started by Harry Truman in 1946.

Other programs, like WIC, that have been in effect and working for a couple of decades. Programs that help young people grow, help pregnant women, help those children with nutrition and counseling. The WIC program, especially. And this was what was called a WIC center in Twinsburg.

The WIC Program is not just a giveaway program. It is a program where working class mothers come in with their children, come in while they are pregnant and get some nutritional supplements and are counseled, generally less educated women are counseled about nutrition while they are pregnant to make sure they have a healthy

baby. The, after the baby is born, for the next 5 years they come into WIC regularly and are counseled about nutrition and can get immunized, either there or are directed where they can get immunized in the first 2 years of the baby's life; all the things that we need for the future of this country.

These people did not understand why the extremists in Congress want to make these cuts. What they did understand is that School lunches, Children's nutrition Programs, programs like counseling for WIC, immunizations, all these things are the investment for the future and they make sense for this country.

They do understand that, OK, we might save a few dollars making cuts now, but in the end, long term, we will pay more money for welfare for children as they get older and have bad nutrition and did not have the advantages when they were younger. They are more likely to be on welfare and more likely to be in prison. And these young families did understand that. That that simply is bad public policy long term.

I am a deficit hog. I voted for budget cut after budget cut after budget cut in this body. But we should not be stupid about it. There is no reason to make cuts that affect our children and affect our future the way that cutting school lunches and cutting programs like WIC and nutrition programs like that would mean.

Three weeks ago this body passed an increase in military spending of \$3.2 billion. The extremists here are cutting nutrition, children's long-term-for-the-future programs on the one hand and increasing military spending \$3 billion on the other hand, for a military in a country where our military budget is larger than the next nine countries in the world. Yet we are increasing military spending, cutting school lunches and WIC Programs, and at the same time the extremists in this body want to see major tax cuts for the wealthiest taxpayers.

Just recently the Republican leaders in the Committee on Ways and Means have called for an end to the alternative minimum tax. You may remember about 10 years ago President Reagan and most of the country were outraged that many large corporations in this country were able, through all kinds of use of accountants and lawyers and all their tax breaks and loopholes, literally to avoid paying any Federal tax and sometimes actually getting the government to pay them money through some rebate programs.

Many large corporations fell into the category. So Congress and President Reagan enacted something called the alternative minimum tax to make sure that every large corporation in this country did, in fact, pay some corporate income tax to the Government. They want to eliminate that alternative minimum tax. On the one hand we are increasing military spending, we are eliminating a tax on major corporations—these are corporations that

Mr. OWENS. If the gentlewoman would yield for a moment, I want to inquire of the Chair how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. OWENS. I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas and I will take the last 4 minutes. I just wanted to close out with a note and I neglected to put in before.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. See how good it is to be able to have time and it is also good to be able to share with those who are in need, and that is the problem we have here in the State of Texas.

This is a gentleman who has no ax to grind. He is our State comptroller, and he has already assessed that we lose about a billion dollars in this rescission package for the State of Texas. We lose some \$763.7 million in Medicaid. Therefore, those who are trying to get off welfare would not have health care, the elderly, the severely handicapped, 69 percent. Family nutrition programs, we are losing \$170.6 million, 15.5 percent, for our State.

Then there is AFDC, there is training, emergency assistance, 10 percent, we are losing \$118.6 million. Then school nutrition in particular, dealing with our school lunches and school breakfasts. By the way, I met with leaders of the local school community and they are just up in arms about the children who will come to their doors who are hungry, particularly the districts that serve at-risk children. We are talking about the national impact, but I know what it means. It is going to hurt the people in the State of Texas, people in the State of New York, people all over this country. The American people understand this. This rescissions package should go nowhere.

As I conclude, let me talk about, and you have worked so hard on the summer programs, summer job perhaps that I have been actively involved in in my community. We are getting ready to lose in FY 1995 and 1996, \$66.6 million in 1995 and \$66.9 million, 43,000 jobs each year, and in Houston, each year, 1995 and 1996, 6,000 jobs. It was already not enough just last summer, 8,000 youngsters showed up on the first day to sign up, with stories of pain and excitement at the same time, excitement of trying to get a job, and pain for the need of the money during the summer months, for rent for their families, for clothing for their families, to take care of younger brothers and sisters.

This is serious. I worked extensively with anti-gang measures in Houston, where there are some 3,000 gang members, drive-by shootings. This is what gets our children off the street. This is what prepares young adults for the 21st century, the opportunity to work. This changes their mind set.

So when we begin to talk about where we are today and your detailing of what we should be looking at with an alternative budget and fairly we can look at possibly tax cuts, possibly

downsizing different agencies, we do not reject that, I do not reject it. But I do reject taking from the most vulnerable and undermining a State that is trying so very hard to improve itself and to serve the people in that community. We must be the better one, the Federal Government, to be able to stand up with the moral fiber and fight for those who are in need.

I thank the gentleman from New York but I think that we must cancel out this rescissions package and ensure that we stand up against this kind of intrusion into the lives of American citizens.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas. I would like to underscore your last point. The defunding, the placing of zero in the budget for the summer youth employment project is probably one of the most cruel and dangerous and deadliest acts of this oppressive elite minority in control of the Congress now. It shows no vision. It betrays the very vital segment of our population that needs help the most.

They follow through on that, that zeroing the budget for the summer youth employment program with a \$210 million rescission of the National Service Program. The National Service Program is for a different set of youth but it is basically program-oriented toward young people.

The National Service Program is not a program of Bill Clinton, it is not a program that the Democrats fabricated 2 years ago and the Republicans stood on the sideline. I have been in Congress for almost 13 years and we have discussed a National Service Program for 10 of those 13 years. Both parties have come forward with proposals, both parties have worked together. Why do we all of a sudden have to throw overboard and destroy a program which it took 10 years of deliberation and planning to develop?

The National Service Program would receive rescissions of \$210 million out of the \$571 million that they have available for this fiscal year. That is taking \$210 million and leaving only \$365 million, crippling the program to such an extent that it would hardly be able to operate because it is just getting off the ground now.

And then there are bigger cuts coming in the budget that begins October 1 because the oppressive minority has made it quite clear that they want to destroy the National Service Program.

The American people have a right to know why. Why? We should challenge the high-technology barbarians and say, You cannot do reckless things like this, you cannot make reckless decisions, you cannot just disregard all reason without explaining to the American people why.

A rescission of this magnitude for the National Service Program would renege on the bipartisan congressional commitment of Americans who have already committed to serving their communities. Middle-class families

who work hard and play by the rules would be especially hard hit because many of the members of the AmeriCorps are middle class. We designed it so it would not just be a program where young people who are poor were involved. It cuts across all classes.

A year and a half ago, Congress mandated a 3-year phase-in for funding 100,000 AmeriCorps members. It called for 20,000 members to begin a year of service in 1994 and 33,000 in fiscal year 1995.

This rescission, this heartless rescission, would require the corporation to scale back existing programs already in place, cutting approximately 2,000 AmeriCorps members from the current level of 20,000 and 15,000 from the phase-in level which has already been authorized by Congress. The majority of those reductions would occur in those States with the most AmeriCorps members: New York, California, Texas, Pennsylvania, and Michigan.

Middle-class families with college-age members willing to serve their communities full-time for a full year who are counting on AmeriCorps to help them afford college educations would be especially hard hit if the congressional commitment is not kept.

We close with National Service, as just one more example. School lunch programs, summer youth employment programs, National Service programs, programs that would benefit all of America a great deal are being very hard hit by these heartless cuts.

On the other hand, the F-22 fighter plane is not touched, and neither is the Seawolf submarine and a huge number of other programs in the military budget.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for joining me, and I hope that Americans are listening. There is a vision offered by the oppressive elite minority and there is a vision offered by the caring majority. We will talk more about those visions in the future.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak unequivocally against the misguided, shortsighted, and unconscionable spending cuts proposed in H.R. 1158—the Republican rescissions bill—to be considered on the House floor on Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

This rescissions bill, as it is politely known, will cut to the bone many programs that manage to maintain a minimal standard of living and health care for America's most vulnerable citizens.

Across the country, throughout my home State of Texas, and right in my hometown of Houston, millions of children, elderly, and poor citizens will be devastated and forced to endure Government-sanctioned hardships in order to provide extensive tax cuts.

That's what it boils down to, Mr. Speaker.

As though the unsettling dynamics and displacement of our rapidly changing, highly competitive global economy were not already bad enough when it comes to driving the widening wedge between America's economic haves and have-nots.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMANDA SAPIR'S VISION FOR AMERICA

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1995

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding young woman from my congressional district, Amanda Sapir of Kingston, MA. This week she won the national Voice of Democracy Award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars for an essay she wrote and recorded on her vision for America.

Amanda, an 18-year-old senior at Silver Lake Regional High School, is the first Massachusetts student to win the award in the 48-year history of the Voice of Democracy Program. She prevailed over 125,000 other students from across the country to win the \$20,000 T.C. Selman Memorial Scholarship Award, sponsored by the VFW and its ladies auxiliary. I was informed of the award by proud local veterans who visited with me this week.

But more important than Amanda's winning a contest, or even the scholarship, is the vision she conveyed: that diversity is America's greatest strength and that our Nation's long journey toward justice and equality for all citizens is not complete.

Amanda's words are so eloquent, her message so timely, that I wanted to include them in the RECORD as a reminder of how far we've come and how far we have to go.

MY VISION FOR AMERICA

(By Amanda Sapir)

The air was thick and sweet smelling. Traffic was bumper-to-bumper as usual. It seemed like there were people everywhere; people walking up and down the sidewalks, shoppers peering hopefully into store windows, tourists searching aimlessly for the nearest landmark, and the homeless sitting in the warmth of a typical hustle and bustle summer in Washington, D.C. It was just another day when I was among the eternally lost sightseers and Helen among the homeless.

"Where's Wisconsin Ave.?" I asked a gentleman who responded, "Isn't that near O street?" "Hmm, where's O Street?" "Beats me. Do you know where Pennsylvania Ave. is?" By the end of the conversation we were both, if you can believe it, even more confused than when we started. This is when I spotted another homeless looking woman sitting on the sidewalk clasping her most precious belongings. On one of her bags was a sticker that read, "Helen." I figured she would know her way around this maze they call Washington.

"Excuse me, ma'am, do you know where Wisconsin Avenue is?" She was looking straight ahead with an empty gaze, not acknowledging me for quite a few seconds. After waiting patiently, I was startled when she jerked her head towards me and staring with intensely fierce brown eyes asked, "What do you see?" as she pointed to a perfectly maintained photograph. Surprised, yet curious by her question, I answered, "Well, there's an average looking older Asian

woman, a middle-aged rather dirty looking white man, and a young well-dressed black woman all standing side by side." Apparently displeased by my answer, she yelled, "No, no, no!" Wondering where I went wrong, I asked, "Why what do you see?" She looked at me with those eyes and without hesitation said, "Three people. Keep walking up this street and you'll find Wisconsin Avenue."

I was stunned by her response, but learned that in Helen's answer was a transcendently clear message that now typifies my vision for America, a nation where its citizens continue to make great strides toward demolishing discrimination by understanding that it is our differences which makes us similar. Although we may wear different clothes, earn different amounts of money, walk or talk differently, we are all just people with fears and hopes, struggles and joys. I feel that with this ideal in mind we as a nation can knock on the door to the next century with confidence, knowing that we will handle all changes and all challenges that will arise. However, this confidence is only achievable if all Americans feel included and worthy, without fearing discrimination.

As I continued on my walk, I learned how this could actually happen. Looking at museums, the White House, the Supreme Court and the Mall, I saw why the United States is the only global Superpower remaining. We rely on creative solutions, which are the result of educating and acting. My vision for a unified America necessitates effort. In order for compassion to prevail over discrimination, the nation must first call on our educators to teach about different places and different cultures. We need our nation's youth to further understand that we are all different, but that diversity is our greatest strength not only in problem solving but in fighting ignorance. Knowledge has a funny way of operating minds, and in the future, bright open minds will be quintessential in fighting prejudice. This knowledge is only useful if put into practice. My vision relies on Americans to act with the same moral impetus it took for civil rights to speak up and for American soldiers to leave their families to fight for our nation, we must also speak up and fight for equal treatment for everyone. As a country, we have already made leaping bounds in the name of equality, but there is more struggling to do, whether we are employees helping a co-worker cope with discrimination or an employer concentrating on having qualified diverse employees. We must act until minorities, disabled and abled are all viewed as people.

America is only as strong as its weakest link, and those links are tested by the way in which we treat people, be they friends or strangers. As this country enters a new millennium, progress will present many opportunities as well as obstacles. My vision is that on December 31, when the clock ticks the past century away, Americans, no matter what ethnicity or sociopolitical or economic status, together will unlock this potential of the 21st century with optimism and a renewed sincere commitment to educating and acting against discrimination and for open-mindedness and unity, so that when any American is asked, "What do you see?" the answer will be without hesitation, "People."

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1995

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, a controversy has arisen recently over a protest staged by ACORN, a membership and advocacy group for low- and moderate-income families. The Washington Times, in a March 7 editorial, asserted that AmeriCorps members—whose stipends are subsidized by the Federal Government—may have worked for ACORN and therefore participated in the protest. Unfortunately, the newspaper got its facts wrong.

No AmeriCorps members work for ACORN, and none took part in the protest. Rather, 42 AmeriCorps members are serving with ACORN Housing Corporation, an entirely different organization that helps working families find homes.

Eli Segal, the CEO of the National Service Corporation, clarified the facts in his March 7 letter to the Washington Times. I have submitted his letter to set the record straight. I would like to express my disappointment that members of the press and of this body would spread misinformation to discredit a program as innovative, productive, and important as AmeriCorps.

AMERICORPS NATIONAL SERVICE,

Washington, DC, March 7, 1995.

TOD LINDBERG,

Editor of the Editorial Page,
Washington Times.

DEAR MR. LINDBERG: In your editorial today (Federally funded Newt-bashing), you asked whether AmeriCorps Members participated in the disruption of Monday's NACO luncheon, which prevented Speaker Gingrich from addressing the gathering. There is a simple answer: Absolutely not.

AmeriCorps doesn't support advocacy. Our statute and Regulations clearly prohibit it. Advocacy aims to make change through politics, and is therefore inherently a process of winners and losers. National service brings about positive change by helping local communities solve common problems through collective effort—where everyone ends up benefiting.

This is much more than rhetoric. Advocacy organizations were furious when our Regulations came out, but we didn't budge. We have also made it clear to all of our grantees that this is a matter of principle, not technicality. We will cut off funding to programs that do not comply. I have reminded all of our programs of these matters, today, in writing.

AmeriCorps aims to re-kick community. That can't happen when basic freedoms of speech are trampled. In the wake of yesterday's disruption, we immediately investigated. Here's what we learned: No AmeriCorps Members participated in the incident (written conformation attached). In fact, the protesting organization is an entirely separate organization from our grantee—legally, and in Board, budget, staff and mission.

* This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

AmeriCorps Members serve not with ACORN, but with ACORN Housing Corporation. The latter is not an advocacy organization, but an entirely separate non-profit helping working families find housing—especially buying their own homes. In the three months our AmeriCorps program has been operating, AmeriCorps Members have already assisted hundreds of families interested in home ownership—and 84 families now have secured mortgages for their first homes.

This is the AmeriCorps mission: getting things done. And this is the American Dream: helping working families afford a home.

We agree with the Washington Times that federal funds must not be abused, and that service must be distinct from advocacy. AmeriCorps is proud of its record—and unshakable in its adherence to these principles.

Sincerely,

ELI J. SEGAL,
Chief Executive Officer.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1995

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which authorizes the use of Constitution Avenue, NE., between Delaware and Third, for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. The resolution also authorizes the Architect of the Capitol and the Sergeant at Arms, to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out this event in complete compliance with rules and regulations governing the use of Capitol Grounds. The Soap Box Derby has run on the Capitol Grounds for the last 4 years.

This year marks the 54th running of the Greater Washington Area Soap Box Derby, and the race is slated for July 15, 1995. Participants ranging from ages 9 to 16 are expected to compete in the early summer race. They hail from Washington, DC and the surrounding communities of northern Virginia and Maryland. The winners of this local event will represent the Washington, DC area in the national race which will be held in Akron, OH later this year.

The Soap Box Derby provides our young people with an opportunity to gain valuable skills such as engineering and aerodynamics. Furthermore, the derby promotes team work, a strong sense of accomplishment, sportsmanship, leadership, and responsibility. As we all know, these are all positive attributes which these young people can carry into adulthood.

Again, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM K. VAN
PELT

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1995

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to former U.S. Representative William K. Van

Pelt of Fond du Lac, WI, on the occasion of his 90th birthday today.

A popular Member of Congress who was known for his quiet common sense and integrity, Bill served Wisconsin's Sixth District from 1951 through 1964, winning seven consecutive terms with little serious opposition.

Respected by colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Bill was proud of his record of service to his constituents and of his committee work. When he left office, Bill was the second ranking Republican member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which handled all conservation issues coming before the House. He was also a senior member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, whose jurisdiction included policymaking and oversight of various facets of America's evolving space program.

Bill's first term in Congress came after he won an upset victory in a four-way Republican primary in 1950 in his first bid for public office. Before that time, Bill was in business for himself as owner and operator of City Fuel Co. of Fond du Lac and was an active participant in Republican Party politics on the local level, serving as chairman of the Fond du Lac County Republican Party from 1944 to 1950.

Throughout his tenure of office, Bill remained true to his roots as a businessman and advocate of Republican Party principles. He was a strong believer in the free enterprise system and in the need for a limited Federal Government dedicated to fiscal responsibility and a balanced Federal budget. He was not afraid to take unpopular stands, and was called on the carpet by his political opponents for daring to question the expenditure of Federal conservation dollars on a Wisconsin project he and many others deemed to be of dubious value.

In 1964, Bill Van Pelt was quoted as saying, "The Federal Government does not have to be a partner in a program to ensure its ultimate success." Thirty years later, I think Bill would have felt right at home in the current congressional climate, working to advance the tenets of the Contract With America.

Bill would probably be less comfortable, however, with the prevailing practices of political campaigning. A gentleman known for his unpretentious manner and low-key sense of humor, Bill prided himself on conducting campaigns free of personal attacks and disparagement. "I might say that I don't indulge in personalities," he said. "Never in eight campaigns have I felt it necessary to go to name-calling."

On this his 90th birthday, I want to congratulate Bill Van Pelt and to wish him continued health and happiness. In addition, on behalf of the people of the Sixth Congressional District, I want to thank him for his 14 years of service in the House of Representatives and for his legacy of integrity and common-sense leadership.

ON THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL
AMENDING THE RAILWAY LABOR
ACT TO CLARIFY ITS APPLICABILITY
TO WORK PERFORMED
BY FLIGHT CREW MEMBERS OF
U.S. CARRIERS ENGAGED IN
FOREIGN FLYING

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 10, 1995

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my distinguished colleagues, Representative JAMES OBERSTAR of Minnesota and Representative DON YOUNG of Alaska, I have reintroduced legislation to protect the public interest in uninterrupted international air service; and the stability of collective bargaining relationships between U.S. air carriers and their flight crew employees—flight deck crew members and flight cabin crew members. It does so by confirming and clarifying that the Railway Labor Act applies to the U.S. air carriers and their flight crew employees while operating to, from, or between points outside the United States.

Historically, air carriers and labor organizations have understood title II of the Railway Labor Act (RLA) to apply to U.S. air carriers and their flight crews when engaged in operations between the United States and foreign nations, and the terms of the act appear to cover these operations.

Such carriers are increasingly engaged in providing service to additional points outside the United States by engaging in beyond operations from one foreign destination to another. For this and other reasons, the status of negotiated contractual work rules applicable to the overseas flight operations of U.S. air carriers, and the statutory scheme applicable to labor relations during such operations, need to be clarified.

Recent court decisions are troubling because they have decided questions about the reach of the RLA by relying upon a presumption against extra-territoriality as well as the uncertain terms of the statute itself. But this approach does not effectively guide the courts or the parties in dealing with overseas flight operations of a U.S. carrier, which are essentially extensions of the carrier's domestic operations and are conducted by flight crews who operate interchangeably throughout the system. As a result, neither the public nor the parties can be certain that the industrial stability fostered by the RLA will protect the public while traveling in the foreign operations of U.S. carriers.

It is the reluctance to fully apply title II of the RLA as it should be applied and as we have understood its application for many years, that has brought us to where we stand today in introducing this legislation. We hope to amend the act so as to effectively guide the parties concerned in dealing with overseas flight operations of U.S. carriers.

Identical legislation (H.R. 4957) was introduced last year, and hearings were held in October, 1994 by the House Aviation Subcommittee, then chaired by the able Representative JAMES OBERSTAR, who joins me as an original cosponsor of today's bill.

This bill, as introduced, preserves the RLA's preference for systemwide collective bargaining agreements and permits such agreements

work in Romania. He was proud of his children and grandchildren, and he often talked of them.

Nellie has asked me to share with John's friends the letter she received, a personal letter. It says, "I'm glad we had a chance to talk. I'll never forget the first time I met John back in 1972. He had such a great balance of common sense and compassion with an energy, and I was elated when he became the DNC chair, and I am grateful for all he has given to our party and our country since. All of us who know John are better for the experience and all of us will miss him. I know you will miss him most of all, and I hope the memory of your great years together and the love and support of your friends will help to sustain you. Hillary and I send you our thoughts and prayers. Sincerely, Bill"

You know, it's hard to avoid all the clichés when remembering John, because in his case they're all so true. His word was his bond. He would give you the shirt off his back. He did light up a room when he walked in. And I'm proud to call him a friend. He's a friend we'll all miss, but we'll remember, I think, with deep affection.

Mr. Jim Wooten. Here's a good rule for reporters: Don't be pals with pols. It doesn't mean that you can't enjoy their company, once in a while. It doesn't mean you can't have lunch with them, once in a while. It doesn't mean you can't like them, once in a while. It just means there needs to be some proper distance in space between us and them. Between those of us who cover the news and those who make it. Because the closer you get, the less you see. So if you want to see clearly, don't get too close. Don't be pals with pols. This is a very good rule for all reporters.

Sometimes, though, he was a pol, wasn't he? You could tell that, because of the pure pleasure he derived from telling the political story. And not only that, from listening to them. To yours. To Strauss's (now there's a real test). And to mine, too. I don't think I ever told my political stories to better listeners than John C. Even if he knew they weren't exactly true (and what political story ever is). Even if he heard them before, he'd sit there and listen and help you along, and encourage you, and chuckle you, and then give a big rip of a laugh, and then he'd say, "I knew some old boys like that." And off he'd ride on some wonderful jaunt down the trails of his remarkable life. For John C., a good story was like a pair of boots: the more you worn them, the more comfortable they were. I loved his story about how much he grew in the eyes of Lyndon once he'd introduced him to Nellie. I loved listening to him. His voice for me was like the distant bell of a country church, always reminding me of home. And he said once, "Well, pal, they have fewer voters in Alabama, but I expect we come out about even on mules and fools."

He was a pol, wasn't he? You could tell that because he made it look so easy. Whether he was managing an unmanageable national convention or untying some devilish knot in the party, or settling some bloody internecine squabble or just working the tables at Duke's—he made it look easy. And politics never is. Not in this town, and not in Texas. And especially not for a man who felt about his party the way most men feel about their mothers. It was where he came from, and who he was. He was his party's son, and he would, by God, wear its name as proudly as he wore his own. White, John C., Democrat, Yellow-Dog. And in five separate decades, in the stormy politics of Texas and America, those were John C.'s unimpeachable credentials. When governor Shivers defected to Ike, John C. backed Adlai. When

the preacher said, "Catholics oughtn't be president," John C. was a Kennedy man. When herds of Texas democrats stampeded over to Goldwater and Nixon, John C. stood straight up for L.B.J. and Humphrey. "Hubert Umphrey" as he called him—and McGovern, too. Over the years in campaign after campaign, from Carter through Clinton, through the sunshine and the rain, he rode that same old horse. And he was as tall in the saddle when he finally got off as when he first got on.

This is important to remember about John C. Not that he was blind to his party's warts or deaf to its bologna, but rather that he loved it for its promise. Not that he was indifferent to its foolishness or insensitive to its folly, but rather that he was committed to its possibilities.

John C. was the most hard-headed, down-to-earth, practical, realistic, commonsense dreamer I ever knew. That was his strength and the source of his stamina. This fierce embrace of an imperfect party as the perfect political expression of the ideas and ideals that he cherished. Others might stray or waffle or wander or waiver; John C. always danced with the girl who brung him. He was a pol wasn't he? You can see that in the respect that other pols had for him; even if he wouldn't give a dime to their party. You can see that here today, look around. And you can hear it too, in the unspoken affirmations of everybody who ever knew him or worked with him or worked against him, that here was one politician who gave politics a good name.

Years ago over lunch at Duke's, he was scolding me for my appearance; "Listen pal," he said, "you ain't a newspaper man no more—you've got to get yourself some clothes. You need more than one suit and tie. Hell, I'll loan you the money!" And that progressed into us listing the real friends we had, the genuine pals, people who might even lend us money, folks in whom we could place our complete trust. John C. had too many to count, he said, which was true; look around, and I had too few to mention and now one less. He was a pol and he was a pal.

We argued about a lot of things over the years, but there was one thing we agreed on and that was that we were both literary critics. And that we had found and read and reread the great American novel. A rough and tumble saga about two Texas rangers who went off up to Montana, far far away from Lonesome Dove. How he loved that book, how I did too and we'd recite from it over lunch. Especially, its last few pages: "mortally wounded and down to his last, few breaths, Augustus McCray looked up at his long time pal and partner Captain Caw and he whispered, 'My God, Woodrow, it was quite a party.'" My God, chairman, it was quite a party.

Reverend Dr. Gladstone. We have listened with gratitude, with admiration, and with hope. Charles Haddon Spurgeon, the Victorian Baptist preacher said of William Ewart Gladstone, four times Prime Minister of Britain, he said, "We believe in no man's infallibility, but it is restful to believe in one man's integrity. Let us pray. Eternal God before who's face the generations rise and fall. Beneath who's will and within who's patience the story of our lives is told. In this memorial service, for your servant John, we lift up our hearts in gratitude, we thank you for his character. We know that this is the true wealth of life. We may be festooned with the whole haberdashery of success and yet go to our graves castaways. We thank you that we heard Senator Dole say that while it is nice to be important, it is more important to be nice. And so we thank you for the decency, the integrity, and the loyalty of your servant John. We thank you his commitment

to the political affairs of this nation. We thank you for all those who are ready to walk the lonely places of leadership, to become vulnerable to criticism, abuse, misrepresentation and public failure and yet who believes they are called to do this for love of country and party. For his commitment to his president, his party, and to the whole nation we give you thanks. And we thank you for his enjoyment of his family. For his dear wife, Nellie, for his children, whom he admired so much, for his sister and for his grandchildren. We remember them all now tenderly and commit them to your loving care. And we pray that as they sigh for the touch of a vanished hand and the sound of a voice that is still, they may know your living presence. And we thank you for our Lord Jesus Christ who has defeated death and brought life and immortality to light. We thank you that we can say he is not here but he is risen again until we meet in your presence. So bless each one of us here members of the family friends and colleagues and keep us at it and with it and for it until our work is done our course is run and on your kind arms we fall. And this we pray through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Will the congregation stand for the blessing and the benediction and remain standing while the family and speakers leave.

Go forth on your journey, Christian soul. Go in the strengths of God and may He bring you at last to the land of Promise, the Country of the Great King. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with us all ever more. Amen.

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ACT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, one of the more exciting and innovative programs enacted during the 103d Congress was the National and Community Service Act proposed by President Clinton. Under the AmeriCorps program established as a result of that act, young men and women are now able, through community service, to earn an education benefit to help defray the costs of a higher education.

I am concerned, however, that this program may now be the target of severe cutbacks. Because of this, I wanted to bring to my colleagues' attention the correspondence I recently received from Mr. George Graboys of Barrington, RI, where he is a distinguished and widely respected business leader. Having retired as the chief executive officer of Citizens Bank, Mr. Graboys, nevertheless, remains very active in civic affairs. Among many activities, he serves presently as the vice chairman of the Rhode Island Children's Crusade for Higher Education.

Mr. Graboys' view on the operation of AmeriCorps in Rhode Island merit careful and thoughtful consideration. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of his January 31, 1995, letter to me be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARRINGTON, RI, January 31, 1995.

Hon. CLAIBORNE DEB. PELL,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: I am writing to express my strong support for the AmeriCorps

national service program and to enlist your assistance in light of the recent call by House Speaker Newt Gingrich to eliminate the program.

From my perspective, AmeriCorps is a refreshing new government initiative. I am impressed, particularly, by its grassroots nature and its ability to place 20,000 dedicated individuals directly into community agencies in its first year of operation.

As Vice Chairman of the Rhode Island Children's Crusade for Higher Education, I have had the opportunity to see the merits of the program first hand. The Crusade's 51 AmeriCorps participants—13 full-time and 38 part-time—have provided an infusion of new energy to the organization. In less than two months, they have built relationships with over 40 schools and community agencies and have created 23 new Crusade mentoring programs in the seven Rhode Island communities with the greatest numbers of low-income children. At the same time, they have been busy phoning parents whose children may need services and going door to door to recruit new Crusaders. Presently, 324 children are being served through these AmeriCorps programs. Crusade Corps members are well on their way to reaching their goal of creating 26 programs that will serve 780 children.

Newt Gingrich has called the program "coerced voluntarism." Based upon what I have seen, nothing could be further from the truth. Our AmeriCorps participants represent a racially diverse group of people from ages 16-55, including 10 parents of Crusaders. Within this diversity, all of them share an intense desire to serve the community and to better themselves in the process. AmeriCorps and the Crusade provide a structure and direction that meshes with their sense of altruism. The modest living stipends they receive make it possible for them to dedicate a full year to community service—rather than a few hours a week. This substantive volunteer experience is something that is likely to effect many participants' choice of careers and to foster a commitment to community service that will endure as their careers advance.

Speaker Gingrich has also indicated that it is a "waste of money to give limited benefits to college students." Again, I think he has missed the mark. The Crusade's AmeriCorps participants cover a broad range of educational attainment. Approximately 30% do not have an undergraduate degree, 53% have earned or are in the process of earning a Bachelors degree, and 17% have or are working towards their Masters or Ph.D. Each of the Crusade's participants has indicated, however, that they have a desire to further their education. For them, the educational benefits of AmeriCorps—\$4,725 for full-time participants and \$2,363 for part-time participants—will be of substantive help along the way. Moreover, the leadership and community building skills they are acquiring through their experience with AmeriCorps will complement their formal education and enable them to become more productive citizens.

I think the AmeriCorps program has produced remarkable results in a very short period of time. It has tremendous potential for strengthening the nation's service ethic while impacting community needs in a cost of effective manner. I hope that I can count on your support in ensuring that the program nurtured and protected.

Sincerely,

GEORGE GRABOYS.

PEACE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as we approach St. Patrick's Day 1995, Irish eyes are smiling as perhaps never before in the quarter century of violence that has wracked Northern Ireland. In celebrating the remarkable progress made toward peace during the past year, we are also mindful of the responsibility that all of us who care about Northern Ireland have to the people there who have suffered so much from the violence. We must do all we can to make certain that a lasting peace is achieved.

Last Monday, the New York Times carried an eloquent and very poignant article by James Clarity about Pauline Hegney, a Catholic mother in Belfast. Her husband, the father of her four children, was killed by Protestant paramilitaries more than 3 years ago. She is one of the countless survivors of the violence who, rather than harboring hatred, feverently hopes that no one else—Protestant or Catholic—will suffer her fate.

Clearly the people of Northern Ireland want the current cease-fire to continue and peace talks to begin. All of us share that hope as well.

Mrs. Hegney wrote an extremely moving account of the death of her husband, and Mr. Clarity quotes at length from her words in his article. I believe that his story and her words will be of interest to all of us, and I ask unanimous consent that the article by James Clarity may be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a poem by W.H. Auden, which speaks to all such loss, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1995]

A WAR WIDOW'S THOUGHTS AT PEACE'S DOWNING

(By James F. Clarity)

BELFAST, NORTHERN IRELAND.—Pauline Hegney, the mother of four young children whose husband was slain three and a half years ago by Protestant paramilitaries on a Belfast street, prays every day that the Government peace effort will work and that there will be no more killings here in the name of patriotism.

She is among the tens of thousands of survivors of the 3,172 Protestants and Roman Catholics who have been killed in sectarian warfare here since 1969. She speaks with a soft Ulster lilt and there is passion in her voice, but no hatred.

Her husband, Karl, an unemployed house painter, was gunned down in the street on his way home from a pub. Both his widow and the police say he had no involvement in the Irish Republican Army. The police told her they had an idea who the killers were, but no proof, she said. No one has been arrested.

She was left with their four young children and a job at the Europa Hotel in the city center, as head of the banquet dining room staff. But the I.R.A. viewed the hotel as a major economic target and bombed it frequently. The bombings often shut it down, putting her out of work, sometimes for months.

The I.R.A. declares that it is fighting for Northern Ireland's Catholics. Mrs. Hegney, who is Catholic, said she prays for them, and for the Protestant guerrillas too.

She told her children that "a sick man" had killed their father and that he was now in heaven with Granny, his mother. Her daughter, Julie-Anne, said that at first she hated Granny for taking him away and that she saw her father return to her room one night. She said she wanted to die and go to heaven with him. Lately Julie-Anne, who is now 8, says only, "I wish I could see him, mummy, for one wee minute."

Mrs. Hegney joined a group of Catholic and Protestant widows of guerrilla war victims, and they exchange their feelings and problems.

But the cease-fires that have raised the hopes for peace and for a normal life for most people in Northern Ireland also left her and the other widows feeling depressed, she said.

"During the trouble, we were all in it together," she said. "Everyone in Belfast was affected. But when the peace came, I felt isolated. Other people can get on with their lives. We can't."

Last October, as reports spread that the Protestant guerrillas, following the lead of the I.R.A., were going to call their own cease-fire, she hoped it would not be on Oct. 13, the third anniversary of her husband's killing, but it was announced on that day.

"It didn't feel right," she said. "I was praying for peace, but I didn't want it on that day." Now, she said, she faces the prospect of seeing representatives of the guerrillas become celebrated personalities as they approach formal negotiations with the British and Irish Governments and the other political parties in the North.

"I don't like the idea that after they've killed so many people, they'll be sitting down to say what the future will be, when people like these destroyed my children's future. But if it stops people being murdered, I've no objection."

Her children still miss their father. Karl Jr., who is 14, wants to be a lawyer. She said she asked him if he would defend someone he knew to be guilty of a "terrible crime." Karl said: "Would you serve him if he came into the Europa. You do what you're paid to do." She shrugged.

"I'll get through it," she said. "I'm a struggler. I've begun to write about it."

In her account of the night her husband was killed, she wrote: "We never know what's to come for us, though, do we? I put the boys to bed when their daddy went out. I went into the kitchen and had a little laugh to myself when I saw the saucepans sitting on the cooker. One was full of potatoes and the other one had sprouts in it all ready for the Sunday. He also had the roast cooked. I thought how organized my Karl is."

"A very curt male voice came on the phone saying he was a police officer and asked if I could make my way to the police station as my husband was in hospital seriously ill. I lost my mind at that moment and I don't think I have actually found it all again."

"The nightmare for me had only just begun. I went to see Karl lying in that operating theater where he had died with the doctors fighting to save his life. He lay there still and cold, no life left in the body of the man who had taken the core of me, loved me and made my life worth living. I thought how could he leave me? What would I do without him? How was I going to live without him?"

"I held Karl's hand and it was like holding the hand of a wax dummy. It felt so strange. I didn't cry. I just asked him to give me strength to get through the next few hours."

UMass Dartmouth and has regained visitation rights to his two children. "I learned that Wayne St. Pierre is more than my probation officer—he's a human being," he said, "and Judge Kane is a human being, and they cared about me. That's made me care about me and start making the right choices."

The program has strict rules. While studying, participants are on probation and live at home. Anyone who misses class or skips readings can be sent to prison. Program graduates remain on probation and must attend a one-day career workshop. They must then make a career choice or plans that will increase employment opportunities, such as obtaining a GED or going to college. If they don't, they can be sent to prison.

The UMass Dartmouth program accepts only male offenders. There are now similar programs, for men and women, in the state—and more judges are studying it. "They should try it," Judge Kane said. "The things that are said here are more interesting than the conversation in the judges' lobby."

Don Ross—the fan of Deliverance, the book—said the course taught him to accept responsibility for the first time. "The day I came before Judge Kane was the turning point. That transformation has been gradual, week after week, book after book."

"This has taught me," he said, "to use my mind."

CONGREGATION EMANU-EL: CELEBRATING 150 YEARS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1995

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the most outstanding religious institutions in the United States, Congregation Emanu-El, which will soon be celebrating the 150th anniversary of its founding. This remarkable temple, which is located on Fifth Avenue at East 65th Street in the heart of my district, has tended to the spiritual needs of its congregants as well as the social and philanthropic needs of the greater community for a century and a half.

I want to first congratulate Dr. Ronald B. Sobel, who has served as the temple's senior rabbi since 1973. Rabbi Soebl is a world-renowned scholar and spiritual leader who deserves enormous credit for helping to make Emanu-El into one of the largest and most respected synagogues in the world.

In fact, Temple Emanu-El is physically the largest synagogue in the world and boasts the largest membership of any reform temple. But its origins were indeed quite humble. In 1845, a handful of German immigrants pooled \$30 and rented a small room on the Lower East Side, thus becoming the first reform Jewish congregation in the city. As the congregation grew, its members found new locations, first a former Methodist church and then a former Baptist church. In 1868, Emanu-El congregants raised over half a million dollars and built a new facility on Fifth Avenue and 43rd Street. Finally, in 1925, construction began on the Temple's final and current home. In 1930, this magnificent structure was dedicated.

The history of Temple Emanu-El is the history of New York, the Nation, and indeed the entire World. Early in this century, the temple founded a committee to assist victims of the Russian massacres. Seven members of the

congregation were killed serving in World War I and 22 were killed during the Second World War. During this war, the temple established a recreational canteen which ultimately served 1.3 million American men and women in uniform. In recent years, the temple instituted programs to address the pressing needs of New York City. The Sunday lunch program—developed in 1983—provides 140 homeless citizens with a hot lunch each week. In 1988, the temple opened a homeless shelter which has become one of our city's most successful facilities of its kind.

Over the years, the leaders of Congregation Emanu-El has read like a "Who's Who" of American civic leadership. Emanu-El members have included Adolph Ochs, publisher of the New York Times; Oscar S. Straus, the first Jewish Cabinet Member, who served as President Theodore Roosevelt's Secretary of Commerce and Labor; and Irving Lehman, who served as chief justice of the New York State Court of Appeals. More recently, Emanu-El president Maxwell Rabb served as U.S. Ambassador to Italy.

Mr. Speaker, for 150 years, Congregation Emanu-El has served as a beacon of community spirit and religious commitment. It is an honor to represent this institution in the U.S. Congress, and I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Temple Emanu-El on this auspicious occasion.

AMERICORPS' SUCCESSFUL INVOLVEMENT IN A COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM IN THE 7TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1995

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the success of a partnership between AmeriCorps and community policing efforts in Illinois' Seventh Congressional District. It is a pleasure to be able to address the House today on the positive impact that the Chicago Alliance for Neighborhood Safety [CANS] and Bethel New Life Inc.'s Take Back the Streets Program is having on Chicago's West Side. By recognizing the accomplishments of this Take Back the Streets Program, I hope to increase awareness and support for successful partnerships such as the one forged between AmeriCorps and community policing programs in my district.

Bethel New Life Inc., a community-based development corporation which was founded in 1979, is a member and partner organization of CANS. CANS has sponsored 21 AmeriCorps-VISTA volunteers who have helped organize community policing programs and who have played an essential role in the recent take back the streets campaign.

To implement this campaign, Bethel chose a drug-ridden 6-square-block area which included a public elementary school, 3 churches, and a city park, as the target area for its 40-day campaign. The key to Bethel's plan of cleaning up the target area or neighborhood safety zone was to organize high-visibility activities that encouraged residents to come out onto the street.

These community activities, which included anti-drug marches, job fairs, drug education and treatment workshops, all night prayer vigils, family nights, and cleanup efforts, took place at all hours of the day and night. The community leaders and residents worked together to take their streets back from drug dealers. In addition to the planned activities, the program included two ongoing events. They were setting up lemonade stands and organizing outdoor prayer services on corners where drugs were sold.

The community leaders and the residents found that their efforts paid off. The drug dealers were pushed out of the area, the cleanup effort greatly improved the aesthetic appeal of the neighborhood, and it was once again safe for children to play on the streets.

In addition to these short-term victories, there were significant long-term effects. One of the greatest accomplishments of this program was that the fear that residents had about getting involved in efforts to fight crime were reduced. An estimated 800 residents got involved with the program because they could see their efforts were paying off. Their community looked and felt safer.

The success of Bethel's program was a direct result of AmeriCorps involvement in the program. CANS' AmeriCorps-VISTA volunteer Charles Jackson, the community leader that was assigned to Bethel New Life Inc., was essential in developing block clubs, increasing interest in community policing, and developing local leaders. The positive effect that the AmeriCorps-VISTA volunteer had on the community will last long after his leadership is gone.

The involvement of AmeriCorps made a significant difference in the overall effectiveness of the program. Without AmeriCorps volunteers, it will likely be difficult for community policing efforts in other neighborhoods to experience this degree of success.

I commend CANS, Bethel New Life, Inc., and AmeriCorps for their hard work and success at helping constituents in my district feel safer and more confident about their right to live in a drug-free neighborhood. As we review Federal programs in the weeks ahead, I hope that this success will be remembered by my colleagues who are quick to mislabel AmeriCorps and community policing efforts as ineffective and wasteful boondoggles and invite them to visit my district to find out what a positive impact these programs have had on hundreds of Americans.

STATEMENT ON MISSED VOTES

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 10, 1995, I missed six recorded votes because of a bad case of the flu. Rather than infect the rest of the House, I stayed home.

If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 112, the amendment by Mr. WATTS, to strike the automatic stay provisions relating to relief lawsuits brought by inmates, "aye."

out the current fiscal storm. Why? Because they believe that the Mexican economy is fundamentally strong. A principle reason they hold that view is because NAFTA has ensured the continuity of fundamental market reforms that has made it possible for Americans to sell products and do business there. Were it not for NAFTA, the crisis in Mexico would be far deeper and far more protracted.

I commend Majority Leader BOB DOLE and Speaker NEWT GINGRICH for their willingness to act in a bipartisan fashion to assist the President in moving the original guarantee proposal through the Congress. Regrettably they were unable to garner the necessary bipartisan support required to pass the legislation in a timely fashion. I think that the President was right in the judgment that the Mexican economy could not withstand the battering of another several weeks of uncertainty over whether the United States assistance would be forthcoming.

Mr. President, we engage in vigorous debate in this body day in and day out. Debate is clearly an integral part of the legislative process. However, from time to time, an issue comes before the Congress that is so important and so sensitive that it mandates that partisan politics be set aside and that we come together in support of the President. I believe that the situation in Mexico is just such an issue.

Mexico and the United States have had a long and enduring friendship. We share a 2,000-mile common border. We share a common commitment to democracy, liberty, and human freedom. We are partners in a global economy that has inextricably linked our fates. For all of these reasons, United States' interests are served by helping Mexico at its moment of need. I call upon all my colleagues to get behind the President in support of this effort—it is in the interest of all Americans that this initiative succeed.

NATIONAL SERVICE

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I was proud to cast my vote for the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 when the conference report came before the Senate for final approval last September. This was important legislation intended to marshal the Nation's best resources—its citizens—to confront the many pressing problems facing communities across the country. The National Service Act, signed into law on September 21, 1993, has helped renew the ethic of civic responsibility and the spirit of community service throughout the United States while also providing critical assistance in meeting vital human, educational, environmental, and public safety needs.

In light of this, I am troubled by recent statements by the House Republican leadership expressing opposition to national service, describing it as gimmickry and coerced voluntarism. I would urge those who put forward

these views to look carefully at the new national service program's centerpiece, AmeriCorps, a national network of local youth service corps. Unlike previous volunteer-based programs, AmeriCorps is not one large Federal program, but a network of locally developed and locally managed service corps which will give thousands of young people the kind of opportunity earlier generations had to serve their country and improve their own lives as well as those of their neighbors.

I am proud that my own State of Maryland has been a leader in the area of national service. The tremendous number of volunteer organizations across the State deserve credit for the enormous difference that volunteers have made and continue to make in Maryland each and every day. Maryland has very deservedly been the recipient of a number of first round AmeriCorps grants. I was privileged to be with the President during the official kickoff of the AmeriCorps Program at Aberdeen Proving Ground last September, the first campus selected under the National Service Act as a site for the National Civilian Community Corps [NCCC]. Using a converted barracks, the NCCC campus at Aberdeen houses 250 young adults who work in 10-member teams on projects throughout Maryland, the Northeast, and the Mid-Atlantic. The program emphasizes conservation of natural resources, public safety, and the educational and human needs of children and older Americans.

I was also privileged to meet earlier with members of Community Year in Montgomery County, Civic Works in Baltimore, and the Maryland Conservation Corps to discuss their critical efforts to rehabilitate housing for low-income families. More recently, my wife was able to visit an AmeriCorps site at Frostburg State University in western Maryland. The local program, named Appalachian Service Through Action and Resources or A STAR, provides many types of assistance in areas involving social service and the environment. Participants perform duties as varied as coordinating environmental projects at Deep Creek Lake, developing Victory Gardens in Garrett County, working with local Head Start programs in recruiting volunteers, providing independent living assistance enlarging area food pantries, and establishing youth literacy programs.

Mr. President, it is my view that national service, and those who participate in it represent the best of our Nation. AmeriCorps and other programs under the National Service Act of 1993 carry forward an idea rooted in the best traditions and values of America—the tradition of serving others, the value of taking personal responsibility for ourselves and our communities, and the belief that to whom much is given, much is expected. Through programs like AmeriCorps we are providing our Nation's young people with both an opportunity and an obligation. It asks

them to put something back into the community while also providing them an opportunity to develop skills which will serve them well throughout their lives.

As I have indicated through examples in my own State, the national service program is working. Nationwide, there are other examples—the executive director of the National Association of Police Organizations has called AmeriCorps a huge boost in the arm for law enforcement; officials of the Federal Emergency Management Agency say that participants in AmeriCorps have helped thousands of disaster victims pick up the pieces of their lives; Habitat for Humanity says they could not do their job without such individuals.

In my view, Mr. President, those who have answered the call to service by participating in AmeriCorps and other national service opportunities are taking part in the oldest and best of America's traditions—a spirit of service. I would ask those who have criticized legislation which has furthered national service to look again at the important efforts underway which serve to produce stronger families and stronger communities, and to join me in commending those who are taking part in this important renewal of service to our Nation.

THE RETIREMENT OF RICHARD COLLINS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, on January 31, Richard Collins of the staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee retired. Mr. Collins has served the committee and the Senate for the past 20 years. It has been my pleasure to have worked closely with Richard throughout that period. Richard served as the clerk and staff director of the two subcommittees I had the fortune to chair in the 1980's and 1990's, Foreign Operations and Defense.

In each of these positions Richard has served me and the Senate professionally and faithfully. I will miss his knowledge and counsel in the days and years ahead. I can take some solace knowing that Richard plans to remain in the Washington, DC, area. And, I know we shall call upon him often to provide the type of guidance that we have counted upon for the past 20 years.

Last Thursday night, the friends of Richard Collins gathered to wish him a farewell and happy retirement. On that occasion, Richard spoke eloquently about his career in the Senate, his many and varied experiences, and what it meant to him to be a staff member for this body. He spoke of his affection and reverence for the institution, the relationship between Members and their staff and the importance of staff in the operation of the Senate. I know that many of my colleagues were in attendance that evening and had the good fortune to hear this gentleman's farewell remarks, but I believe the

height of hypocrisy, the height of hypocrisy for the Democrats to come down here and complain about what the Republicans are doing after the way they have run this House for the last 40 years.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The gentleman will be seated. The Clerk will report the words.

□ 1230

The Clerk read as follows:

But it is apparent to anyone who is paying attention to what is going on that the Democratic Party is doing everything they can to derail the Contract With America. They are proposing hundreds of amendments to slow down the process. All I want to say is that it is the height of hypocrisy, the height of hypocrisy for the Democrats to come down here and complain about what the Republicans are doing after the way they have run this House for the last 40 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The Chair is prepared to rule.

It would be out of order for the gentleman to make reference to a particular Member, but precedent suggests that reference to procedures, or amendments, or to parties is not out of order.

The House will proceed in regular order please.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NADLER. The second half of the statement of the distinguished gentleman made reference to the hypocrisy of the Democrats. The context clearly indicated that it was the Democratic Members of the House that he was referring to. My parliamentary inquiry, therefore:

Since the rules prohibit the impugning of motives of Members of the House, and the gentleman impugned the motives of a group of Members of the House, just under half the Members of the House; so is it not permitted under the rules then to impugn the motives of an individual Member of the House, but to impugn the motives of a group of Members of the House is permitted?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes that collective political motivation can be discussed and it was not discernible that it was relating to any particular Member.

The House will proceed in regular order, please.

CALLING FOR A RENEWED COMMITMENT TO AMERICORPS

(Mr. WARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the President in his efforts to strengthen our communities and enable young Americans to further

their education through the National Service Program, AmeriCorps.

As a former Peace Corps volunteer, I know the value of serving our community here in the United States as well as around the world.

Despite its short existence, President Clinton's National Service Program has already achieved remarkable results in terms of participation, serving our communities, and extending the invaluable benefits of higher education to tens of thousands of young Americans.

In my hometown of Louisville, the 22 volunteers of the ACME Program, which is affiliated with AmeriCorps, serves at-risk youths in local schools through safety and education programs. Also in Kentucky, AmeriCorps sponsors a housing and homeless program. This program seeks to provide affordable housing for those in need.

I believe that programs such as AmeriCorps can only make our Nation stronger and bring our people closer. Mr. Speaker, I call for a renewed commitment to AmeriCorps.

THE TIME TO DELIVER IS HERE

Mr. BROWNBACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the body to comment about the elections on November 8 and the clear statement the American people spoke of at that point, which was to reduce the size, the scope, and the intrusiveness of the Federal Government. It has come that time to stand and deliver.

I call on the administration to put forward proposals looking at all Federal agencies for their continued work and their efforts in questioning whether or not we should reduce the Federal role in these areas, and I ask the administration to address that and to examine whole roles of agencies and programs. This body has been continually focused on the costs of these programs. I would ask the body to consider the responsibility of us to our children and the enormous deficit that has been put forth, the enormous debt that has been accumulated and what responsibility we have to the children of this country to free them of that debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to spend our children's inheritance. It is quite another to spend them in debt, as we have, and also the opportunity we have to free the society of these strains.

GET THE FACTS STRAIGHT

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, to correct the record, I believe the gentleman from the 18th District of Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] who surely is no rookie to the process here, perhaps unintentionally mischaracterized what has happened in terms of the history of

the House. He said, if I understood him correctly, that no piece of major legislation has ever passed under open rules while the Democrat majority was in power.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a member of the Committee on Natural Resources, Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] conducted every single piece of legislation under open rules. Every single hearing, including the budget hearings, were open. Every single Member of the then-minority who wanted to offer an amendment was able to do so, no matter how long, no matter how lengthy. That was the case.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a mischaracterization not to indicate to the American people and to new Members of the House here that time was equally divided always under the chairmanships of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Get the facts straight, get the process right, and good legislation will follow.

□ 1240

U.S. INVENTORS THREATENED BY NEW REQUIREMENT OF GATT IMPLEMENTATION LEGISLATION

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, pardon me for talking about legislation for a few moments.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues today to join with almost 100 Members of this body in cosponsoring H.R. 359. This legislation is aimed at preventing a crime against the American people. That crime was made possible by a provision, not required by GATT but snuck into the GATT implementation legislation, that will have the effect of decreasing the number of years of patent protection enjoyed by American citizens.

H.R. 359 ensures that Americans will have the 17 years of protection that has traditionally been our right. Almost 100 Republicans, Democrats, protectionists, free-traders, liberals, and conservatives have joined together to prevent this rip-off that could see billions of dollars that should go to American inventors and investors instead ending up in the bank accounts of foreign and multinational corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to please join in cosponsoring H.R. 359.

THE NEW ANTIFEMININE TRENCH INFECTION PILL

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

limit spending as the way to implement the constitutional balanced budget amendment. Of course, as a mere statutory program, Congress can override it. We can always unpass what we just passed. But at least I think it sets forth a blueprint, a guideline for achieving the objective.

Finally, Mr. President, I think almost all of us agree that if we pass this balanced budget amendment and send it to the States for ratification, we have to begin achieving that balanced budget today. We have to go back to last year's budget and see if there is anything in the appropriations we passed last year that we can pull back—money that we can save. We need to look at this year's budget as the first of the budgets that gets us on the glidepath to a balanced budget, and set the outside limit of perhaps 7 years. But we probably ought to try to do it in a shorter period, if we can, so that when the balanced budget amendment has finally been ratified by all of the States, it will not be an impossible task for us; so that we will have already started the process and each year intervening will have brought that budget deficit down another ratchet.

If we do that, in the last couple of years when we actually have to do it as a constitutional requirement, it will be an achievable objective, and in the last year or two, we will be able to make the savings and limit spending in such a way that we can achieve that balanced budget at the time it is called for in the constitutional amendment.

So these are some of the things we are going to have to think about as the balanced budget debate begins to unfold. I think it is important to at least begin to think about them in the context of the debate we are having on unfunded mandates, because as the Governors and State legislators that have to deal with the balanced budget amendment tell us, they know we have to mean business and get on with the balanced budget amendment.

At this point, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

NATIONAL SERVICE

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the national service program which has been the subject of a good bit of discussion in recent media accounts and which President Clinton addressed this last week.

From the outset, I want to make it clear that I join President Clinton in

expressing my continued strong support of the concept of national service. The passage of the national service bill in the last Congress was an event that I, along with a number of my colleagues, looked forward to for many years. Since President Clinton signed the legislation into law on September 21, 1993, thousands of Americans have served our country in projects which range from teaching school in inner-city neighborhoods to preventing destruction of lands along our Nation's rivers.

The case for this initiative depends on understanding that it is uniquely a program that offers a triple investment in the future productive capacity of our people and our communities—first of all, in the service performed; the service experience, No. 2; and the postservice benefit for our young people, No. 3. I know that the word "investment" has been much abused in debate on the Senate floor in recent years, and for some it is just a code word for Government spending. We must not, however, become so cynical that we cannot see a real investment with a real payoff when it is staring us in the face.

The idea for this investment came from recognition that many Americans have, for the first time, perhaps, in our history, forgotten the relationship between rights and responsibilities. We often see reports in the news media about various groups proclaiming that this Government service or that Government service is a right. We are so often reminded of the rights all Americans should enjoy that we often lose sight of the other side of the same coin, and that is the responsibilities that we must share in order to make these rights possible. Just as we have rights to freedom, to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, those sacred rights carry with them equally sacred responsibilities. The National Service Program was created to provide young Americans with opportunities to fulfill that obligation to give something back to their country and to their communities.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who dedicated his life to the cause of civil rights and whose birthday we celebrated this past Monday, understood that only through assuming responsibilities that accompany our rights can we help ourselves. He said in the last Sunday morning sermon before his assassination:

Human progress never rolls in on the wheels of inevitability; it comes through the tireless efforts of men willing to be co-workers with God, and without this hard work, time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation. So we must help time and realize that the time is always ripe to do right.

National Service provides young people a means to meet the challenge to do right while expanding their own horizons and building opportunity for their futures.

Critics have tried to attack the National Service Program in a number of different ways. During the debate on the authorizing legislation, we heard cries of how many more Pell grants we could fund with the money, or how many more job training programs we could fund with the money. Though these criticisms are valid as far as they go, they almost inevitably lose sight of the fact that National Service does not exist for the purpose of simply providing student aid or even job training. National Service exists primarily to provide service. And if the program is not providing service, then it does not deserve to exist. A good analogy is our Nation's Armed Forces. We do not maintain Armed Forces in order to provide valuable skills and develop good character in young men and women. Rather, Armed Forces personnel develop skills and character in the military as they carry out their primary mission of providing our Nation's security.

The same is true of national service. Would critics have the Senate disregard the benefits to society of national service participants providing employment counseling and tutoring to homeless people in Atlanta? Should we ignore the benefits of the first-time immunization of 33,000 children in Fort Worth, TX, in one month which was carried out by those serving in the national service program?

I could go on and on with the kind of service being provided. That is the true test of national service. Are we really serving people and helping communities? Considering the benefits national service provides at the community level, it is difficult to see why there are so many objections to this program. Indeed, given the debates we have heard on unfunded mandates and we continue to hear that on legislation in this body, I would think that our colleagues would agree that national service represents the type of program that we ought to support.

National service is not a Federal mandate for any specific type of service, nor does it require that communities participate at all. National service gives communities and service organizations and young people the chance, voluntarily, to identify and perform the kind of service which best meets their local needs with the Federal Government providing the funding. So it is almost the opposite of a Government mandate.

At the same time, it provides meaningful work for young people addressing real problems without Federal micromanagement. This real work for real value will ensure a strong payback for the taxpayers' dollar. In the process, national service instills in young people the strong traditional values of hard work and responsibility. They learn those values because they are serving. It is not a program to teach those values. It is a program where the values are learned because of service rendered.

As for the claim that national service is—quoting one of the critics—“coerced volunteerism,” I would suggest that critics ask any of the more than 200,000 people who requested applications for last year's AmeriCorps Program or the 20,000 that were selected and are now serving, whether they were coerced. National service is not coercion any more than was the Montgomery GI bill which provides educational benefits for hundreds of thousands of young Americans who serve and have served in our Nation's All-Volunteer Force.

Instead, like the Montgomery GI bill, national service is an opportunity, an opportunity that young people all over America have said they want. Nothing is more evident of that than the overwhelming number of applications. I think we will see even more of the applications in the years to come, assuming this program continues.

As for the benefits of service, and to me this must be the way we judge the program more than any other judgment, although there are, really, as I said, three parts to the program, service is the No. 1 part. In my State alone the excellent works that have been performed by these young people is very impressive. In Georgia, national service participants are working in Atlanta area schools as teaching assistants, tutors, and mentors. They are aiding police in developing a community-oriented police program in Albany, GA. They are helping create an emergency 911 network in Douglas and Coffee County. They are identifying local environmental programs in Decatur, GA, and developing plans to engage youth in solving them. They are tutoring hundreds and thousands of young people every day in elementary school. They are also in some of the rural areas that I visited. They do not have any foreign language teachers in the schools there and they have found that with the immigration that is growing in our State and other States, these young people who are in school that cannot speak English need help. In many cases, in a couple of the rural communities, that help is coming from national service participants who have a second language and who are able to be the only ones in the community that can really communicate with the newly arrived legal immigrants in our school.

All of these efforts are duplicated in national service programs nationwide. From aiding the American Red Cross and providing food and clothing for California flood victims to building homes for needy families in the poorest sections of Miami, with Habitat for Humanity.

In conclusion, Mr. President, national service provides a triple payback in valuable service to the community. Higher skills and lower debts for our young people for attending colleges or getting advanced education after high school and a much stronger sense that we are all in the American enterprise

together, bound by mutual respect and mutual obligation.

In the Peace Corps Program in my State the participants begin each day with a chant announcing their readiness to serve, to earn, and to learn. That, Mr. President, is the most eloquent summary of the concept of national service that I think we can offer: To serve, to earn, and to learn.

I urge all Senators to listen to our young people, to visit these programs, to make sure that the criticism of the programs—which is welcome—make sure it is constructive, to make sure we look at whether we are really getting service in the communities where they are serving, rather than simply oppose this program as another governmental program.

I urge all Senators to particularly talk to our young people, listen to them, and see what they say about what they are doing in serving and earning and learning and continuing to give them a chance in this regard. There is room for improvement in the program. There is room for constructive criticism. There is room, perhaps, to even critique the program in a way that would affect the budget. In my view, blind opposition to this exciting concept is simply not the way to go at this point in time.

I think the main measure must be whether we are getting service from these young people and whether they are helping the communities, helping young people, helping those in need. It is my hope that if this program works and I believe it is working, that it will be viewed in the future as not simply an addition to the way we deliver services to those in need in our country and in our communities but rather in lieu of some of the existing programs.

I can think of no better way to deliver social services in this Nation to those in need. We are going to continue to have people in need. We are going to continue to have community demands that cannot be met with nominal funding. I can think of no better way than unleashing the energy, enthusiasm, and idealism of tens of thousands of America's young people in addressing these critical problems. To me this is the way we ought to begin thinking about shaping our social services.

At this point in time this program is in addition to the existing programs. We should look at it more and more as a substitute to some of the programs and a supplement to others.

I thank the Chair. I know the Senator from New Hampshire would like to speak. I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

END DELAY ON UNFUNDED MANDATES LEGISLATION

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the bill that has been before the Senate for 8 days now basi-

cally has been delayed and stalled, is very important business for the people of the United States of America and certainly many communities around the country who suffer from the unfunded mandates that they have to comply with.

I want to discuss that legislation today for a few minutes and also to say that I sincerely hope that in the very near future, hopefully some time early next week, that we will be able to pass that legislation and get it on through the House and the Senate and get it to the President. Hopefully he will sign it. This is a major piece of legislation that the majority, overwhelming majority of the American people support.

I do not understand why we are delaying it. Apparently there seems to be, based on those we talk with, a great number of people on the other side of the aisle who say they support the bill yet when it came down to signing the petition for cloture, we did not get much help at all. Indeed, we only had one vote. I find a strange inconsistency here that those who say they support the legislation cannot bring themselves to bring the legislation to a vote. I think sometimes we get criticized here for not being able to accomplish anything and the American people look at this and say, why is it that a Senator, perhaps my own Senator, would say, “I am for this bill but I do not want us to vote on it.”

When we get criticized out there in the public, we really should not wonder why that happens. There is nothing wrong with debate. All Senators have every right to debate this legislation as long as they wish. Certainly, I stand here today before one of the most historic desks in the U.S. Senate. This desk belonged to Daniel Webster, one of the few original desks in the Senate.

Daniel Webster, of course, at one time represented New Hampshire in the House, was born in New Hampshire, and represented Massachusetts in the U.S. Senate, one of the greatest orators of the pre-Civil War time. He certainly stood on the floor of the U.S. Senate before this desk and debated many of the great issues of the day and, I am sure, frustrated a lot of people on the other side. That is the way it should be. That is what the Senate is. There is nothing wrong with that. I do not criticize that in any way.

I will say that this is an issue, the unfunded mandate issue, that is so overwhelmingly supported by the people in this country—I hesitate to say this, but I think it is true—that the American people, I think, are going to exact a price from those who delay it. I think they do it under grave risks.

This legislation places, very interestingly, increased and added responsibilities on those who want to create the new mandate. It would also increase the cost of an existing one. In other words, they must get an estimate of the cost of the new requirement to both State and local government and the private sector and provide the

Mr. GRASSLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 243 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. NUNN pertaining to the introduction of S. 244 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana, Mr. BREAUX, is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

Mr. BREAUX. I thank the Chair.

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President and my colleagues, I remember when I was practicing law in Louisiana as a very young lawyer. One of the senior lawyers was explaining to me how we should proceed in a courtroom. His suggestion was,

If you don't have the facts on your side when you are arguing your case, well, you should talk about the law. But if you do not have the law on your side and you are handling a case in court, you should talk about the facts.

He went on to suggest if you do not have either one on your side, you ought to just stand up and shout and walk around the courtroom and act like you know what you are talking about.

Mr. President, I would suggest that some of the Republican rhetoric that I have heard in talking about national service takes the approach if you do not have the facts on your side, just make them up and say whatever you want about a program in order to try to show that it is not a good program.

I think it is very important that we stick to the facts when we talk about programs and things we do in Government. I think the public gets so much

misinformation that it is very important to try to point out when the facts are wrong when we talk about programs.

I start off by making these comments because I was really very surprised by the Senator from Iowa, who was on the floor earlier, his remarks regarding national service that I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I supported the program. It was the type of initiative that the President ran on 2 years ago, the type of program that I think is a good program. When I read the gentleman's statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I was flabbergasted. I said, This cannot be true.

In essence, what the Senator was saying was that the AmeriCorps Program, part of the National Service Program, was costing \$70,000 per student—\$70,000 per student—in order to help kids go to college. I said that is ridiculous; I am not going to spend \$70,000 a year to send kids to college. I found out some serious mistakes, in my opinion, were made about characterizing this program that is costing \$70,000 a student in Pennsylvania, in the city of Philadelphia.

What I found out was that the mistake that was made in using these facts was the fact that they did not take into consideration private law firms that were contributing to this individual's salary; they did not take into consideration the Philadelphia Bar Association's contribution in this particular area. When he added up what the private sector was going to do with up to 11 full-time workers, he came up with the figure of \$70,000, when in truth the Federal Government's contribution and the cost to the taxpayers was only \$4,911. That is a big difference from \$70,000.

The AmeriCorps Program, the National Service Program, is really what I think Republicans have always been talking about. Let us get away from giveaway programs. Let Members terminate programs, and just give money away from Washington to get people to do certain things. The essence of what AmeriCorps is all about—and we have had up to 200,000 young men and women in this country volunteer to participate in the AmeriCorps Program. It is a wonderful concept. It builds on the Peace Corps Program.

By the way, Peace Corps Program volunteers get a stipend; they are paid. Just like the Vista Program has young men and women in this program, that participate in the program and do wonderful things, they get a small salary, as well. The concept of AmeriCorps, and why I think Republicans and Democrats alike should be supportive of it, is because it is a partnership between the Government and the citizens of this country.

It talks about community, responsibility, reciprocity; it talks about saying if the Government is going to help me to go to college, I have an obligation to reciprocate and give something back. What they give back in the

AmeriCorps Program is doing community work, doing legal work in the communities, working in a law enforcement program, in a drug rehabilitation program, in a nursing program, an environmental cleanup program, as they are doing in my State of Louisiana, as we are doing in Louisiana where we have young AmeriCorps students who are working in the sheriffs department and local law enforcement.

Mr. President, they are giving something back to a Government that has helped them go to college. It is a partnership. It is not a giveaway program. It does not cost \$70,000 for one young student to be able to participate in this program. It is asking the local community to say, do you need these types of students working in your local town? Most of them are saying, Yes, we need some help. We need some help in the environment. We need some help in drug enforcement programs and drug rehabilitation programs.

So the AmeriCorps Program is not a giveaway program; it is a program that encourages young people to participate. We have an all-volunteer army. They get paid, too. They get a salary so they can survive and so they can live. I do not think they detract from an all-volunteer military. The basic fact is we should be encouraging young men and women to give something back to a Government that has helped them get an education.

As President Clinton has said so many times in this country today, what you earn is going to be based on what you learn. The facts are dramatic, that a young person, a young male in this country that graduates from a 4-year college earns about 83 percent more in his lifetime than a person who has not been able to go to college; 83 percent more in a lifetime. That is not just pie in the sky. That is real facts.

That is something that we as a nation should be encouraging. And we do not encourage it under national service by a giveaway program; we encourage it to be a partnership by saying to that young man or young woman that if you would like to go to college and you need some help, we will help you pay for your tuition. But it is not free; it is not free. You have an obligation to try to give something back to your Government—not in India, not in Japan, not in Europe, not in a Third-World country, but right here in America. That is why it is called AmeriCorps. It is not a foreign aid program. We are not sending kids to other nations to help them solve their problems. We are saying that if you accept this challenge, we will let you work in your local community, back where people know you, where you may ultimately end up working as a citizen in a partnership with your local citizens in your local community.

That is why when someone says, well, this program costs \$70,000 a student, it is absolutely not factual. It does not cost \$70,000 for the taxpayers of this

country. What we have in Philadelphia in this instance is a situation where the local bar association and several law firms in the country have helped put up money to pay the salaries for up to 11 AmeriCorps students who will be working in that community as lawyers and as law students, helping people that have problems, helping people understand the Government and this system. The Federal Government is going to put out \$4,900 to allow that student to work in that community. We have helped them get a college education and they are paying back with their services, and getting enough of a stipend from the Federal Government to at least survive and to be able to continue that work and do it full time. We are talking about full-time workers.

This is not a giveaway program. Does it cost anything? Of course, it costs. But how much does it cost to build a prison? We spend \$300 million for a national program to try to get people to have a partnership with their Government, to get a college education, and give something back to the community. We spend billions of dollars, I suggest, building prisons in this country and running prisons in this country, to incarcerate young men and women who have gone by the wayside, maybe because they did not have a National Service Program, because nobody cared. Nobody told them they have a reciprocal obligation to give something back to a Government that has helped them get a college education.

I have heard Speaker GINGRICH in the other body talk, time and time again, about communities, family, and service, and giving something back to the communities. This program is an example of giving something back to the communities, of national service, of saying: I want to help my Government do better. If my Government helps me get a college education, I am pleased, but I also recognize that it is not free. I will give back to my Government in the same ratio that they have given to me.

I think that produces a stronger community. I think that produces stronger families. I think that produces a sense of what America is all about. So I would suggest when we talk about national service, let Members first get our facts straight. Let Senators first understand the real cost.

I suggest, second, let Senators join together if there are problems, and let us improve the program. Let us not, by incorrect factual information, try to kill a program that I suggest is in keeping with what America is all about.

I yield the floor, Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BASE CLOSINGS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, in less than 2 months the Secretary of Defense will forward to the 1995 Base Closure Commission his so-called "hit list" of military base closings. Although it is an excruciating exercise, I think we would all agree that closing obsolete military bases is a painful necessity.

With the end of the cold war, the Pentagon estimated that 30 percent of our domestic military bases must be shut down. Due in large part to the efforts of Senator SAM NUNN, of Georgia, and former Senator Alan Dixon, of Illinois, Congress created a bipartisan Base Closure Commission to help us make the necessary choices of which bases to close.

I believe the base closure process is sound. It serves as a model of how to make difficult and politically sensitive budget-cutting decisions. The Base Closure Commission successfully completed base closure rounds in 1988, 1991, and 1993.

As this chart to my left indicates, these three rounds of base closings eliminated some 70 military bases throughout America. Some areas and some States were hit harder than others.

On March 1, 1995, the Commission will begin its very important deliberations once again, and before the year is through, the Commission will seek congressional and Presidential approval to close dozens of additional bases. We have been told that this list will be longer and painful. In fact, it has been said that this base closure round will possibly be equal in size to the first three rounds combined.

To be certain, base closings hurt. In communities that lose a base, thousands of jobs are terminated, businesses close down, millions of dollars in annual revenue disappear from sight. Mr. President, I am personally aware of that pain caused by base closure announcements. The 1991 Commission closed Eaker Air Force Base, a B-52 base located in Mississippi County, AR. They also took away a majority of the work at Fort Chaffee near Fort Smith, AR.

Most of our colleagues in the Senate have witnessed the departure of the military in at least one community in their State. My colleagues from California lost eight major military bases in 1993 alone, as this map so indicates.

We have seen communities react with anger and frustration to the news of base closings. We have witnessed their fear about surviving such a tremendous economic blow. For most base closure towns, the military was the largest employer, as in the case of Eaker Air Force Base in Blytheville, AR.

Mr. President, I visited this base in 1992, 1 year after the closure announcement, to see how the local townspeople

were coping with the impending loss of the Air Force.

What I found was a community that desperately wanted to beat swords into plowshares. I found also a community that was receiving virtually no help whatsoever from the Federal Government. In fact, this community claimed that Washington was their largest roadblock to a speedy recovery. The citizens of Blytheville needed the Air Force's cooperation and the Federal Government's resources. What they received instead was bureaucratic lip service and endless red tape.

The same was true in other communities across America. The problems were so severe that the former majority leader, Senator George Mitchell, decided to create a special task force to devise a strategy for easing the impact of defense budget reductions and for making a smooth transition to a post-cold war economy.

Senator Mitchell asked me to become the task force chairman. With 24 Democratic Senate colleagues, we began studying what the Federal Government's role should be, if any, to help in our Nation's ongoing transition from swords to plowshares.

Our 1992 task force concluded that the end of the cold war had caught our country by surprise, and that we were late in devising a national strategy for helping our cold war workers, communities and companies find a new direction.

We also found that the United States of America was better prepared to handle a much larger transition in the years following World War II. As early as 1943, 2 years before the war had ended, President Roosevelt made the decision to begin planning for the war's end and the difficult conversion to a peacetime economy. He had created the War Demobilization Office and charged this new entity with devising a national strategy. From this office emerged the GI bill and many other initiatives that helped our country grow and prosper in the years that followed.

In 1992, however, 3 years after the Iron Curtain began to crack, our Government still had no comprehensive strategy for beating swords into plowshares. History, Mr. President, should have taught us better. The lesson learned after World War II, and in other periods of defense downsizing, was that our Government has a duty to provide comprehensive transition assistance to those affected by reductions in our Nation's defense expenditures.

Some might say, Mr. President, that this is not the function nor the role of Government. I would submit, however, that our Government should become a partner in this endeavor and not an obstacle to economic recovery.

To compensate for our slow start and to finally allow our Government to become a partner instead of an obstacle, our 1992 task force recommended sizable increases in defense reinvestment funding and programs. That same year

to war, who have served their country, and indeed as in the wonderful men who fought at the Battle of the Bulge and saved western civilization. But I wish to speak about another hero, a hero by the name of Sister Mary Adelaide Schmidt, school Sister of Notre Dame who taught me in Catholic elementary school. Sister passed away in the last few days at age of 97. She was born in 1898, when we did not even have the right to vote, but she certainly knew how to empower women, empower us with the message of the gospel, empower us with the skills that we needed to make it in the world, and to know how to claim our womanly virtue and at the same time make a difference.

Sister Adelaide played a special role in my life. This booming voice that you hear on the Senate floor today was a voice that was shy about speaking up when I was in the sixth grade. The same kind of voice, low pitched, husky, that can be heard throughout the Senate Chamber, could be heard throughout the sixth grade at Sacred Heart of Jesus Elementary School. As a result, I was shy about speaking up because my voice was lower than the other girls' in the classroom, when boys voices were changing.

Sister Adelaide asked me to stay after school, brought this out in her kindly way, to have me share that with her. And then for the next couple of weeks she said, let us make sure you know how you sound and how good it is going to make you feel. She had me read poetry, she had me read passages of the Psalms, she had me read out loud from both the Bible and contemporary works of literature. By the time I finished that stretch of time I knew how to speak up; I was comfortable in doing it. Two years later I ran for class president in the eighth grade and, as Paul Harvey says, "You know the rest of the story."

So today I would like to pay tribute to Sister Mary Adelaide and the enormous sacrifice that she made with her life that made a difference in so many others', like my own. And for all of the wonderful men and women who are teachers, and teach in religious day schools: Know that you have made a difference. I believe that they are unsung heroes.

So, Mr. President, I wanted to salute Sister Mary Adelaide.

NATIONAL SERVICE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wanted to speak on the issue of national service. The new issue of Newsweek quotes the new Speaker of the House as unequivocally opposing national service because it is, in his words, "coerced voluntarism."

I believe the new Speaker does not understand national service or the grounding that went on behind it.

As one of the founding godmothers of this initiative, I rise this afternoon to express my dismay at yet another at-

tempt by Republican leaders to distort a bold approach to solving our country's problems.

It appears from these recent comments and others made earlier on the floor today, that some in this Congress will try to lump national service in with every other program headed for the chopping block as part of our institution's budget cutting fever.

Well, I am here today to say that national service is not a Government-run social program. And that is the point that the Speaker and some of national service's critics misunderstand.

It is not a program but a new social invention created to provide access to the American dream of higher education and to help create the ethic of service and civic obligation in today's young people.

Under national service, young Americans receive a reduction in their student debt, or a voucher for higher education, in exchange for full- or part-time community service. Service projects are driven by the choices of local nonprofits organized around one of four broad themes—public health, the environment, public safety, or education.

National service began as a concept with the Democratic Leadership Council and other Democrats like myself in the 1980's. But its purpose was not born of political gamesmanship or partisan advantage. It was designed to address two of the most pressing needs that our country faces. One, how can students pay off their student debt; and how can we create a sense of voluntarism.

The first is the issue of student indebtedness and access to higher education. Most college graduates today face their first mortgage the day they leave college—it is called their student loans. That debt often forces them to make career choices oriented strictly to getting them financially fit for duty.

Worse yet, for many the high cost of higher education simply denies them access to college at all.

By providing a post-service benefit, national service members can ease their student debt, or accrue savings that will help them go to school. It is not an entitlement, and it is not a hand out.

Educational benefits are linked to work service. Participants are eligible only when they have finished their work service commitment.

The second problem national service is designed to address is more idealistic. It is how to instill in young Americans what de Tocqueville called the habits of the heart. To address the sharp drop over the last two decades in the number of Americans who volunteer in their own communities, a fact representative of Americans disinvesting in those social institutions which helped build our country.

Bob Putnam, a Professor at Harvard, has written an article called "Bowling Alone." He says more people bowl today than a decade ago but few bowl

to bowling leagues. So, Senator MIKULSKI, what does that have to do with national service?

The point is bowling alone is a metaphor for the way Americans have come to view civic involvement and citizenship. There has been an absolute decline in developing community involvement. People have less time available because many households have two wage earners instead of one. They are more mobile. We have a society that is more influenced by TV. And they are also less committed. There is a serious lack of a sense of civic obligation.

Fewer people attend PTA, groups like Red Cross and the Boy Scouts have fewer volunteers.

My point in saying this is that national service is an idea that promotes exactly the values that the Republican leader wishes to instill. The fact that we should not rely on Government, that there should be a role for non-profit organizations, that there should be for every opportunity, an obligation; for every right, a responsibility. And that is what national service is about. It is not coercive. Nobody is forced to get into the national service program. But I will tell you what they do. Their lives are significantly changed by it and their communities are significantly changed by it.

Young American men no longer have the shared experience of military service that served for the men of my generation as a rite of passage into adulthood. Where they learned that there was more to being a good citizen than just staying out of trouble. That instead, civic responsibility meant uniting with people of all different walks of life for a common purpose to help people help themselves; to be part of an American effort bigger than themselves.

National service is the latest in a long series of social inventions we have created to help provide access to higher education. We created night schools to teach immigrants English. We created the GI bill for returning veterans, and we invented community colleges to bring higher education close to home at a modest cost.

The argument that national service is coerced voluntarism is a knee-jerk statement that belies the facts. I chaired the Appropriations Subcommittee which has funded national service in the past. In the first 2 years of the Clinton administration, no one coerced anyone to participate. Instead, people were knocking down the doors to join.

Two facts make this point. First of all, there are more people who want to participate than there are opportunities.

In national service's first 2 years, about 1,500 organizations applied for funds. Only 300 were selected because of lack of funds. That is a selection rate of just 20 percent—a lower selection rate than peer-reviewed research grants at either the National Science

Foundation or the National Institutes of Health.

Second, in the current fiscal year, we provided enough funds to get about 23,000 people participating in full- or part-time national service. Yet since the President launched his call for a season of service, the Corporation for National Service has received calls from nearly 200,000 different persons wanting to participate in the program. So just 1 in 10 who have wanted to voluntarily participate have been able to do so.

Now some discount the kind of work undertaken through national service. They say it is trivial, or unnecessary, or even irrelevant. But I can tell you that in my own State of Maryland, national service is making a difference—not with fancy bumper sticker programs or activities that simply touch the surface of what is needed.

For example, 30 national service volunteers in Montgomery County are working with cops as victim assistance advocates for 1,000 senior citizens. They help teach crime prevention techniques and organize neighborhood watch activities. They work every day to make Montgomery County, MD, a safer place to live.

National service is helping senior citizens avoid crime by teaching crime prevention, organizing neighborhood watchdogs and rural, urban. In suburban areas they have service corps related to conservation. They are rehabilitating houses for low-income families. When we were hit by tornadoes, the National Service Corps moved in and helped families help themselves to be able to pull themselves out of the tragedy that affected them. There are many criticisms of national service, and Senator GRASSLEY raised a few related to bureaucracy. I do think we need to make sure that bureaucracy is kept at a minimum.

Mr. President, regardless about how one feels about it as an organization, let us not lose sight of the mission. We need new social inventions in this country to take us into the 21st century just like we need new technological inventions. We have continued creating social inventions that have provided access to the American dream around owning a home and acquiring higher education. In terms of acquiring education, we in the United States of America invented night school so immigrants could be able to learn English, citizenship, and move ahead. No other country in the world had it until we invented it. There is the GI bill that said "thank you" to Americans who made sacrifices in World War II, and part of that was to be able to have a VA mortgage and a VA opportunity to seek higher education. We even invented the community college system to make sure that you did not have to go away to be able to learn.

National service is an opportunity. It is an organization right now that is providing volunteer slots of 20,000 people a year to actually work hands on in

their own community, primarily working through nonprofits and enabling themselves to pay off their student debt, helping the community. Mr. President, I believe their lives will be changed. I believe that when the voucher part of this program is over they will go on volunteering the rest of their lives.

I think it is an important program. I hope that before we go around attacking some of these programs that we take a look at their mission. If we have to fine tune the administrative aspects of it, so be it. But I believe national service is an important part of our national agenda and should have bipartisan support.

In rural, urban, and suburban places around Maryland, the Maryland service corps—like the Maryland Conservation Corps, Civic Works in Baltimore, and Community Year in Montgomery County—are teaming up to rehabilitate houses for low-income families.

These are but two examples of hundreds of ones that are taking place across America in 49 of the 50 States. They are fighting to make a difference in people's lives, 1 day at a time, one person at a time. Because in today's culture of mass marketing, mass production, and mass advertising, we need to teach every young American that he or she can make a difference. Whether they are from a middle-class suburb, a tough inner-city neighborhood, or a rural county that's economy is driven by the labor of the land.

Earlier today, one of my colleagues alluded to a General Accounting Office study that I initiated when I chaired the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee. It is a routine review of the administrative costs of national service activities designed to help us improve it where possible, and guarantee as much money goes into service activities instead of overhead.

The fact that we began it in the last Congress demonstrates the long-standing desire of those who support the program to make it bipartisan, and focused on results, not rhetoric. It doesn't indicate any evidence that this initiative is off-track or funds wasteful service efforts.

To suggest otherwise is simply to let one's rhetoric get ahead of the facts.

So, I for one, look forward to the GAO's findings and intend to use them to improve national service, not undermine it.

As the new Republican majority takes shape in both Houses of Congress, I hope that they keep an open mind on national service. Rather than criticizing it, national service seems to be the kind of program they should like.

Service choices are selected on the basis of merit, not political muscle. And those choices are made at the State and local level, not by bureaucrats in Washington.

It rewards the kind of values like sweat equity and hard work that are the heart of American family life. It

does not identify with victims, but instead calls people to self-responsibility—by helping not just yourself, but others too.

What better way to help a young woman on welfare but to help her understand that she can not only receive help, but provide it to others as well.

Benefits are earned through work, not a Government handout. There is no entitlement.

And national service promotes the kind of social cohesion—rich and poor, black and white—best achieved by people working together, a theme the new Speaker outlines so eloquently in his maiden speech as Speaker.

I worked for many years as a social worker and community organizer in Baltimore. I learned from that experience more than I have ever learned from memos and briefings in Washington. I am a better Senator because of what I learned from the people and the communities I worked with every day. The people who work in national service are also learning and being changed by their experience too.

It was 35 years ago that President Kennedy challenged Americans to ask not what their country could do for them, but what they could do for their country. In that spirit, I will join the President and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in fighting to preserve national service in the days and months ahead.

I yield the floor under the unanimous-consent agreement that we had agreed to.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, thank you very much.

Mr. President, it was going to be my intent to seek unanimous consent that we proceed to a vote of the pending amendment before us, which, as I understand it, is the amendment on page 15, lines 23, 24, 25, and on page 16, line 1. But it is my understanding that there would be objection to that. Therefore, Mr. President, in order to continue to proceed forward, I move to table this amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho to lay on the table the committee amendment on page 115, lines 23, 24, and 25, and on page 16, line 1. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH], the Senator from Texas

11/28/95

Rick:

These
Are the
negative
statements
per your request.

Patty

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 31 and Wednesday, November 1, 1995 to hold hearings on Global Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

VA, HUD, INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to take this time to explain some of the votes I cast during consideration of the VA, HUD, independent agencies appropriations bill on September 27, 1995.

Senator BUMPERS offered an amendment to reduce the appropriation for implementing the space station program with the intent of terminating the program. The Bumpers amendment raised the question as to what the United States fundamental goals and needs are in exploring space. While it is clear that the space station has spurred technological and scientific development unrelated to space, I am not convinced that these developments justify the enormous taxpayer expense of the space station. Therefore, at this time, I supported Senator BUMPERS' amendment. Since the amendment failed, however, we will most likely continue to fund the space station for fiscal year 1996, and as we spend more on this program we will come closer to a point at which it would no longer be wise to discontinue funding. I believe we are near that point and will review this budget request again next year to determine whether eliminating funding for the space station would benefit taxpayers.

Senator ROCKEFELLER offered two amendments regarding benefits for veterans. One involved compensation for mentally incompetent service-related disabled veterans and the other would have increased funding for the general veterans medical account. My opposition to these amendments was not based on their content, but rather on the fact that the funding mechanism for both of these amendments involved waiving the Budget Act. More than any veteran-specific funding we can provide, balancing the budget will benefit veterans and their children. Any amendment which increases spending and puts our country further from achieving a balanced budget ought to be rejected. And while I do not doubt that Senator ROCKEFELLER's amendments have merit, his inability to find other spending offsets made them impossible for me to support.

Senator LAUTENBERG also proposed to waive provisions of the Budget Act in order to provide more funding for the

Superfund Program. While I share Mr. LAUTENBERG's concern for the environment, very few Americans familiar with the Superfund Program would disagree that it is in need of reform. We have spent billions of dollars on the Superfund Program already, and the results have been minimal. Superfund has resulted in more lawsuits, more paperwork, extreme cleanup mandates, and few cleanups. This is a classic attempt to throw good tax dollars after bad. Without meaningful reform of the program, I am not convinced that Superfund dollars are being well-spent, making it impossible for me to support this amendment.

Senator MIKULSKI offered an amendment which would have restored \$425 million in funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service. While I applaud her efforts to encourage Americans to provide more service to their communities, this program costs \$26,000 per participant per year—a level which cannot be sustained in the current budget environment.

Furthermore, I could not support funding for this program upon learning that \$14 million out of last year's AmeriCorps funds were used to fund Federal agencies. While the administration claims it is cutting staff, they are actually playing a shell game with taxpayers' dollars by using AmeriCorps workers in the Federal Government. I am confident that the original supporters of this program did not intend for these volunteers to choose Federal employment as their community service.

Forty percent of the dollars currently spent on AmeriCorps is used for administrative purposes by the Federal Government. These funds would be more efficiently and effectively spent on a local rather than a national level.

Another amendment which touched on an important social issue was the Sarbanes amendment to transfer \$360 million from section 8 contract renewals to homeless assistance grants to increase funding for Federal homeless programs. Most Americans share a common concern regarding the plight of the homeless and agree that the Government should play a role in the solution. Nevertheless, I voted against this amendment for two reasons.

First, the underlying bill provides \$760 million for homeless grants, with an additional \$297 million in homeless grants funding available from the earlier rescission bill, which deferred this funding from fiscal year 1995 to fiscal year 1996. In total, homeless programs will have \$1.057 billion to spend in fiscal year 1996. The Sarbanes amendment would not increase this funding by one penny. All the funds he proposes to transfer would not be available until fiscal year 1997. In other words, this amendment would not have helped one homeless person next year.

Second, I was concerned that an unintended consequence of this amendment would be to increase homelessness. The bill provides \$4.35 billion in funding for section 8 contract renewal.

Section 8 subsidizes the construction and operation of apartment buildings, provided the owner agrees to rent a certain percentage of those apartments to low-income people. Currently, 1.5 million units are subsidized in this fashion, and many of these contracts are due to expire. If they are not renewed, many of the tenants will lose their homes.

In order to pay for the increase in homeless funding, Senator SARBANES would have reduced funding for renewing section 8 contracts. By taking away from this account, this amendment threatens to put people currently housed under the section 8 program on the street. The Federal Government has a role to play in helping the homeless, and in this case the underlying bill fills this role by addressing the needs of people already living on the streets as well as ensuring we don't encourage additional families to join them.

Overall I believe we have produced a solid appropriations bill, one which stays within the budget limitations necessary to balance the budget by the year 2002, delegates much of the funding to States in the form of block grants so that spending is more effective, and revises or eliminates programs that simply have not been working. I was proud to support final passage of this legislation. •

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

• Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, on October 20, a letter from four former National Security Advisers was sent to the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations expressing their support for the work of the National Endowment for Democracy [NED]. According to these four distinguished experts, NED "has served our national interest well through its timely support of those who advance the cause of democracy."

As we make the difficult budgetary choices that will help guarantee for us and our children a prosperous future, it is essential that we not discard those programs—particularly those that are cost-effective—which enhance our long-term security. As the following letter from Messrs. Allen, Brzezinski, Carlucci, and Scowcroft points out, the National Endowment for Democracy is such a program.

I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD. The letter follows:

OCTOBER 20, 1995.

HON. JESSE HELMS,
HON. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee Washington, DC.

HON. BENJAMIN GILMAN,
HON. LEE HAMILTON,
House International Relations Committee, Washington, DC.

As former National Security Advisers to the President, we are familiar with the work of the National Endowment for Democracy (NED). In our assessment, NED, established under President Reagan as an instrument in

placed a bomb on board, but a nation-wide investigation, costing an estimated \$60-million, has left the crime still unsolved.

According to Soft Target, some senior CSIS officials and one RCMP officer eventually concluded that an Indian intelligence service was probably the real culprit. After all, a number of persons associated with the Indian government had cancelled their reservations on the doomed flight. And why did the Indian consul-general in Toronto have a near-perfect account of what happened so soon after the event?

Moreover, a similar bombing had occurred at the Madras airport in southern India about a year earlier, most probably caused by the Third agency, an Indian intelligence group created in the early eighties to win support for Indira Gandhi's government by encouraging Sikh extremists in Punjab. One group at CSIS concluded from the exclusively circumstantial evidence available that most likely the Third agency ordered the bombing, knowing that suspicion would fall on Sikhs generally and Canadian ones in particular. Another CSIS group inferred that the planting of a bomb was not authorized in New Delhi, but originated solely with local security agents.

Some Canadians became convinced that Talwinder Singh Parmar, head of a tiny extremist Sikh group based in Vancouver, the Babbar Khalsa, was the Air-India murderer. The RCMP, say Kashmeri and McAndrew, eventually decided that Parmar was an agent of the government of India. They query why, among numerous contradictions, a major financial backer of Parmar in Vancouver received a \$2 million loan from the State Bank of India (Canada). By early 1989, Parmar had disappeared, and Joe Clark finally ordered several Indian diplomats to leave. Until then, as detailed carefully in Soft Target, Clark and his officials had accommodated the Indian government repeatedly in ways that seemed to have the effect of poisoning the minds of Canadians against Sikhs.

This controversial book examines some important issues and is largely convincing. All who want Ottawa to do the correct thing for correct reasons in both domestic and foreign policy should read it.

IS AMERICORPS WORTH KEEPING?

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I think you will find Susan Molinari's article on AmeriCorps informative:

IS AMERICORPS WORTH KEEPING?

(By Susan Molinari)

Volunteerism is a tremendously American tradition. Few of us, however, would characterize a volunteer as someone who is paid (more than minimum wage) receives medical benefits and child care allowances, and gets a \$5,000 education stipend.

Welcome to the AmeriCorps world of volunteerism.

The Clinton administration's year-old AmeriCorps program is riddled with problems, not the least of which is that it's too expensive to administer. That's why the Senate followed the House's lead and voted on Tuesday to completely de-fund AmeriCorps. The government simply must stop making financial commitments it can't keep, especially when we have to rob other needed programs to do so.

OTHER PROGRAMS SUFFER

Despite that fact that we were able to fund the 20,000 AmeriCorps "volunteers," we could not, for instance, fully fund either the Pell Grant or the Stafford Loan program, both of which help thousands more.

For every AmeriCorps participant who got education dollars, five students could get Pell Grants. Factor in other, noneducation costs for one volunteer to participate in AmeriCorps, and the number of Pell Grants that could be funded jumps to 18.

Some of AmeriCorps' high costs are directly attributable to the way this "volunteer" program is administered. The non-partisan, independent General Accounting Office estimates that it costs \$27,000 per participant to run the program, and this figure jumps to \$33,000 when the dropout rate is factored in.

AmeriCorps' overhead, including \$2 million in payments to a public relations firm, accounts for some of the more than \$10,000-per-participant cost overruns from the \$17,000 originally estimated. More than half the cost of the program goes to pay for the bureaucrats who administer it.

According to the GAO, the price tag to the federal government for one AmeriCorps volunteer is \$15.30 per hour, including salary, health and child care benefits. This doesn't include the education stipend, training or administrative overhead. When you plug in the money cities, states and private sources kick in, the cost per hour for one volunteer's time jumps to \$19.60, again minus education stipend, training and overhead. Originally, this number was supposed to be \$6.43 per hour.

While government costs soar way over initial projections, private contributions have been much lower than expected. Rather than picking up half the costs, as was promised at the outset, private funds make up only 7% of the cost for each volunteer, the GAO now estimates.

Rather than costly new government bureaucracies, we have a better way to encourage charity and foster community spirit. For decades we have used the tax code to create just such an atmosphere, through deductions for charitable contributions. And we have a better way to fund the education of middle and lower-income students—by fully funding existing programs such as Pell Grants, to the extent resources will allow.

I admire the 20,000 young men and women who have joined AmeriCorps, as I admire the 89.2 million Americans who volunteer—without pay—their 19 billion hours worth of time each year. Trying to encourage volunteerism through a big-government approach, however, does more to encourage bureaucrats than community service.

AmeriCorps participants do worthy work, but the real substance of American-style volunteerism is proven every day by those who are willing to give their time to make others' lives better.

MEDICARE REFORM

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today about the subject of Medicare. It is a topic that has been in the headlines and on the news every day now for weeks. It is on the minds of almost every constituent I see. It is among the foremost issues we are addressing here in this body, and definitely, I think it

would be safe to say, is the current major concern of seniors across America.

The GOP has put out a plan to cut Medicare. Based on what is known or perhaps I should say not known in terms of legislative language being unavailable, this plan is one which it seems will have a devastating impact on the most vulnerable of Americans—senior citizens.

In a letter I received from the Families USA Foundation it spoke about how seniors will lose guaranteed health protections that they have today. It spoke about how these individuals will lose out-of-pocket health cost protections at the same time that pending proposals would double Medicare premiums. We're talking about out-of-pocket health costs which already consume more than one-fourth of seniors' incomes.

What this says to me is that something is drastically wrong—that this is not the path to pursue.

Allow me quote from a letter I received this week from a Texas senior:

As a Senior Citizen and drawing Social Security, which I earned, I would like to input my viewpoint on Medicare. I am more fortunate than some of my widow friends in the amount that I get each month, but with the price of living today it is not very much. Out of this Social Security deducts \$46.00 per month and believe me this covers very little, so in order to pay for health care I am forced to take a supplemental policy that costs me \$65.00 per month. If Congress cuts any part of this Medicare care it will force all of us to go on the county medical care for the indigent. Can you imagine what that would do to the whole country if all the people on Medicare had to go that way. Most of us have worked hard all our lives and paid our bills, but what the government has done . . . is unforgivable . . . and NOW they want to put us all on WELFARE.

This is typical of what I am hearing. People are frightened. People are scared. And rightly so.

My party is closely identified with Medicare. Democrats first conceived of Medicare and led the effort to enact the program into law. We have been its champions ever since. This program has been a success, helping to provide health care to millions of Americans who otherwise could not afford it. That is not bad as so many today would have us believe. It is good. If changes need to be made then our goal must be to work together to determine what it is we need to do that is positive and will continue to protect our Nation's seniors. That is what I am wholeheartedly committed to doing.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO INCREASE DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will restore equity and fairness in the tax treatment of the nation's small business entrepreneurs. The Self-Employed Health Fairness Act amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals to 100% of such costs.

ask for 6, 7, minutes as in morning business at this point.

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

A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to talk a little bit about the balanced budget that we have put forth and that we all worked so hard for—at least on this side of the aisle. I am going to put it into the framework of the Secretary of Treasury, Mr. Rubin, talking to the American people and us about that day sometime after October 20, perhaps before November 15, in that timeframe, when the debt limit that we have imposed upon ourselves expires, and in order to borrow additional money, Congress has to act to raise that debt limit. Essentially, that is being discussed with the American people. I am not sure they all quite understand what that means.

I want to, in a sense, respond as I see it to the fear that the Secretary of the Treasury is pushing across this land in terms of that debt limit day.

First of all, Congress has never given up the power to tell the President and those who work for him, like the Secretary of Treasury how much they can borrow. Occasionally, it seemed kind of strange to me because Congress passes all these laws to spend money, and everybody votes on those, and then when it comes time to extend the debt, people say, "We will not extend the debt." But I am beginning to understand that power to control the debt limit is very important, especially in this year and years like this one.

The Secretary of the Treasury is saying to us, "You'd better agree to extend that debt limit because if you do not, something very ominous might happen." Then he talks about such things as default and we will not be able to pay interest on some bonds.

First of all, let me make it very clear from the standpoint of the Senator from New Mexico, who put this budget resolution together, and look at it from my vantage point as to the seriousness of that contention on the part of the Secretary that we had better be prepared to let that go up.

Now, I see it this way. I think there are two major events that are coming together in the month of November. One is described by the Secretary of the Treasury with all of those ominous tones about what will happen; the other is whether we are going to get a balanced budget—no smoke and mirrors—and entitlement reform.

Frankly, many people are now experts on this Federal budget. Interest rates out there on bonds affect our standard of living because it affects interest rates on many things. Those who look at that know precisely what is a balanced budget and what is not a balanced budget.

Mr. President, we know precisely what the big ingredient in a balanced budget is. The big one is reforming the

entitlement programs that are out of control—Medicare, Medicaid. I did not say cut them, I said reform them. In addition, we must look at commodity price supports and a whole list of programs that are on automatic pilot.

If we do not stop them and change them, they just spin, some at a 10-percent increase a year, some 12. We had Medicaid in some States, increasing as much as 19 percent a year. I think we had as high as a 28-percent increase in one year in Medicaid—28 percent, automatic. Experts on the Federal budget know if you do not fix those and if your assumptions are not honest, then you have a budget that is smoke and mirrors, and ineffective.

Now, what I am saying to Members on the other side and others who will listen is do not jump to the conclusion that the most serious event is the day that we do not extend the debt limit when it needs to be extended.

Actually, an equally important day is coming when the President of the United States has to decide whether he wants to help us get a real—no smoke and mirrors—entitlement reform budget. Both of them are important events.

I will not place one above the other because I believe we must do everything we can this year—not next year, that is an election year; not 2 years from now; right now, this year. We have to get a balanced budget, with no assumptions that are too optimistic, and one that changes entitlement programs to reduce their ever dramatic increases.

Now, I cannot put it any better than that. I am not suggesting I am for a default. I am suggesting that is an important event. I believe we have to put the other event right up there alongside it. We have to serve notice on the Secretary of the Treasury and the President that we are not just going to run out on this balanced budget. We think we have done a job. We think it is positive. We think it is right.

Let me close by saying the reason that this is a big event is because for the first time in 31 years, elected officials are saying, "We care about the future. It is not about today only. It is about the future. And we care about our children, not ourselves. We care about those yet unborn as much as ourselves." If we really believe that, we cannot continue to spend at what is currently, believe it or not, \$482 million a day—a day. That is the amount we are adding to the debt every day—\$482 million. That is a lot.

Who will pay it? If we are standing up saying we do not care, well, somebody is going to pay it. Do you know who is going to? The next generation, with a lost standard of living, because too much of the income has to come back up here and pay for our profligacy.

That is not right. That is a big event for adult leaders. It is just as big an event as the event that is closing upon us on whether we increase the debt limit, to let us borrow more or not.

I do not think the Secretary or the President should read anything more into my statement than what I have said. It is pretty clear that I am not running off in some kind of trepidation because we are being told about this need to extend the debt limit. For those who wonder about that debt limit extension, let me suggest—none of which I advocate—but there are a number of ways the Secretary of the Treasury can pay some bills out there after that debt limit is extended, without extending it. They know it. The Secretary knows it.

There are at least four. A couple of them have serious political ramifications. A couple of them they could use. It may be they do not want to do that, even when push comes to shove. But we do not want to abandon our balanced budget. And I am repeating, the kind of balanced budget we are talking about involves no optimistic economic assumptions, no smoke and mirrors. It is entitlement reform that is consistent with what is happening to the budget under current entitlement programs which, run unabated, have no relationship to what we can afford, just merrily run along, causing the debt to increase at \$428 million a day.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE BUDGET AND SPENDING

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, while we are trying to arrange a vote here on this important amendment, I would just revisit what our distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee was talking about: the budget and spending.

Mr. President, the present budget for the fiscal year is \$1.518 trillion, in other words, one trillion five hundred eighteen billion dollars. The budget under consideration, of which this State, Justice, Commerce appropriation is a part thereof, is \$1.602 trillion. So, one trillion six hundred two billion dollars means spending is going up \$84 billion.

Which reminds me of my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Texas, always talking about those in the wagon who are going to have to get outside the wagon and start pulling it. The funny thing, like Pogo, "We have met the enemy," we have met those in the wagon, "and it is us." We have been spending literally hundreds of billions more than we are taking in each year. While the budget itself increases some \$84 billion, interest costs increase \$348 billion, or \$1 billion a day, as has just been referred to by the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee.

That is what is bothering this Senator—the reality of it all. We push and pull and tug and talk about those in the wagon, out of the wagon, and hard choices and biting bullets. But the comeuppance is that we continue to spend way more, and we act like we can actually eliminate the deficit by cutting spending. That is absolutely false. It is going to take taxes.

They do not want to say the word "taxes" around this town except to cut them, because a little poll you take, whether it is a Republican poll or a Democratic poll, says that is political poison. A hot-button item is what they call it. So what you do is you get out and you are for the family and you are against taxes. You are against crime and for prisons and on and on, this nonsensical charade we are engaged in.

The truth is, having been in the vineyards here, trying our dead-level best with others. We tried a freeze. Then we tried a freeze and spending cuts. Then we tried a freeze, spending cuts and loophole closings. Then we tried a freeze, spending cuts, loophole closings and a value-added tax. And then just most recently, we opposed new programs that we cannot afford—AmeriCorps.

I stated yesterday the AmeriCorps Program took away 346,000 student loans in order to fund 20,000 to 25,000 student loans. Actually, it is the Federal Government cost of some \$20,000 per student on AmeriCorps, plus \$6,000 from private and local government resources, so it is \$26,000. I remember when I got out of law school, if I could have gotten paid \$26,000 I would have jumped for joy. I would have jumped for joy.

I can tell you now—voluntarism? At \$26,000 a head, you call it volunteer? Let us cut out the charade and get down to brass tacks and realize it is going to be way, way more than any kind of spending cuts.

The idea of a broad-based consumption tax I proposed over 10 years ago, almost 15 years ago. Now they are copying the idea to replace—I have been through about seven tax reforms in my 28, almost 29 years. The need is not to replace; the need is to replenish. What we need is more money, not different money. So the flat tax is now a wave—a hot-button item, again in the poll, where we are just going to do it one way and replace the income and replace the corporate and replace everything, every other kind of tax. The truth of the matter is, rather than cutting taxes, we need to increase the taxes. And the bill to increase the taxes is presently, and has been, in the Finance Committee for the past 4 or 5 years. I have introduced it right regularly. They quit having hearings on it.

I will never forget the one hearing we had 5 years ago with Senator Bentsen as chairman. As I was leaving the Finance Committee room, a couple of the Finance Committee members said, "If we had a secret ballot we would pass that thing out unanimously. We need it

now." That was before the 1992 election for President Bush's reelection.

Of course, we were up to then \$400 billion deficits, and the Democrats did not win the 1992 election so much as the Republicans lost that election. I campaigned in it. I know it intimately.

Once again, we are going through the tortures of big talk about how we are really going to balance this budget by the year—they put it out where nobody can get their hands on it—2002; 7 years hence. We used to do it in a year. Then we went to 3 years. Then we went to 5 years. This crowd over here has it for 7 years. And the President has it for 10 years. You meet another Congress and they will have it in 15 years and up, up and away.

But they do not want to write that. They write in a very reverent, respectful, studious term—the media does—that the present budget on which we are now torturing would balance in the year 2002. That is absolutely false. It has no chance of doing it. Simple arithmetic—it is not going to take care of the interest payments. The interest payments are \$1 billion a day. There is no plan here. The cuts? You take the consummate cuts right across the board, there is not \$1 billion a day to get on top of the increases.

Like the famous character in "Alice in Wonderland", in order to stay where we are, we have to run as fast as we can. In order to get ahead, we have to run even faster.

That is the reality. Nobody wants to talk about it because the poison in politics is taxes. I will never forget, back in 1949, 1950, when Jimmy Byrnes—former Senator Byrnes, Secretary of State, Supreme Court Justice, Governor—he had just come in as Governor. I had a little committee. I said, "This is South Carolina, our little lowest per-capita income State next to Mississippi. We have ground to a halt. We need money. We are going to have to put in a sales tax."

We could not even get the senators to meet with us. We just had House members. I chaired that House group. We sold the idea to Governor Byrnes, and he put it over. Mind you me, we never could have done it without the Governor's leadership. But we put in a sales tax at that particular time for public education, so that then, when we went out and solicited industrial development in South Carolina, we could talk not only of good schools, but fiscally-responsible government.

We did not balance that budget in South Carolina until I finally came in, in 1958. I again raised taxes over the objections. What we did was we got the first triple A credit rating from Texas all the way up to Maryland. So, as a young Governor, I had, as a calling card, a triple A credit rating, which South Carolina has now lost, again with this item of growth—growth. And we are going to have a property tax cut and we are not going to pay the bills and we are going to put the nuclear facility up for sale and start storing nu-

clear waste all over again at Savannah River; going backwards.

That virus is at the local level, at the Federal level and throughout the land. We have to kill it if we are ever going to get competitive internationally.

If we can pay our bills, develop a competitive trade policy, cut out this nonsense about free trade and join the real world and get a competitive trade policy—Cordell Hull said reciprocal trade policy—then we will begin to survive and rebuild this economy and clean up our cities and get rid of the drug and crime problems and come forward like a great America that I came into in my early years.

With this plan, these programs now have been taken over by the pollsters and we are going right straight down the tubes. We are talking nonsense. The media is going along with it. They think it is great progress. It is not great progress—a half a hair cut—because we had that great progress last year and we had that great progress the year before. We had the great progress the year before that. Like Tennessee Ernie Ford, "another day older and deeper in debt." The debt continues to go and grow and go and grow. It took us 200 years of our history before Ronald Reagan came to town. When he came to town after that 200 years and 38 Presidents, Republican and Democrat, we were less than \$1 trillion. And \$903 billion was the deficit and debt. We had with President Ford an economic summit, and everything else of that kind after the OPEC cartel crisis, and what have you. When President Reagan came to town, he said, "First I am going to balance the budget in a year," and then said, "Oops—this is way worse than I thought. It is going to take 3 years. We are going to get rid of waste, fraud, and abuse."

We had the Grace Commission. I served on the Grace Commission. I got me a picture here earlier this year, but Peter Grace and I started implementing his savings. We had to report annually. By 1989 we had implemented some 85 percent of the Grace program. But then we stopped, and we quit reporting.

But the truth is the Budget Committees have come along. Republicans and Democrats have voted for taxes in the Budget Committee. We got eight votes for a value-added tax because back 5 years ago, we could see the coming default and the debt growing up, up, and away.

So now after Reaganomics, voodoo, riverboat gamble, now we have voodoo all over again. We are talking about it again by the very author of voodoo, the chairman of the Finance Committee. That started off as—what is that football player's name? Kemp. Yes. That is right. Kemp-Roth. I remember when the distinguished majority leader said we are not going that direction. He said, "You cannot go that way. We have got to start paying the bills." But the Presidential political pressures that come from GINGRICH to go to GRAMM to come to DOLE have got us all

talking nonsense here on the floor of the U.S. Congress. We are talking again in the Finance Committee of devastating health care. Last year, they were saying, "Oh, What is the matter? We have the best health care on the planet." Last year, we had a survey by the very group they quote this year that said Medicare was going broke by the year 2001. This year they are saying it is going broke by the year 2002. Now they say what they are trying to do is save it.

Well, they come in with a contract that increases the deficit and Medicare some \$25 billion because, yes, without that contract crowd, we voted to increase taxes on Social Security, liquor, cigarettes, gasoline, and everything else and cut spending \$500 billion which has the stock market and the economy, they say, going up and away. But the truth is that of that \$25 billion that we got from the increase in Social Security taxes, we allocated it to Medicare and they said, "Abolish that." No. We do not believe in that. They are playing the game, the pollster proposition of Social Security and saying that we are trying to frighten the American people.

The debt now has gone not just to \$1 trillion as it did in 1981, but to \$2 trillion, to \$3 trillion, to \$4 trillion. It is right now at \$4.9 trillion, and it is going up \$5 trillion and on and away, because of what? We are in the wagon. The kids, the children, the grandchildren are the ones pulling the wagon. We are acting like the taxpayers are the ones pulling the wagon. Well, they can hardly move the wagon. The wagon is drifting back. It is not being pulled. It is gradually going backward into debt, and we are on board.

For the last 15 years, the Senator from New Mexico and I have been working in the Budget Committee, and it has gotten worse and worse. The rhetoric has gotten better. We really have them fooled—everybody out in the land, particularly in this editorial column crowd saying we are making progress, that we are going to balance the budget.

We are not even near it. We are doing some cutting. We are devastating programs. But we are not balancing any budget because we will not do all of the above, and all of the above includes taxes. And we need that tax increase allocated to the deficit, and the debt.

Let us get on top of this fiscal cancer, excise it once and for all, and then start spending the amount of money that we need on Government itself rather than on past profligacy and waste. If you had a \$74.8 billion interest cost in 1980 and in 1996 in the President's budget, it is \$346 billion, that means the interest cost alone has gone up to \$273 billion. That is exactly the level of domestic discretionary spending. You take Congress, the courts, the Presidency, you take the Department of Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, Treasury—go right on across the Gov-

ernment itself, take the departments and domestic discretionary spending, it is right at \$273 billion. We could double that budget, if we were not wasting it on the interest cost on the national debt.

That interest is what I call "taxes." This crowd that says they are not against taxes is really for taxes. There are two things in life: Death, and taxes. You cannot avoid them. There is a third thing. It is the interest cost on the national debt. It cannot be avoided.

So what we are doing talking about no, we are not going to increase taxes, is, yes, we are going to cut taxes. The truth of the matter is we are going to cut taxes in order to increase the taxes more so the debt can go up so the interest costs or the taxes on that debt go up. You pay it, not avoid it, and you do not get anything more.

But we are in the wagon. All of us are in the wagon, and the children and the grandchildren, are hopefully going to pull it. I hope the country just does not come down in fiscal chaos. But whatever it is, we are in the wagon, and we are raising taxes every day \$1 billion. We have a tax increase on automatic pilot in this Government of \$1 billion a day. We are talking about cutting taxes. That is how ludicrous, ridiculous, and outrageous this whole rhetoric has gotten in the treatment by the media itself. They do not want to report the truth. They do not want to report the facts. They go along with the political charade.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHELBY). The Senator from Massachusetts.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2819

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to restore funds for the Legal Services Corporation.

The words inscribed on the wall of the Supreme Court building capture the idea at the very heart of our constitutional democracy: "Equal Justice Under Law."

The Constitution guarantees to every man and woman in this country the same rights and privileges before the law. Indeed, we require Federal judges to take an oath to render justice equally to the poor and to the rich.

But our courts are largely powerless to render justice to persons who are too poor to afford a lawyer to assist them in protecting their legal rights. And a constitutional right without a remedy is no constitutional right at all.

The bill reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee would unleash

an unprecedented assault on the rights of our most impoverished citizens. It would eliminate the Legal Services Corporation, which Congress established more than 20 years ago with the active support of President Richard Nixon.

And though it would authorize the Attorney General to make civil legal assistance block grants to the States through the Office of Justice Programs, it would not earmark one penny of funds for this program and it would impose unprecedented and excessive restrictions on the ability of legal services programs to represent poor people.

There are compelling reasons why the legal services program should be administered by an independent Federal corporation. First, and foremost, litigation to protect the legal rights of poor people often antagonizes powerful interests in the community. President Nixon recognized this when he introduced what later became the Legal Services Corporation Act. He said,

The program is concerned with social issues and is thus subject to unusually strong political pressures * * * if we are to preserve the strength of the program we must make it immune to political pressures and make it a permanent part of our system of justice.

Many of my colleagues will recall that Federal support for civil legal services for the poor was first provided by the Office of Economic Opportunity [OEO] and later by the Community Services Administration, each of which was part of the executive branch. But in the early 1970's, the Federal program became the subject of heated political debate.

During this period, President Nixon's Commission on Executive Reorganization concluded that the legal services program should not be maintained in the executive branch and that a new structure should be created to administer the program.

Congress responded to that recommendation with passage of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974. In its Statement of Findings and Declaration of Purpose, Congress found that "to preserve its strength, the legal services program must be kept free from the influence of or use by it of political pressures"; and "attorneys providing legal assistance must have full freedom to protect the best interests of their clients in keeping with * * * [professional responsibility] and the high standards of the legal profession."

An independent Federal corporation remains the best way today to assure that powerful constituencies do not pressure legal services lawyers not to protect their clients' legal rights. A block grant program simply cannot insulate these lawyers from political pressure.

Nothing in the bill requires States to apply for block grant funds. Nothing in the bill prohibits States from denying block grant funds to programs that challenge unlawful State actions.

S 14498

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

September 28, 1995

wrote the Congressional Budget Office. I said that my friends on the other side of the aisle continued to talk in terms of a balanced budget by the year 2002.

I ask unanimous consent that I may include the letter in the RECORD dated September 25 from the Congressional Budget Office, June E. O'Neill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
 Washington, DC, September 25, 1995.

Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
 U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your letter of September 20 concerning CBO's scoring of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996 adopted by the Congress. Because a budget resolution represents a general plan for future Congressional action rather than specific legislative proposals, CBO cannot provide estimates for a budget resolution in the same sense that it estimates appropriation bills or bills that provide changes in direct spending or revenues. CBO has compared the spending, revenues, and deficits proposed by the budget resolution with those projected by CBO in Chapter Three of its August 1995 report, *The Economic and Budget Outlook: An Update*. A copy of that report has been enclosed.

If you wish further details about this comparison, we will be pleased to provide them. The staff contact is Jim Horney.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BLUM
 (For June E. O'Neill).

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Republican budget, the Kasich budget, the Gingrich budget, or whatever budget you want to call it that they are talking about balancing, has never been scored.

The distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee is here and we worked together when he was ranking member and I was chairman. I can tell you here and now, after we passed that budget in May, we sent over the assumptions so that the Congressional Budget Office could score it. Those scores have never been sent over. From time to time they have asked questions: If we do this, we save that; if we do this, we save that.

But we do not have a CBO-scored figure for President Clinton's budget and we do not have a CBO figure for the Republican budget.

Watching all of this as it occurs, at this particular time, I can guarantee you that it will not be balanced in the year 2002. And anybody who wants to bet me, pick out the odds and the amount. I will jump off the Capitol dome if this budget is balanced by the year 2002. I can tell you that here and now.

What happens is exactly what happened, as the distinguished Presiding Officer and I viewed it this morning in the Committee of Commerce. We were allocated \$15 billion. What did we do? We took \$8.3 billion that we have already allocated in the telecom bill. So we double-counted that already. Talk about smoke and mirrors. We are not going to have smoke and mirrors. I understand, of course, that in the Finance

Committee they were \$80 billion shy last week.

Someone said, no, they got up, meeting last night, to about \$15 billion, and they are still trying to find it. But if they go through with the contract and do away with the Social Security tax increase, they will have to find another \$25 billion. They are shy there.

I can go to welfare reform. We passed welfare reform. It was a \$63 billion savings. The budget that they say is going to be balanced called for a \$113 billion savings. That is \$50 billion shy there. The agricultural and everything crowd said, no, we had not met our figure. It is smoke and mirrors.

So what you see now is the moment of truth. And I only mention this to get that moment of truth out. We ought to level with each other. You cannot get on top of this cancer of interest costs on the national debt unless you do all of the above. All of the above includes spending cuts, spending freezes, loophole closings, tax increases, and denying new programs.

We just voted earlier this week—I hated to vote against the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, and her AmeriCorps Program—but I can tell you now that that program was going to cost billions and billions. I did not think we ought to start new programs that we could not afford and specifically not start an AmeriCorps Program for education whereby in order to get 25,000 scholarships we had to do away with 346,000 student loans.

That is what we did. We took the money from the student loans and put it into a new program and talked about voluntarism. I happen to have been down there the Sunday after Hugo hit us in our own backyard in South Carolina. There was the mayor and me and we had 1,500 to 2,000 volunteers that were working in the rain. We asked for a show of hands and we had them from 38 States. People volunteer.

When little Mr. Segal called me about this particular program and said we already have 2,000 out there working in the flood year before last, I said, "Young man, you have 2 million out there working without this program. You do not need a program at the Federal Government level to start voluntarism."

So the pressures brought on this particular budget are really politically manufactured where we are not going to balance anybody's budget. We are just going to get rid of the Government. That has been the cry of the contract—that the Government is not the solution, the Government is the problem, the Government is the enemy.

So what you have here is a \$283 billion estimated deficit for 1995. That is the accurate figure as between what we will take in and what we will spend. So let us not get high and mighty and start criticizing about how I got a balanced budget 7 years from now when people will be lucky to be around 7 years from now and they will know good and well they will come again.

I remember when we used to balance the budget year to year. In fact, President Reagan said, "I'm going to balance that budget in a year." He got into Washington and said, "Whoops, this is going to take me 3 years. I did not realize it was so bad."

Here was a gentleman who was going to do it in a year. Then we got to 3 years. Then under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings we got to 5 years. Now, this crowd comes with 7 years. And I can tell you within the next election we will come and have—excuse me, President Clinton has already gotten to 10 years. Now he has come back to 9.

We are going up, up, and away; 15 years. Say anything except to do the job and tell the American people that we have to deny programs and we have to raise taxes. We have to cut spending. We have to freeze spending. We have to close loopholes. We have to do all of the above to save \$1 billion a day. This particular budget that we have that we are working on at this particular time does not come near to saving \$1 billion a day to get us really rid of any kind of deficit at any time during that 7-year period.

Now, Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee talks about philosophy—and I must touch on that and then we can go to these amendments—the philosophy here that they are trying to justify these programs to get things back to where they can do it as they please.

They said, if they really want to buy equipment, then they can do that. If they want to put policemen on the beat, then they can do that. It is the old adage that the best government is that closest to the American people, the Jeffersonian philosophy. And I generally adhere to that except through hard experience.

Within the field of law and law enforcement, we have had our experience. We had what you call the legal assistance enforcement program, LEAA, and that particular program gave block grants back to the States and communities. And when we looked around, we had—please, my gracious—down in Hampton, VA, they bought a tank and put it on the courthouse lawn and thought the courthouse was going to be attacked. The sheriff down in Alabama, he bought a tank because he was going to have crowd control. The Governor in Indiana, he bought an airplane so they could fly to New York and buy clothes. And they had all kinds of embarrassments where the money never got through to the policemen on the beat.

Now, there is no education in the second kick of a mule. We learned from hard experience. So we came around with community policing and policemen on the beat and said, in order to qualify, you have to come with a match of 25 percent. And it is working extremely well.

Now they come with the philosophy of getting the grants back, which reminds me—and I have, of course, a memory that is resented many, many

times. But I am referring to the stimulus bill where when President Clinton came to town, we were going to stimulate the economy. And the distinguished chairman of my subcommittee, now who believes in block grants, said, heavens above, "We are going to use it for cemeteries, for whitewater canoeing, for fisheries, atlases, for studies of the sickle fin chub," and all these different other programs back at the local level. And the Senator slaughtered President Clinton's stimulus program—just killed it dead in its tracks here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Now we come with the philosophy: Whoopee, let us get the money back to the Government; we are not smart enough to do anything here in Washington; only the people back home are smart enough. So here we go again. Here we go again, changing the formative law and making it into block grants. Taking working programs like policemen on the beat and the Legal Services Corporation. Abolishing these laws in that sense and providing monies for a program that has already been derided in the most expert fashion by my distinguished chairman.

I can tell you now that we could not possibly go along with the block grants. I think the President said he is going to veto that particular approach. Maybe we can reconcile it. I hope some of the defects of this particular bill can be cared for in Senator HATFIELD's and my amendment. We worked until 1 in the morning on this particular amendment. I think it will meet generally with the approval of the colleagues.

And a reallocation here, I am grateful for that help. Of course, there are fundamentals still involved. And I will say it right to the point. We will be debating these things, as the distinguished chairman says. What we have done is really savaged Commerce and its programs, the State Department, and, more or less, force-fed a goose in Justice. When I say "force-fed a goose in Justice," I look at the particular figures.

I can see that it took us from 1789 to 1983 or 1984 to get to a \$3 billion Justice Department budget. But it has only taken us the last 15 years to quadruple, quintuple—excuse me—and go up, up and away to \$16.95 billion in this particular 1996 appropriation. I know we have had various crime bills. I know we have had the problems and everything else of that kind. But I can tell you now that we have, with all the budgetary constrictions, to get a little bit better balance in this particular measure.

And in some of these, I am definitely of a mind where the Senator from Texas and I agree that you should not abuse the use of legal services money to sue the State and Governor and Legislature of New Jersey over welfare reform. We agreed that we could work the prisoners. I have worked prisoners as a Governor. I put in a laundry program. I put in a furniture repair program. I even had a Jaycee chapter as

well as our educational programs behind the wall.

We agree on many, many things. But generally speaking, we did not have a chance to debate these things. Unfortunately, we had not conformed the appropriations to the basic statutes, whatever. We have just run willy-nilly through the programs trying to abolish departments and the working programs that have done so much for our society.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the Senate is considering the appropriations bill for the Commerce, Justice and State Departments. It would be tempting to address this bill in the same fashion as I have other measures during this session which have contained drastic—indeed, draconian—spending cuts. The natural inclination is to talk about how the cuts will affect specific programs or policies, many of which are vital to the security of our Nation or the well-being of our people.

In this context, I would be led to talk about how the CJS appropriations bill, as reported by the committee, lops off more than \$1 billion—I repeat, more than \$1 billion—from the President's request for the foreign affairs agencies. There will be dramatic reductions in spending for the administration of foreign affairs, for the acquisition and maintenance of buildings, for the U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations, for U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping, and for international exchange programs.

I understand that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee may offer an amendment which may add additional funds to the foreign affairs account—which I applaud and will support. I must speak now, however, to the bill as reported by the committee.

Many of my colleagues know that these are programs and functions that are extremely important to me. When I recently announced my intention not to seek reelection to the Senate, some of my fellow Senators graciously came to the floor to say some very kind things about me. For that I am deeply grateful, and indeed humbled. One thing that struck me that day was how many of my colleagues mentioned my support for the United Nations, and the fact that I have carried a copy of the charter with me for many years.

I have not carried it with me all of this time just for show and tell. I carry it because I believe in it, and I think that it has represented—and continues to represent—one of our best hopes for international peace and security. If we proceed with the reductions in funding for the U.S. contributions to the regular and peacekeeping budgets, however, the charter will become nothing more than pretty words. There will be no point, and no joy, in carrying it in my pocket.

I have also been a consistent advocate of the U.S. Arms Control and Dis-

armament Agency [ACDA]. More than three decades ago, President KENNEDY and the Congress decided to create by statute the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—which was then and remains now the only separate agency of its type in the world. If the Congress eviscerates ACDA and perversely rewards its employees by discharging them, we will do grievous damage to our ability to lead the world in effective arms control, to verify compliance of often hostile nations with their arms control obligations to us, and to deal effectively with new arms control and proliferation threats.

As I said moments ago, it would be tempting to continue at length about the impact of this and other bills on programs such as arms control, the United Nations and U.N. peacekeeping. Today, however, I want to discuss this bill in broader and more far-reaching terms. Whether or not the Senate cares to admit it, our decisions and actions this year are going to have a direct and negative impact on America's place in the world, and on our fundamental relationships with other world powers.

I am very proud of the U.S. record of leadership, achievement, and engagement in international relations. Twice in the 20th century, our Nation stood with its allies to fight on a global scale against aggression. During the cold war, the United States took the lead to contain the hegemonistic designs of the former Soviet Union. In the early 1990's, the United States led an international coalition of forces in turning back Iraq's illegal grab of Kuwait.

Equally as important, however, are the battles we did not fight—the conflicts that we avoided, the crises that we averted through diplomatic discussion and pressure. Even if we made mistakes from time to time, we were successful in all of these endeavors because of our belief in principles, our commitment to do what we thought right and our willingness to be actively engaged. Our decisions, policies, and programs were often costly in both human and material terms, but they made our world a safer place, and our Nation a better and more profitable place to live.

Our motivation sadly seems to have changed. Decisions are being made out of political expediency rather than sound judgment. Our impulse as politicians—particularly this year—is to rush willy-nilly to make budget cuts for their own sake, without regard to the consequences. Instead of using reason and analysis to construct a foreign policy, we are using calculators.

We must stop, think, and take a good hard look at how the United States can expect to project its power and influence under the circumstances now proposed. The State Department and the foreign affairs agencies—our Nation's eyes, ears, and voice to the world—cannot carry out its mission if they haven't the personnel, resources, and infrastructure required by the times.

Mr. SANTORUM. I would be happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, because I do not want to speak on the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to use my 5 minutes to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

REINVENTING AMERICORPS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I had an opportunity to read in the New York Times this morning that the President has been making speeches around the country and particularly in response to action yesterday by one of our subcommittees of appropriations, because yesterday the National Service Corps was zeroed out by the subcommittee. And the statement that I do not like is referenced to the fact that we are just playing politics when a program like this is zeroed out. I hope I can stand before this body as a person who has criticized the National Service Corps or AmeriCorps with credibility and say that I can be watchful of how the taxpayers' dollars are spent without being accused of playing politics. Most of my colleagues would remember that during the Reagan and Bush years when we controlled the White House and even controlled this body during part of that period of time I was not afraid to find fault with my own Presidents—Republican Presidents—when this was a waste of taxpayers' dollars when it comes to expenditures for defense.

I think I have a consistent record of pointing out boondoggles, whether it be in defense or anything else. And I have raised the same concerns about AmeriCorps based upon the General Accounting Office saying that each position costs \$26,650 and that that is about twice what the administration said that these would cost. And the poor AmeriCorps worker getting \$13,000 out of that \$26,000 for their remuneration so that much of the money is going to administrative overhead and bureaucratic waste. And I do not see, when we are trying to balance a budget, that we can justify a program that is going to have about 50 percent of its costs not going to the people that are supposed to benefit from that program. And so I have pointed out to the President the General Accounting Office statement. I wrote a letter to the President on August 29 of this year, more or less saying reinvent the program or it is going to be eliminated.

I have not heard a response from my letter to the President yet. I hope he will respond. But I have suggested that he needs to keep the costs of the program within what he said it would cost a couple years ago when it was invented, and that most of the benefits of it should go to the people that are doing the work, not to administrative overhead.

And I suggested reinventing it by doing these things. And I will just read from the letter six headlines of longer paragraphs that I have explaining exactly what I mean.

No. 1, limit the enormous overhead in the AmeriCorps program.

No. 2, ensure that the private sector contributes at least 50 percent to the cost of AmeriCorps. This was an important point that the President was making when the program started, that at least \$1 or 50 percent of the total cost would come from the private sector; \$1 of taxpayers' money leverages a dollar of private sector investment. I doubt if we would find fault with the program if it were to do that. Then I also suggested limiting rising program costs by not awarding AmeriCorps grants to Federal agencies. They say that they get match on this—if EPA has a program with an AmeriCorps worker, that whatever the EPA puts in is part of the match. Well, that is the taxpayers' match; that is not a private sector match.

I said funds must be targeted to assist young people in paying for college because some of the money is going to volunteers who will either drop out or not use the money to go to college.

Then I said to increase the bang for education bucks by making sure that the money is used for those who are going to go to higher education.

Finally, I suggested that if the President wants to reinvent the program, to tell us where in the VA budget, VA-HUD appropriations bill the money ought to come from because there is a lot of other money used. As Senator BOND said yesterday, the money was taken from AmeriCorps and put in the community development block grant program.

I am suggesting to the President that he needs to take into consideration—could I have 1 more minute, please?

Mr. SANTORUM. One additional minute.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggested to the President that he, according to this chart, consider the fact that he has 20,000 volunteers of AmeriCorps; and we have got 3.9 million Americans who volunteer. These are young people, volunteers who do not worry about getting paid anything for volunteerism.

A second thing that the President should consider is that for one AmeriCorps worker we can finance 18 low-income people to go to college with a PELL grant. Those are some alternatives that the President ought to think about as he has a news conference today to expose what he says is playing politics with his program.

When I make a suggestion to the President that he reinvent the program according to his own definition of how that program should be financed and operated, I mean reinvent it. Just do what the President of the United States said the program was going to cost and who it was going to benefit or it will be lost. I speak as a person who wants no playing of politics, but as a

person who wants to make sure that the taxpayers' dollars are used well, whether it is in AmeriCorps or whether it is in a defense program.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). Who yields time to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first I would like to compliment my colleague and friend from Iowa for his work on AmeriCorps. I hope that the American people realize, according to the General Accounting Office, that the cost per beneficiary is \$27,000. The Senator from Iowa has been very diligent in trying to awaken America to this enormously expensive program. It is a new program. I understand it is one of President Clinton's favorite programs, but it is enormously expensive—enormously expensive.

So I compliment my colleague from Iowa for bringing it to the attention of this country, and, hopefully, we can stop wasting taxpayers' money and maybe do a better job either through the student loan program or PELL grants and help lots of people go to school and obtain a college education instead of a few select receiving benefits in the \$20,000-to-\$30,000 category.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2488

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment of my friend and colleague from Louisiana, Senator BREAU. I think if we adopt the so-called Breau amendment, we are preserving welfare as we know it. President Clinton said we want to end welfare as we know it, and I happen to agree with that line. But if we maintain or if we adopt this maintenance of effort, as Senator BREAU has proposed—he has two amendments, one at 100 percent and one at 90 percent—if we adopt either of those amendments, we are basically telling the States: "We don't care if you make significant welfare reductions, you have to keep spending the money anyway."

So, there is no incentive to have any reduction of welfare rolls; certainly, if you had the 100-percent maintenance of efforts. "States, no matter what you do, if you have significant reductions, you spend the money anyway." That is kind of like "in your face, big Government, we know best; Washington, DC is going to micromanage these programs anyway. Oh, yeah, we'll give money to a block grant, but if you have real success, you have to spend the money."

I think that is so counter to what we are trying to do that I just hope that our colleagues will not concur with this amendment. This is a very important amendment.

I just look at the State of Wisconsin. Currently, they are saving \$16 million a month in State and Federal spending.

is in a better position to make a family's spending decisions and set their financial priorities—Washington, or the family itself?

Clearly, that responsibility belongs with the family.

We have the opportunity to take that first step in the next few weeks, by passing a \$245 billion tax cut which includes the \$500 per child tax credit I authored and have fought for over the last 3 years.

I welcome President Clinton's support for tax relief, and urge him to join our efforts. By letting taxpayers keep what is rightfully theirs, we send a strong message that our efforts to balance the budget will always make taxpayers the first priority—not the last.

The second area we must address when discussing reform of the Tax Code is simplification—and simplification must be at the heart of any plan Congress considers.

There is nothing simple about our tax system anymore.

The IRS manages a library of 437 separate tax forms and mails out 8 billion pages of tax instructions every year.

The distinguished House majority leader, Representative ARMEY of Texas, points out that American workers and businesses spent 5.4 billion hours in 1990 just preparing their taxes—more time than it takes to build every car, truck and van manufactured in the United States each year.

This Congress has made shrinkage and simplification its primary goals, and there is nothing that needs it more than our current tax system.

Today's Tax Code may be good business for tax lawyers and accountants, but it is not good policy for the average American taxpayer.

Tax reform must include tax simplification.

The final consideration in building a better Tax Code is making it fairer and more equitable for the taxpayers. Far too often, the current system is not.

The Government continually manipulates the Tax Code—not just to fund Government objectives, but to micromanage the economy and the activities of the taxpayers.

If the Government wants to encourage a particular behavior, it offers a tax benefit.

If it wants to discourage a particular behavior, it sets a tax penalty.

The social engineers have had a field day with the Tax Code. Fairness seems to have been left by the wayside, and families are paying the price.

Look how they have been manipulated through the tax system.

Families, who in 1947 paid just 22 percent of their personal income in the form of taxes, today send nearly 50 cents of every dollar they earn to Federal, State, or local government.

As someone who ran for Congress because of high taxes and what they are doing to this Nation, I am incensed that middle-class American families are being asked to bear the brunt of our enormous tax burden, and then lis-

ten to some Senators say that we have to increase taxes more.

In fact, families with children are now the lowest income group in America—below elderly households, below single persons, below couples without children.

In 1950, the average American family sent \$1 out of every \$50 it earned to Washington—today, the average family sends \$1 out of every \$4 to feed the Federal Government.

The marriage penalty targets families by taxing them at a higher rate than it does single filers.

And if the dependent exemption had kept up with inflation, it would be more than \$8,000 today instead of just over \$2,000.

The message we're sending through our tax policy is that families are just not as important today as they were in 1950.

That message must change.

We have the opportunity and responsibility in this Congress to repair the fractured relationship between the Government and its owners—the taxpayers.

It is time we started to talk seriously about cutting taxes, simplifying the system, and making it more equitable.

A recent *Forbes* magazine cover story called tax reform a "broad political movement, gaining in popularity the way a hurricane gathers force as it heads for land."

The questions we should be asking ourselves are not will we ever break form the past and will we ever have a Tax Code that treats all Americans equitably, but rather when.

Mr. President, the answer to that question is now, and the Senate Finance Committee has taken an enormous step toward reaching that goal with its \$245 billion tax cut package.

By cutting taxes for families and job providers, simplifying the way those taxes are collected, and ensuring a process that's fair, reforming the tax system will go a long way toward making government more accountable to the people.

Washington needs to be reminded that the money it collects is not theirs by right—it is collected for use at the will of the taxpayers. And Congress needs to be reminded daily that it represents the taxpayers.

The success of our efforts to reform the tax system won't be measured solely by how much of their own dollars Congress allows families and job providers to keep. It will also be measured by how equitable the system is, and how the taxpayers fare under it.

If we can successfully accomplish all of that, then we will have heard the message of last November and delivered on the solemn promises we made to the American people.

Mr. President, it is time that we get behind this effort. It is time that we balance the budget and stop passing our deficits on to our children and grandchildren.

Thank you very much. I yield the floor.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

BUDGET FANTASY VERSUS REALITY

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to continue discussing the same subject that the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Minnesota have been discussing, and to do so by, first of all, focusing on some of the myths that have been created by the President and by some of his supporters here in the Senate. I am talking about the difference between the budget fantasy and the reality that faces us here today. It is almost an "Alice in Wonderland" exercise where words take on meanings that are only in the eye of the beholder and have no relationship to actual reality.

Frankly, they are the last desperate attempts by proponents of big Government to cling to the status quo, which means more spending, higher taxes, and greater regulation. That is really what this exercise in opposition to a balanced budget and tax cuts is all about.

Many of the Democrats cannot believe, let alone accept, that the American people overwhelmingly rejected their approach to governing in that way in last fall's election. Rather than attempting to fulfill the mandate which the American people gave us, they are now cynically pandering to the mandates while doing everything they can to undermine it.

In this topsy-turvy "Alice in Wonderland" change, the meaning-of-words situation they have created, spending cuts are increases; spending increases are cuts. For example, claiming that a Medicare spending increase of \$2,000 per person over the next 7 years is actually a cut when, in fact, it is a \$2,000 increase.

Tax cuts, they say, are spending increases. Tax relief for families become tax cuts for the rich. A volunteer in AmeriCorps is actually paid by the taxpayers \$20,000, \$30,000, or \$40,000 a year. Tax payments, the President says, are contributions. Preserving Medicare is slashing Medicare. And, of course, bankrupting Medicare is saving it.

President Clinton is even now so bold as to blame Republicans, not a single one of whom supported his budget in 1993, for forcing him to raise taxes. It is like "the old devil made me do it" skit that we used to see on TV. He says he wishes he had not increased the taxes. I, too, wish he had not increased taxes. But at least our attempt to reduce taxes by \$245 billion is a beginning, a partial rollback of this tax increase which he now wishes he had not imposed upon the American people.

Here are some examples of increases that the Democrats claim are cuts.

The Republican Party has said all year that we would not balance the budget at the expense of Social Security. The budget reconciliation bill will



not touch Social Security retirement benefits or cost-of-living adjustments, COLA's. Social Security will increase 43 percent, from \$336 billion this year to \$482 billion 7 years from now.

Medicare—we are going to increase Medicare spending, not cut it. Medicare will grow from \$178 billion in 1995 to \$274 billion in 2002, a 54-percent increase. Spending per beneficiary will rise from an average of \$4,800 today to more than \$6,700 in the year 2002, almost a \$2,000 increase, as I said before.

Student loans—we have heard a lot about that. Student loan volume will grow from \$24 billion in 1995 to \$36 billion in the year 2002, a 50-percent increase. The maximum Pell grant will be raised to \$2,440 next year, the highest level it has ever been.

By the way, we could send a whole lot more needy kids to school with Pell grants, eight or nine for every single AmeriCorps volunteer that we pay a salary to.

Here are some examples of cuts that the Democrats claim are actually increases.

Defense spending declines from \$270 billion in 1995 to \$264 billion in 1996. That is \$6 billion less. Defense spending is not going up. It is going down.

Here is an example of spending increases that many of the Democrats not only call cuts but claim are tax increases as well. Only in Washington can such distorted logic have any semblance of credibility.

Talking first about the earned income tax credit, we will spend more on the EITC program every year between now and the year 2002. Spending will rise from \$19.8 billion in 1995 to \$22.8 billion in the year 2002. The maximum credit for families with one child will rise from \$2,094 in 1995 to \$2,615 in the year 2002. For families with two children, it rises from \$3,100 next year to \$3,888 in the year 2002, and the examples go on.

The Democrats not only call that a cut, but a tax increase on low-income families. If you are eligible, you get a check from the Government to offset any income tax liability you might have under that program, plus any excess to which you are entitled. Eighty-four percent of the program costs are cash grants. The program is run through the Tax Code because it is more efficient. It requires less bureaucracy. But it is just not possible that you can be hit by a tax increase if you get back all of your tax payments plus more. It cannot be a tax increase.

Here are some examples of tax cuts that they claim are spending increases. They claim that allowing individuals and businesses to keep more of what they earn is a subsidy that is equivalent to direct spending. But as Llewellyn Rockwell, Jr., pointed out in a column in the Washington Times on September 18 of this year, I am quoting:

A subsidy means the Government is giving money to you that originally belonged to somebody else. Dairy farmers, for example,

are subsidized. That means they get money that the tax man extracted from the taxpayers.

"Next word: deduction. That's when you were allowed to count some of your income as off limits to the tax man. You can take a deduction for mortgage interest. A portion of your own money stays in the bank."

Democrats claim the tax relief for families is a tax cut for the rich. The fact is over 70 percent of the tax cuts included in the Finance Committee bill go to families with incomes of less than \$75,000 a year.

Let us talk about the AmeriCorps for a moment. The GAO estimated that the program cost nearly \$27,000 for each "volunteer," and I put quotation marks around that word "volunteer" since they are paid that salary. In fact, that salary is more than the average American earns in a year. Paying people makes them employees, in my view, not volunteers.

For the average of \$20,000 to \$30,000 cost per year for each student in AmeriCorps, as I said, eight needy students could get Pell grants at \$2,400 apiece. The fact is Americans aged 18 and up volunteer 19.5 billion hours of their time, which is a 50-percent increase in the number of hours since 1981. We do not need to pay people to be volunteers under AmeriCorps.

Another one of these Alice in Wonderland meaning changes is calling taxes contributions. Referring to tax increases he would be proposing, President Clinton, in an address to the public from the Oval Office on February 15, 1993, said:

We just have to face the fact that to make the changes our country needs more Americans must contribute today so that all Americans can do better tomorrow.

I have an idea, Mr. President. Let us just call these contributions voluntary and we will see how much in the way of contributions are received. There is nothing voluntary about the income tax.

On Medicare, President Clinton says, "The Republican plan would dismantle Medicare as we know it"—the Washington Post, September 16, 1995—despite the fact that six Medicare Board of Trustees, five of whom are Clinton administration appointees, issued a report in April, with which we are all familiar, which stated that "The Medicare Program is clearly unsustainable in its present form and will become insolvent within the next 6 to 11 years."

Mr. President, the reality is clear. Medicare benefits will be cut off completely unless we act now. If Medicare goes bankrupt, which could happen as early as the year 2002, according to the trustees, by law no payments could be made to Medicare beneficiaries for hospital care, doctor services, or any other covered benefit.

Even the Washington Post has condemned the duplicity of those who would oppose solving this Medicare problem. In a lead editorial on September 25, 1995, the Post wrote:

The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare tax connection because it's useful politically. It allows them to attack and duck responsibility, both at the same time. We think it's wrong.

The editorial, by the way, was entitled, "Medagogues, Cont'd."

It is no wonder, Mr. President, that the American people are frustrated and angry. We need to keep the promise we made to the American people to balance the budget by the year 2002.

The Congressional Budget Office has certified that our budget will do just that. We have abided by the Congressional Budget Office, the agency that the President praised for its accuracy in budget forecasting in 1993. But while we have abided by the CBO's scorekeeping, the same entity the President praised 2 years ago, the President himself has changed the numbers to make his alternative budget balance by the year 2005. He has used the numbers from his own office rather than the Congressional Budget Office. As former CBO Director Robert Reischauer put it, "He lowered the bar and then gracefully jumped over it."

Let me close by saying that it is unfortunate that the President would change the numbers in order to get his budget balanced rather than face the tough realities we have had to face in putting together a budget which we know will balance by the year 2002. I think we owe it to our children and grandchildren to do that, not to hand them the debt that we have accumulated over the years we have been here.

We have a historic opportunity this year. Not since 1969 has Congress had a chance to vote on a balanced budget. And I do not think we can miss this opportunity. It is not just because of the politics of it. It is because of the children and grandchildren who are going to follow us and who do not deserve to have to pay off the debts that we have accumulated.

So I am very hopeful that we can support the budget that will be presented, the reconciliation bill that will be before us next week. I think if we do that the American people will say thank you for keeping the commitment that you made to us in 1994.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

COMMENDATION OF SENATORS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, let me commend the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his excellent statement and the other Senators who have spoken on our side of the aisle tonight on the subject of the balanced budget process, the reconciliation bill which will be coming before the Senate next week, and the effort that has been made to put together a plan to achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002. This is a plan that is workable. It is defensible in every respect. It shows a new awareness and sense of responsibility for managing the fiscal policy of

General Accounting Office," are reduced by 1.92 percent.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to my colleague from Wisconsin without losing the right to the floor.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from South Carolina very much.

I just want to briefly comment on what we just resolved with regard to the campaign finance reform issue.

I am very gratified by the bipartisan vote, very strong vote, including 11 Members on the opposite side of the aisle, against tabling the sense-of-the-Senate resolution with regard to the issue of bringing up and considering campaign finance reform during the 104th Congress. It is one of the strongest bipartisan votes we have had on this floor during this 104th Congress.

Now the majority leader has suggested that as a perfecting amendment. In addition to a number of items that were originally in the Mack substitute that did not include campaign finance reform, they have now offered to include in that list—for the first time—campaign finance reform. It is something that should be considered during the 104th Congress.

Mr. President, this is precisely what we had hoped for, a vote by the Senate. I hope, given the fact that it is the majority leader's intention to support his own proposal, that we will have very, very strong bipartisan support to add that to the list.

This is a shift from earlier in the day when the proposal by the Senator from Florida listed many important items but did not include—in fact excluded—campaign finance reform.

So we are extremely pleased that we will have the vote, another vote in addition to the other one that we had, with the vote which was very strong, to indicate that before we leave here in the 104th Congress on a bipartisan basis we should reform this terrible system.

I again thank the Senator from South Carolina for his courtesy.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished colleague. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this amendment is one to retain the Office of Technology Assessment. It first occurred over on the House side. The bill came out of the committee abolishing the Office of Technology Assessment but on the floor the House added \$15 million for its continuance, taking it out of the side of the Library of Congress.

On yesterday, Mr. President, at the full appropriations committee markup, I offered an amendment. I was not quite prepared then, and I should be better prepared at this moment. Yesterday, I was not quite prepared because I wanted to present the amendment without cutting the Library of Congress. The fact of the matter is we

had a very close vote, and if I had had the proxies of absent Members, this amendment would not be necessary today. It would have been adopted in committee and on the bill at the moment.

Be that as it may, Mr. President, I have now clarified the provisions of this \$15 million. The President's budget for the Office of Technology Assessment is some \$22 million, and this continues OTA but levels a 30-percent cut, at a level of \$15 million, to be obtained from a 1.12-percent cut from the various legislative accounts—the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Building, Capitol Grounds, Senate office buildings, the Capitol Power Plant, the salaries and expenses of the Superintendent of Documents, the Government Printing Office, and a 1.92-percent cut out of the GAO. We thought, twofold; one, we could make that a little over 1-percent cut across the board, obtain the \$15 million, keep OTA in harness, and otherwise, Mr. President, have a study recommendation made by the distinguished colleague from Alaska, who is no longer but served with distinction as the chairman of the Office of Technology Assessment. His suggestion was that we have a study on how best to consolidate the various legislative or congressional services within this segment of the budget and save money.

There is no question that this amendment not only saves OTA, but it saves money. It is bipartisan. I offer this amendment for myself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WELLSTONE, and others who support this legislation. We have now solved the problem relative to the Library of Congress; Dr. Billington—and he is a good friend and an outstanding librarian—has been doing his homework.

Mr. President, I do not have charts or prepared statements. I agreed to limit my comments without charts so let me get right to the heart of the matter.

Back in the Nixon administration, they abolished the Office of Science Adviser, and at that particular time the various committees were crowding in saying we have to learn about this, we have to know about that. We always referred it to the Office of Science Adviser. We could depend on it; it had credibility.

They said, let us get together in a bipartisan fashion, which we did, with alternating between the House and the Senate as chairman, alternating between Democrats and Republicans. We have had quite a successful administration at the Office of Technology Assessment.

One way it saves us money is by having these distinguished boards, advisory panels, counseling the Office of Technology Assessment. They are comprised of college presidents, heads of the science departments from the institutes of technology, and others around the country who give outstanding as-

sistance free of charge, counseling on the various technological questions.

If we go right to it, I think one of the principal objections is that the needs for these studies will not go away. If each committee crowds in on the technological needs for information from the General Accounting Office, obviously the General Accounting Office will go out and hire all of these people and meet themselves coming around the corner having in all probability expended more money.

Now, what is wrong? This crowd—and I guess I am in on it, too, because I get frustrated on figuring out where you try to save money. I have been through the exercise of freezes, the cuts of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, a value-added tax allocated to the deficit and all the other attempts made to get us in the black. Unfortunately, in today's political climate, individual chairmen come around and say, "Well, I have got to eliminate something." And more or less, if this amendment passes, it would take away a Brownie point from their political resume.

It is easy to go campaign next year and say, "I am for economy, and I got rid of the Office of Technology Assessment. That is saving \$15 million." Come on. Two nights ago ABC reported on a particular misguided missile, \$4 billion. You never heard this crowd that is fussing about \$15 million—we took almost 2 hours in the Appropriations Committee trying to save \$15 million or trying to sustain the need to know of the Members of this Congress. But they do not talk about that \$4 billion.

Now, that is where the Congress ought to really be working. Do not come around here to get a Brownie point on a political resume about how we saved and got rid of the Office of Technology Assessment. That is good in the 20-second bite. They will not just say how much they saved and everything else of that kind. But instead they cry in frustration, "Well, if we can't cut this, where can we cut?"

I can give them a list. I voted this morning against the space station. I was former chairman of Commerce, Science, and Transportation. I do not like to vote against the space station, but I am trying to maintain the space program. And you see, you learn from experience. They came forward with the space station at \$8 billion. The next thing you know it was at \$17 billion. The next thing you know it was \$30 billion. We have had four revisions of cutting it back until all I think we are going to get is the booster or the thruster up in space and we'll call it a station before we get through.

Now they have a new angle—that it is a matter of comity with the Soviets and everything else. Fine business. If we were fat, rich, and happy, a space station could well be in order. But we are broke. This Congress and Government around here for 15 years now has been spending on an average of \$200 billion more than we are taking in. So we



are not paying our way, and we have to not just cut; we have to forgo.

Another one, AmeriCorps. I believe in voluntarism, but I expect it. We had it when we had Hurricane Hugo. I stood in the rain that weekend, and we counted up volunteers from 38 States that had come around to help us. The first plane that landed in Hurricane Andrew or whatever it was down there at Homestead was our plane that carried generators, clean water, and personnel. We had Spanish-speaking police officers, and you saw them at Hurricane Andrew in the recovery. No cost to Florida, we sent them down from Charleston.

The people of America believe in volunteering, and they will continue to work to help their neighborhoods. Oh, it is good to say on your resume I believe in voluntarism and I voted for AmeriCorps. But instead, I withheld my vote. So I have been saving the money.

So do not come around here saying, "Oh, if we cannot get rid of this." You are not getting rid of it. The need is there. What you are doing is eliminating the most economical approach, the most technologically adept approach to this technological need.

Now, that is the best statement I can make. I note that some of the other Senators want to talk, but I can mention some of the examples of where we save the Government not just millions but billions.

The distinguished Senator from Alaska, I do not know whether he can approach the floor. On yesterday, we talked about the spectrum auction, and that came out of the Office of Technology Assessment. And we put it up, and in the last 2 years now we have brought to the Government \$12 billion—not \$15 million, \$12 billion—from those auctions. So here is a money-making entity.

Those who are frustrated and say, "If I cannot cut this, where can I cut?" I cannot understand those who are committed to ignorance. We are trying to find out. We are trying to learn. We, who have been dealing with the Office of Technology Assessment, study very closely and look at their particular commitments. We just do not take anything and everything.

In fact, all of the requests made are bipartisan. They come from the chairmen and the ranking members of the committees themselves. We get way more requests than we respond to and cannot take on each and every question that would come. So it comes with a real need from the Congress itself. OTA has responded. It has done a professional job. There is no criticism in this debate about the quality of work.

I am not going to try to overwhelm you and bring all the studies and everything else. But we can get into a few of them. I am pleased—I have checked this amendment through with our distinguished ranking member, the Senator from Washington, and I will be glad to adjust it.

Do not tell me that we can give everything to GAO; we know GAO can do it. That is not true. I worked closely for years as chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, working with Elmer Staats and everything else. What we had to do was cut out all the term papers that were being made for high school graduates and everything over there. They will take on anything to keep the work going. Let us not do that. Let us keep the Office of Technology Assessment at an economical price and continue it and not abolish it in the political urge to get rid of something here.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is no one in the Senate I have more respect for than the junior Senator from the State of South Carolina. But having said that, I am not sure who would have won in the Appropriations Committee if all the proxies had been given. That is something we do not know. The fact of the matter is, this amendment was brought up before the Appropriations Committee in an effort to remove this, and that amendment lost.

Mr. President, I, for 6 years, served as chairman in the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. And we went through some very rough times. In prior years, there was quite a bit of money to pass around in the legislative branch. There came a time when there had been cutbacks in Washington generally, and no place has it been focused more than in the legislative branch. So for my friend from South Carolina to talk about going into the black box where all these secret things are, or the A-12, we all know that we cannot do that here today. We are bound by what is in the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of Appropriations. That is all we can deal with. We cannot deal with A-12's, space stations, or black box matters. We have to deal with what we have in this very tiny little Appropriations subcommittee.

And what we have is the fact that we have to cut \$200 million from this subcommittee. This amendment will cut approximately—this—what has been done on the subcommittee level takes approximately \$22 million. It is a tremendous step forward to arriving at the goals we have to meet.

Mr. President, the Office of Technology Assessment is a luxury. It is something that would be nice to have if we had lots of money like we used to have. But we do not have the money that we used to have, and we have to look someplace to make cuts. The amendment offered in the Appropriations Committee took the money from the Library of Congress. Well, it is obvious that that has not sold very well. And now, there is an across-the-board cut, cutting things like the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, if there has been one entity that has been hit hard in the legislative branch for the past 6 years, it has been the General Accounting Office. Last year, the General Accounting Office was hit with \$69 million in cuts. This next year, it is \$45 million in cuts. It has been cut back about 25 percent, and that is a significant cut for the watchdog of Congress. The General Accounting Office has saved this country billions and billions and billions of dollars. And they are now cut back to the point where they have significantly cut back on the work that they can do, the requests that we make to them that they can meet. The Office of Technology Assessment did 50 major reports last year, 50 major reports for \$22 million. Now, Mr. President, CRS, where the money was originally to be taken, an example of a different workload, CRS did 11,000 reports last year.

The work the OTA does can be done by other agencies. I have had the OTA do work for me. They do fine work. But we do not have the ability to have in our garage three Cadillacs. We have to start cutting back until we wind up with maybe two Chevrolets, or I should say a Ford and a Chevrolet, or maybe a Ford and a Chrysler, however you want to combine it. But, Mr. President, we cannot have three luxury automobiles anymore. All we can have is the General Accounting Office and all we can have is the Congressional Research Service, which the congressional staff depends on around here to meet the requests of constituents at home and Members of the Senate. Our staffs depend on the Congressional Research Service. They did not depend on the Office of Technology Assessment.

Now, Mr. President, I say that the work of the OTA can be done by other agencies. The General Accounting Office can do their work. They are not a bunch of accountants. They have scientists there. They call in scientific panels all the time. We have been told in this debate that they have distinguished boards, advisory panels. Well, that is not hard to copy. That is not hard to do. The General Accounting Office does the same thing.

It is interesting to note, in one of the most scientific matters we have had before this body in a decade, namely, the superconducting super collider, we did not see a word from the Office of Technology Assessment on the superconducting super collider—one of the most scientific measures brought before this body in the last decade. OTA did not write a report on it.

I repeat the words of the Senator from South Carolina: If we cannot cut funding for this agency, then we cannot cut funding for anything. If this is not fat and something that we do not need, then there is not anything we can do—\$22 million in this very tiny little subcommittee.

The proposed amendment attempts to keep OTA alive. We do not kill things around here; we just kind of choke them to death. What we are

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Legislative Branch Appropriations, 1996

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S10329-S10444

Measures Introduced: Two bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1052 and 1053, and S. Res. 155. Page S10426

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 919, to modify and reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 104-117)

S. Res. 103, to proclaim the week of October 15 through October 21, 1995, as National Character Counts Week. Page S10426

Measures Passed:

Legislative Branch Appropriations, 1996: Senate passed H.R. 1854, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, after agreeing to committee amendments, and taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows:

Pages S10340-67, S10373-86, S10400-20

Adopted:

(1) By 60 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. 312) Byrd Amendment No. 1802, to express the sense of the Senate that the Senate should consider a resolution requiring each accredited member of the Senate Press Gallery to file an annual public report with the Secretary of the Senate disclosing the member's primary employer and any additional sources and amounts of earned outside income. Pages S10350-57

(2) Brown Amendment No. 1805, to prohibit the hiring of new elevator operators to operate automatic elevators. Pages S10363-64

(3) Feingold Amendment No. 1803, to express the sense of the Senate that the 104th Congress should consider comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation. (By 41 yeas to 57 nays (Vote No.

313), Senate earlier rejected a motion to table the amendment.)

Pages S10358-63, S10373-74, S10380, S10419

(4) By 91 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. 314), Dole Amendment No. 1807 (to Amendment No. 1803), of a perfecting nature. Pages S10373, S10380

(5) Specter Amendment No. 1806, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding war crimes in the Balkans. Pages S10364-67, S10419

(6) By 84 yeas to 13 nays (Vote No. 318), Murray Modified Amendment No. 1826, to provide that none of the funds in this Act may be used to award Federal contracts to unqualified persons, in reverse discrimination, or in quotas, or is inconsistent with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Adarand Constructors, Inc., v. Peña* on June 12, 1995. Pages S10402-18

(7) Mack (for Dole) Amendment No. 1828, to retain the Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office. Page S10419

(8) Mack (for Simon) Amendment No. 1829, to repeal the prohibitions against political recommendations relating to Federal employment. Page S10419

(9) Mack (for Lieberman) Amendment No. 1830, to amend the Congressional Accountability Act relating to the submission of a study by the Administrative Conference of the United States. Page S10419

(10) Mack (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 1831, relating to the reduction in facilities energy costs. Pages S10419-20

(11) Mack Amendment No. 1832, to strike language relative to law enforcement on Library of Congress property at Ft. Meade, Maryland. Pages S10419-20

Rejected:

(1) Hollings Amendment No. 1808, to restore funding for the Office of Technology Assessment. (By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 316), Senate rejected a motion to table the amendment.)

Pages S10374-86, S10400

(2) By 36 yeas to 61 nays (Vote No. 317). Gramm Amendment No. 1825, to ensure equal opportunity and merit selection in the award of Federal contracts. **Pages S10401-18**

Withdrawn:

(1) Mack (for McConnell) Amendment No. 1804 (to Amendment No. 1803), in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S10358-63, S10374**

(2) Exon (for Murray) Amendment 1827 (to Amendment No. 1825), of a perfecting nature. **Pages S10403-S10417**

U.S. Insular Areas Authorizations: Senate passed S. 638, to authorize appropriations for United States insular areas, after agreeing to an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S10440-42**

D.C. Transportation Projects: Senate passed S. 1023, to authorize an increased Federal share of the costs of certain transportation projects in the District of Columbia for fiscal years 1995 and 1996. **Pages S10442-43**

Bosnia/Herzegovina Self-Defense Act: Senate continued consideration of S. 21, to terminate the United States arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S10386-87**

Pending:

Dole Amendment No. 1801, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S10386**

Comprehensive Regulatory Reform Act: Senate continued consideration of S. 343, to reform the regulatory process, taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S10386-S10401**

Pending:

(1) Dole Amendment No. 1487, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S10386**

(2) Ashcroft Amendment No. 1786 (to Amendment No. 1487), to provide for the designation of distressed areas within qualifying cities as Regulatory Relief Zones and for the selective waiver of Federal regulations within such zones. **Page S10386**

(3) Hutchison/Ashcroft Amendment No. 1789 (to Amendment No. 1786), in the nature of a substitute. **Page S10386**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 58 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 315), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate failed to close further debate on Amendment No. 1487, listed above. **Pages S10399-S10400**

Emergency Supplemental/Rescissions, 1995: Senate resumed consideration of H.R. 1944, making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S10419-25**

Pending:

Wellstone/Moseley-Braun Amendment No. 1833, to strike certain rescissions, and to provide an offset. **Pages S10420-25**

A unanimous-consent time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill and the amendment pending thereto, on Friday, July 21, 1995. **Page S10419**

Military Construction Appropriations, 1996—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the consideration of H.R. 1817, making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, on Friday, July 21, 1995. **Page S10420**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

James A. Joseph, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

31 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Army, Navy. **Page S10444**

Messages From the House: **Page S10425**

Measures Referred: **Pages S10425-26**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S10426**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S10426-27**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S10427-28**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S10429-33**

Authority for Committees: **Page S10433**

Additional Statements: **Pages S10433-40**

Record Votes: Seven record votes were taken today. (Total—318)

Pages S10357, S10373, S10380, S10399-S10400, S10418

Recess: Senate convened at 9 a.m., and recessed at 11:27 p.m., until 9 a.m., on Friday, July 21, 1995. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's RECORD on page S10443.)

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a special congressional panel heard stories of growing threats and attacks against public officials, law enforcement officers, environmentalists, and women advocates by extremist right-wing groups and militia in this country.

This week the Nation was shocked by extremist campaign material produced by the National Republican Congressional Committee in the name of Speaker GINGRICH that suggested Democratic Members of the House are wanted criminals just for disagreeing with the Republican Contract for America.

That extremist rhetoric endangers democracy and encourages a lunatic fringe of this Nation. As a Nation we have learned that when you preach hate; you get hate, when you preach violence, you get violence.

Thirty-two years ago another wanted poster was distributed in Dallas, TX, on November 22, 1963, accusing President Kennedy of selling out America to the United Nations and being anti-Christian. This wanted poster ended in a tragedy.

We should understand that we cannot have the leading politicians of this Nation preaching hatred, preaching the suggestion that politicians who disagree are somehow criminals. Speaker GINGRICH should repudiate this poster and withdraw this campaign rhetoric from the public.

AMERICORPS PROGRAM A WASTE OF MONEY

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, last night, NBC News did an expose on AmeriCorps that proved what a lot of us have suspected for some time—the program is way over budget and wasting taxpayers' money at a phenomenal rate.

AmeriCorps may have worthy goals, but it has lousy execution. According to a report by the General Accounting Office, the Clinton administration projected AmeriCorps to cost \$6.43 per hour for each so-called volunteer. The actual cost: \$15.65 per hour. Annually, the program was supposed to cost no more than \$18,000 per participant. The final tab: \$27,000 per participant.

Mr. Speaker, these are large sums of money. Most of the citizens in my district, who work full-time jobs to support their whole families, don't earn this kind of money. Why does it cost \$27,000 to support just one AmeriCorps participant?

On Monday night, the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee cut all funding for President Clinton's so-called national service program.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer is that it won't anymore. I applaud my col-

leagues on the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee for stopping this new entitlement program.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF DOW CORNING NEEDED

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about Medicare, Medicaid, and SSI, because the taxpayers for those programs will be paying for the sins of Dow Corning—Dow Corning, that told hundreds of thousands of American women that silicone breast implants were safe.

The Harvard Nurses Study just came out and said there are no health risks. By the way, that was paid for by Dow Corning.

Mr. Speaker, is there any justice left? If there is, ask Grace Nero's family in my district. Grace passed away on Independence Day after complications from surgery from breast implants, a blood clot.

Dow Corning manipulated Federal bankruptcy laws to avoid a \$4 billion settlement. Dow Corning in fact lied to the American people, and I am asking U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno to investigate possible criminal charges.

Dow Corning lied to Congress. Does Congress care anymore? Anybody just comes up here and lies to you? Do we really govern around here? To me, this is unbelievable. Congress should support an investigation of Dow Corning.

KEEP TWO ROCK COAST GUARD TRAINING FACILITY OPEN

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, for some reason that's beyond me, the U.S. Coast Guard is considering closing its only west coast training facility—the training base at Two Rock, CA.

No doubt about it, the Coast Guard needs to get rid of some dead weight. It will be missing the boat, however, if it shuts down this important base.

Any old coastie can tell you Mr. Speaker, that it makes sense to consolidate one of the four east coast training centers at the Two Rock Base.

It makes sense because of Two Rock's expansion capacity, good climate, available housing, and, above all, the fact that taxpayers recently invested \$22 million to make the base's computer and radar training facilities state-of-the-art.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to heed this SOS, and join the entire California delegation in ensuring that the Coast Guard can fulfill its mission by having training facilities on both of our coasts by keeping Two Rock open.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will take one additional 1-minute speech from each side.

THE TRUTH ABOUT MEDICARE CUTS

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a program that gives security to our Nation's elderly and hard-working families. I rise in support of Medicare.

We beat you to death to keep someone else from killing you. The Republicans say that they are cutting Medicare to save Medicare. But it is time to be honest with the American people. These cuts will not help Medicare. These cuts pay for tax breaks for Americans earning over \$200,000 a year. And, at the same time, the average senior citizen will pay \$1,000 more for health care.

We must help the Medicare Program, and I have supported efforts to do so. But we should not and must not take away the security of health care insurance for our elderly.

These cuts to Medicare are not reform. I know it, You know it, It's time the American people know it.

Don't support Medicare cuts to pay for tax breaks for the rich. That is not right. That is not fair.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 171 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1905.

□ 1028

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. OXLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 11, 1995, the bill had been read through page 24, line 18, and title III was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, numbered 25.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMERICORPS: ANOTHER FAILED
ELITIST PROGRAM

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in typical liberal fashion, the President 2 years ago chose to respond to declining voluntarism by throwing Federal money and bureaucrats at the problem. At the time, I warned against this wasteful use of limited tax dollars because it would jeopardize worthwhile and necessary projects.

Lo and behold, 2 years later, that is exactly what happened. President Clinton's pet project was funded at the expense of needed veterans' health care projects. Mr. Speaker, veterans are people who know all there is to know about national service and deserve the assistance our limited resources can provide. To that end, my good friend and chairman of the Veterans' Committee, BOB STUMP, and I sponsored an amendment to restore the funding for VA outpatient clinics by rescinding funds from AmeriCorps.

Like all other liberal programs, AmeriCorps is wrought with abuse and spends half its money on bureaucracies and paperwork. Just like their School Lunch Program, which supports bureaucrats instead of feeding hungry children, this volunteer program, intended to provide student aid, funds even more bureaucrats rather than directly aiding students. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the liberals and President Clinton have succeeded in exacerbating the problem of voluntarism by throwing money at it. Their volunteers receive more money and benefits than many of our hard-working citizens. On top of that, the tax dollars funding this program often go to wealthy families, maintaining their elitist pool of feel-gooders instead of inspiring do-gooders. Supporting existing community based groups who already perform charitable duties would incite civic virtue and activism amongst others.

Mr. Speaker, since my warning 2 years ago wasn't enough to discourage my fellow Members from creating another wasteful, bureaucratic program, I would like to offer the following article that appeared in the Hill newspaper as evidence of its failure. "AmeriCorps: Rhetoric vs. Reality" provides justification for rescinding valuable tax dollars from this misguided program.

[From the Hill, Mar. 29, 1995]

AMERICORPS: RHETORIC VS. REALITY
(By Allyson Tucker)

Thanks to a \$1.7 million public relations budget, AmeriCorps, the Clinton administration's national service program created in 1993, remains a sacred cow despite a cost of \$30,400 per "volunteer" and abundant evidence of waste and abuse.

Consider the facts. In 1993-1994 AmeriCorps had about 20,000 "volunteers" who the Clinton administration promised would be working as teachers, doctors and police officers to help improve communities. The reality, how-

ever, is that the majority of these highly paid "volunteers" work in federal or state bureaucracies, government-funded programs or even political action organizations.

For example, more than 2,800 AmeriCorps participants work in federal departments or agencies, including 1,200 in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 525 in the Interior Department, 210 in the U.S. Department of Justice, 135 at the Environmental Protection Agency and 60 at the National Endowment of the Arts.

The federally funded Legal Service Corporation, the chief litigator for the welfare state (which for example, represents drug dealers when they are threatened with eviction from public housing), was awarded 44 AmeriCorps volunteers, cost the U.S. taxpayer \$959,000 plus an additional \$1,242,784 in "matching funds." In San Francisco, the AmeriCorps "Summer of Safety" program organized 40 groups to rally against the federal crime bill's "three strikes and you're out" provision.

More than half of the money spent on AmeriCorps ends up funding bureaucracies and paperwork. "Educrats" at Northwestern University, for example, were given \$140,000 by AmeriCorps to develop "a plan to complete for more AmeriCorps money next year," without funding a single "volunteer." Similarly, AmeriCorps gave bureaucrats a \$100,000 planning grant to study a volunteer corps in the Virgin Islands and gave the Council of Great City Schools, which is devoted to the "advancement of education in inner-city public schools through public and legislative advocacy," a \$200,000 planning grant. Again, none of this money went to help students pay for college.

Despite the rhetoric, AmeriCorps does little to help working families pay for college. At a 1993-94 price tag of \$155.5 million, about one-tenth of one percent of the 16 million students enrolled in post-secondary education participated in AmeriCorps. Even if Congress expands the program to 150,000 participants by 1997 as the Clinton administration has requested, less than one percent of students will be able to participate.

Furthermore, the majority of the students recruited come from wealthy, not poor or needy, households. The AmeriCorps program is not means-tested (the liberals in Congress defeated conservative efforts to develop a means test). Thus, the children of wealthy and influential people can elbow out poor students for participants in the program. As Sen. Robert Byrd (D-W.V.) noted on the Senate floor, instead of sending one AmeriCorps participant (who may or may not need financial assistance) to college, five needy students could qualify for Pell Grants.

Nor does AmeriCorps promote "volunteerism." Each AmeriCorps "volunteer" is paid a \$7,400 stipend and a \$4,750 tuition credit, worth approximately \$7.27 per hour, plus medical benefits and free child care. The total, tax-free AmeriCorps package is worth nearly \$20,000 annually, more than the income of 39.3 million working Americans. The total, non-taxable income of an AmeriCorps "volunteer" exceeds the median income of workers in the private sector, including those with years of experience. The educational benefits also exceed those available to veterans. In addition, at least \$15,000 per participant goes for overhead and administration.

Worse than President Clinton's good intentions gone awry and the litany of waste and abuse is AmeriCorps' effect on the essence of volunteerism. Private sector community service is thriving. The Labor Department estimates that there are currently three million unpaid volunteers between the ages of 18 and 25, most of whom work for religious organizations, the backbone of community activism.

The laudable goals of AmeriCorps do not match its reality. If the goal is to expand educational opportunity, the AmeriCorps budget would be better spent on direct aid to students. If the goal is to stimulate service, Congress should amend the tax code to allow for tax credits or increased deductions for those who donate their time and money.

THE HOME RUN READER SUMMER
READING PROGRAM

HON. JIM LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the Members' attention to a reading program in my district which has done a great deal to motivate young people to read. It seems commonplace to hear about American students who do not meet the strenuous criteria we must require of them. Unfortunately, it is not unusual to hear about young Americans who graduate from high school without adequate reading skills.

This program is sponsored by the Daily Tribune newspaper in Ames, IA, and the Iowa Cubs baseball team and is entitled, appropriately enough, "The Home Run Reader Summer Reading Program." This program was conceived with the sole purpose of helping children discover the pleasure of reading. The program has been successful.

Last year marked the launch of the program and over 5,000 children and 26 libraries in 4 Iowa counties were involved. The students ranged in age from 2 to 16 years of age and read or had read to them an astounding 50,000 books, according to Mary Youngerman, a constituent in my district who served as the coordinator of the program. This summer, the program will span eight counties and its estimated that 12,000 young people will participate.

It is my hope that participating in this program will initiate a love of reading in children that will last them for the rest of their lives. According to Ms. Youngerman, this program was inspired by a similar program in Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I hope other Members will feel free to contact me if they are interested in developing similar programs in their districts. Hopefully, bringing attention to the Home Run Reader Summer Reading Program will motivate others to get involved at the local level to encourage young people to read and learn.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The central bank chief—that is, Alan Greenspan—also linked last week's projection—now 2 weeks ago—of the balanced budget amendment by the Senate with the latest troubles facing our dollar.

The Secretary of the Treasury has gone before the world to try to strengthen the dollar, and the world did not pay any attention. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve said our dollar has suffered from the failure to pass the balanced budget amendment and it is destabilizing our currency.

In deference to time, Mr. President, I am not going to read from the seven different economists who are defining the problem with our currency as being directly related, as the Reuter's story acknowledged, to our budget deficits; more importantly, to our unwillingness to do anything about it, to the defeat of the balanced budget amendment and to spiraling trade deficits.

Last week, in front of Emory University students in Atlanta, my home city and State, the President and this same Secretary tried to tell those students and America that we really are operating an operational surplus. I said at the time that was not factual and, more important, it was harmful because by telling the Nation we have an operational surplus, you are sapping the will of this country to do the things it needs to do.

Mr. President, in light of these reports about the falling dollar today, I would like to call on the President of the United States to change his mind and call on the Congress to pass a balanced budget amendment. That is one of the strongest actions; these statements before the world are not having an effect. The world saw us defeat the balanced budget amendment. The world saw the President's budgets with \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see. The world is watching us argue about these minimal cuts right here today. Mr. President, the President should call on the six Senators on the other side of the aisle that voted for a balanced budget amendment 1 year ago who changed their mind this year, who participated in what is now happening to our currency worldwide. And the best short-term signal we could send to this world about our currency is that we are going to stand up and pass a balanced budget amendment and send it to the States for ratification.

The Senators from New Mexico, North Dakota, California, Kentucky, and South Carolina decided to vote against it this year. They voted for it last year. The President said he was for a balanced budget "but." And I would suggest to you, Mr. President, that the world has taken more notice of the word "but" than any of the other things that are emanating from the administration such as we really have an operational surplus.

For Heaven sakes. By the way, the reason they calculated that was they said you would not have to add in our

interest on debt and then we would have a surplus.

I was speaking to a group of business people today, and I said:

You remember when you went before the loan officer and the loan officer said, "I am sorry; I can't loan you any more money because of your financial statement." And you turned to the loan officer and said, "Well, if you just forget the interest payments I am making to you, I would have a great financial statement." You know what the reaction of that loan officer would be.

Mr. President, the world has taken note of the, "I'm for a balanced budget but I am going to oppose a balanced budget amendment. I am going to submit budgets to the Congress and to the people with huge and unending deficits." And the quickest way we could turn this around would be for the President to call the leaders of this Senate and say, "Pass it."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I would like to get back to what I believe is the business before us. Are we on the Daschle amendment as amended by the Dole amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair. It seems as if we have been at this for some time, and we have had some very enlightening discussions in other areas, but this bill, which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota seeks to amend, is an extremely important one. I spent some time last week presenting the details of this measure and talking about reasons why it was necessary for us to rescind budget authority and outlays for the coming year. Having made those points, I do not want to make them again. I wish to instead focus on some of the basic underlying assumptions in the Daschle amendment.

You will recall that this bill as we reported it out of the Appropriations Committee provides in the current year and next year about \$6.7 billion for the California disaster relief effort. The Daschle amendment cuts \$1.3 billion out of that.

Mr. President, I would have to say what a difference a week makes, because last week we heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that what we needed was an across-the-board cut in all Federal agencies as an emergency step in order to pay for the terrible natural disasters which have afflicted the country this past year. In particular, we heard a very compelling argument from the Senator from California about the tragedies in her State and the need to provide the money so that the residents of California would get their lives and communities back together. Thus, they offered an amendment to provide \$6.7 billion in disaster funding and cut elsewhere across the board.

Today, it appears maybe they do not need all that money. Today, just a few

days later, the terrible California disaster described so eloquently is not going to require the \$6.7 billion it did last week. Now they only require \$5.4 billion. Never have I seen \$1 billion saved quite so quickly.

I had to ask myself why. Well, I soon discovered it is not that they really want to save that money. Instead they want to spend it on some of their and the President's favorite programs. Today, instead of setting the money aside to help disaster victims, they want to raid a rainy day fund and spend it on so-called volunteers or throw more money at HUD, an agency in the midst of its own financial and management disaster. It is no wonder that many of my colleagues agree with the Congressional Budget Office's analysis of what happens when a rainy day fund for disasters is set up. I believe we ought to set money aside, but there are some questions I have about setting it up.

Let me quote from the disaster task force report which was issued only 3 weeks ago. I had the pleasure of serving with the distinguished Senator, Mr. GLENN, from Ohio as co-chair of that disaster task force. We brought together all of the information on disasters and asked the agencies—CBO, GAO, CRS—about what we might do. In that disaster task force report prepared by the agencies there was a very prophetic statement. Our report said:

A tendency to spend accumulated funds might be a problem unless the law restricted the types of disasters that would qualify. Policymakers could become tempted to be more generous in relieving small disasters or to raid the fund for spending in other programs.

Well, Mr. President, that kind of looks to me like what we had. Only 3 weeks from the report and days from the discussion of the rainy day fund the first raid is being attempted on disaster relief.

So let me tell my colleagues, if this is what we can expect, regular, systematic raids on the disaster relief fund to pay for political goals, then I for one, this Senator, is not going to support any sort of rainy day fund.

What kind of discipline does this show to the American people, that just days after arguing for a \$6.7 billion rainy day disaster fund, the same people now want to raid the fund for other purposes? How many families set aside funds for emergencies and then successfully resist the temptation to raid them? How many communities and small businesses set aside funds and then successfully resist the temptation to just dip in a little more for some reason? But not our colleagues here today. They view the disaster relief fund as a honey pot which lets them avoid tough choices of where else to cut in order to spend more on the programs they like.

Instead of standing up and saying, "We don't like your proposed spending cuts; here are ours to replace them," our friends on the other side of the

aisle, once again show their colors on spending cuts. They say, "We want to spend first and worry about the deficit and the debt later on".

Again, I go back to the prophetic words of the disaster relief task force. In that report the agency said:

Requiring the Congress to cut spending and other programs would raise the political cost of providing disaster relief. Now, increases in disaster relief increase the budget deficit, which may impede economic growth over the long term. But the effects on the standard of living of future generations have far less direct influence on political decisions than having to cut programs this year or next year.

No wonder our debt is nearly \$5 trillion. No wonder the President's budget thought it would be OK to leave the deficit at \$200 billion a year for the next 5 years, adding another \$1 trillion to our national debt. This is a debt, Mr. President, that threatens our economic stability.

Our distinguished colleague from Georgia has already spoken about what judgment the international financial markets are passing on the value of the dollar. And it is because we just do not seem to be too concerned about adding another little \$1 trillion to our national debt.

Well, Mr. President, I think it is very serious for our economy and it is very serious for our children and grandchildren who are going to be carrying the burden of that debt on their credit card.

Let me speak about one particular aspect of the Daschle amendment. I want to focus on that for, I hope, the enlightenment, perhaps, of my colleagues. But maybe they all know it.

I want to focus on the proposal to restore national service funding. I believe this issue highlights the fundamental differences between those who would shrink Government and those who still believe in business as usual.

The bill before us proposed a cut of \$210 million to bring AmeriCorps and other new programs authorized by the 1993 National and Community Service Act back to the fiscal year 1994 level. The fiscal year 1995 appropriation for this year was \$575 million; the rescission currently in the bill would bring that funding level back to \$365 million. The National Service Corporation had hoped to have 33,000 volunteers enrolled by the end of fiscal year 1995. The bill before us, as reported out of committee, would keep the number of volunteers—and I say "volunteers" in quotes—at about 20,000. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Daschle amendment for the additional reason because I do not believe the increase in funds for AmeriCorps is justified.

The cut we have proposed is legitimate. We are not gutting the program, as some have suggested. The corporation actually received a huge increase for the current fiscal year over the fiscal year 1994 level. They had \$365 million in fiscal year 1994 for AmeriCorps grants, education awards, technical as-

sistance, and related activities. They received \$575 million in last year's appropriation for the current fiscal year. That is a 58-percent increase for an untested program. I have not seen any increase of that level in any other discretionary program. At a time when we are running budget deficits of hundreds of billions of dollars each year on top of a debt load of \$4.8 trillion, we just cannot afford the increase.

This rescission will not affect any programs now in operation. The fiscal year 1995 funds are not scheduled to be spent until the start of the school year in September 1995. So we will not have to stop work that is now going on. We are simply proposing that the amount available to the programs scheduled to begin this fall be the same as for those that began last fall.

Under the Senate bill, none of the volunteers—or, actually, employees—currently serving will be affected. The program would remain at the same level. The corporation could still increase the number of those it hires and chooses to fund in State and local programs next year by reallocating the money provided.

For instance, the corporation is now spending \$32 million on innovation, demonstration and assistance activities, which includes training and technical assistance for AmeriCorps programs. Presumably, most not-for-profits that receive funds are already experienced themselves in training new employees and providing services. And many of them are working with true volunteers.

The corporation also spent \$3 million this year on planning grants. Now, those do not fund a single new position, but simply allow an organization to plan how they will use volunteers in the future. And, both the National Service Corporation and the State commissions spend a good deal of money on public relations and recruitment of volunteers—read "employees." I would argue that we can do less of that since the program is now well established, if it is continued, and it is well known.

In addition, the corporation awarded more than \$14 million to Federal agencies this year, nearly 10 percent of the total amount available for AmeriCorps grants. Why are we padding the Federal payroll with paid, they call them, volunteers—I call them employees—at the same time the administration claims it is downsizing the civil service?

We cut it on one hand, but we call them volunteers and we spend \$14 million hiring them on the other hand. I think there is a good deal of room to make cuts in these areas if the corporation wants to increase the number of those serving in State and local programs, under the bill.

I remain a great skeptic of the program. I am looking forward to conducting oversight hearings, which we will have in our subcommittee during the next few months, to determine exactly

where our money is going. And, in particular, I am concerned about the money going to AmeriCorps national direct programs.

Under the act, in 1993, there are three different ways that you can receive funds. One-third of the funds are available to States according to a population-based formula. The States then choose which programs receive funds. Another third of the funds are distributed to programs that are first selected by the States and then submitted to the corporation for competitive consideration. The final third of the funds for AmeriCorps are distributed directly to the National Service Corporation to programs operated by national non-profit organizations, programs operating in more than one State, and to Federal agencies. I would like to focus the attention of my colleagues on some of these programs.

I think America would be surprised to learn where fully one-third of the funds for AmeriCorps is actually going. I venture to guess that most Americans believe that money in this pot is going to help support the efforts of some well-established, reputable, mainstream volunteer organizations that we have all come to know and rely on. We would expect, Mr. President, the funding would go to the Red Cross, the Girl Scouts, Boys and Girls Clubs, Big Brothers and Big Sisters, and the 4-H; that they would be the ones receiving funds from that source. That certainly was my expectation.

Needless to say, I was surprised to learn that is not where the money is going. So I asked, and the Corporation for National Service provided me, with a list of all applicants in the "National Direct" program for 1994, as well as a list of those groups that receive funding.

I have made a chart of some of the examples that we have found. I think they will be illustrative.

All of these groups applied for "AmeriCorps Direct" awards for fiscal year 1994, as well as many other groups. This is not the exclusive list.

Here is the list of who was funded and this is a partial list of those who were not funded. Many well-established, reputable, and noncontroversial voluntary organizations did not receive funds. But look at the list of those who did receive funds, in addition to those that are Federal agencies. Can you say "politically correct"?

Take a look at what we funded. This was our volunteer money. We are downsizing the civil service, cutting the Federal Government, getting rid of employees.

So why is the money going to hire people in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, the Department of Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Veterans Affairs?

Sounds like a good way to cut the civil service. If you get a program, call it a "volunteer" program and use it to fund these.

And then there are others, ACORN Housing, Legal Services Corporation, National Endowment for the Arts, National Community AIDS Partnership.

These are the programs being funded by the AmeriCorps direct funding program.

These are some of the ones that are not funded, and somehow it strikes me as passing curious that they chose not to fund the Future Farmers of America, the National 4-H Council, the Girl Scouts of America, the American Red Cross, Big Brother/Big Sisters, Boys and Girls Clubs, National Audubon Society, Appalachian Mountain Club, American Library Association, United Negro College Fund, United Way of America, and United Cerebral Palsy Association.

I have had an opportunity to work with many of these fine organizations, and when you are talking about volunteers, this is where I think you need support, if you need support, to get people who are actually doing volunteer work.

Mr. SANTORUM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOND. Yes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Are those not funded? Did they apply for grants and were refused?

Mr. BOND. These are agencies all of which applied. "Funded" are the ones which were funded by the AmeriCorps direct program. The ones "Not Funded" are the ones I just read, beginning with the Future Farmers of America.

Mr. SANTORUM. That is amazing.

Mr. BOND. That is exactly my point. I do not believe that the priorities chosen by the National Service Corps are the priorities of the American people. Americans do choose where they give their time voluntarily. We know where people want to give and work as volunteers. Over 80 million Americans choose to donate unpaid time to charitable volunteer work each week and they choose their churches, their schools, their hospitals, the Red Cross, the Girl Scouts, the Big Brother/Big Sisters. They do not choose to donate their time to the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Transportation, or the Department of Labor.

I think the American people might well be shocked to learn that these Federal agencies were chosen over other well-known, well-established and much respected volunteer organizations which were turned down.

I am sure that if you go back to the State programs, my colleagues will undoubtedly show me examples of Girl Scouts and Red Cross programs funded through the State commissions, one of two sources of funding, but that is not the area of national priorities. The corporation has clearly chosen not to fund those groups. The further away from States and local communities where

the volunteer work is actually being done, where people volunteer their time and their resources, that the decisionmaking occurs, that is where decisions to fund the Federal Departments and those agencies which carry out the politically correct goals happen.

I suggest that the funding decisions of the national corporation may not reflect the priorities of American people. I have not examined the decision of the State commissions sufficiently to be able to comment on those. We will explore those in the VA, HUD Appropriations Subcommittee during our fiscal 1996 oversight hearings.

But for the purposes of the discussion of the Daschle amendment, I absolutely do not believe we should restore funding for the Corporation for National Service. In fact, considering some of the other tough decisions we have made, there is room for further cuts. We are only bringing the program back to the 1994 level. Based on what I described, I believe that is overly generous.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to turn down the Daschle amendment. The Daschle amendment has one provision which has been called to our attention by Senator INOUE, the problem with funding for Indian housing. I have been working with Senator INOUE and his staff. I believe we can accommodate the needs of Senator INOUE for the Indian housing.

I think we need to take special recognition of the problems which may arise there at a later time in the discussion of this bill when we have an amendment, however we work it out with Senator INOUE, who has been a leader on this, and Senator MCCAIN.

We will attempt to work out a good compromise to make sure that the cuts do not fall unnecessarily heavily on our native Americans. I will discuss the particular needs of that program. That, too, is included in the Daschle amendment.

But the main point of the Daschle amendment is to cut \$1.3 billion from what was described last week by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as "critically needed, vitally important, let's-do-it-now emergency relief" so we can go back and spend money on HUD, which is already spending too much money, on the National Service Corporation, the AmeriCorps direct dollars, which are keeping all those wonderful people employed at Federal agencies.

Mr. President, I just do not believe we need to restore those cuts. So I urge my colleagues not to accept the Daschle amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I want to commend the senior Senator from Missouri for an outstanding presentation. The juxtaposition of the funded agencies and the volunteer

agencies is a stark and compelling contrast. To think that the Future Farmers of America applied and were turned down when the Department of Agriculture was funded; to think that the 4-H Council applied and was turned down while the Department of Energy was funded; to think that the Departments of Interior, Justice, and Labor were successful applicants when no "volunteers" were provided to the Girl Scouts or the American Red Cross. In my mind, and I think my good friend would agree, this reflects very poorly on the character and quality of the AmeriCorp Program.

Mr. President, we are not talking about rescinding Federal money in a vacuum. I believe this entire debate must be placed in the context of America's financial condition. The American people are alarmed at a \$4.8 trillion debt. Last November, they said "It is time to stop this out of control spending, and put our fiscal house in order."

In family budgeting, what father or mother would say, "Even though we are \$72,000 in debt, business as usual will suffice." Despite our massive debt and rising deficits, Bill Clinton has suggested just that. The President has projected \$200-billion-a-year deficits for as far as the eye can see. Mr. President, this type of unrestrained spending must stop.

So, I rise today in support of the majority leader's amendment. If enacted, this package would significantly decrease discretionary spending for this fiscal year. More importantly, it would achieve that end by attacking non-essential government services. AmeriCorp, which I discussed earlier, is a perfect example. This so-called volunteer program, which costs \$30,400 per participant per year, is not a volunteer program at all. It is a way of paying individuals to do things that people already do.

Mr. President, out of the \$30,000 used to support each volunteer in this program, \$15,000 goes to administration and overhead costs. That means that this is really just a program to support the Federal bureaucracy. Then, when you think of the rest of the money—the \$15,400 that is left over for the volunteer after you have paid the \$15,000 for overhead and costs—you have to understand that 20 percent of all of those volunteers are working in the Departments of Agriculture, Energy, Labor, the Environmental Protection Agency, or the National Endowment for the Arts.

AmeriCorps. It sounds like you ought to stand up and salute. The truth is that the American people ought to stand up and grab their wallets because it represents a raid on their resources. And not just the American people, but also the yet unearned wages of generations to come.

Mr. President, we hear over and over again from the Democrat party that we have to save the children. Well, let us save them from bankruptcy. Let us practice a little responsibility. The

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SUPPORT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM AND COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about something we did last night on the Committee on Agriculture on which I serve, but first, before I get into that, I would like to address briefly some of the remarks I have heard on the debate this evening concerning the tort reform bill, and particularly the punitive damages aspect of that bill, the claims being made on one side that sexual predators and drug dealers will no longer be subject to punitive damages.

Certainly as an emotional issue as this type of conduct, these types of conduct are, I wanted to clarify from my viewpoint and from my experience as a civil attorney for about 20 years, which included about 2 years as a U.S. attorney as a Federal prosecutor, my experience in the area of punitive damages and this type of conduct which I find was not really connected.

I never saw, in my experience, a sexual predator suit in civil court, but rather the more likely remedy the law has there is a criminal prosecution, the aggressive criminal prosecution of people who sexually pray on children.

Likewise with drug dealers, what we come out there with drug dealers is they are arrested and prosecuted under the criminal law, not suing them civilly, where we put these types of people in jail for their conduct. Certainly in the area of drug dealers' civil forfeiture, that was available to us as prosecutors, to seize the ill-gotten gains that these people had, their assets, their homes and cars, things that were gained through the sale of drugs. It was certainly valid forfeitures. But not again in my experience have I seen the

use of punitive damages in either one of those cases, but rather the more appropriate remedies of putting these people in jail.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to talk about the Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve.

Last night, the House Agriculture Committee passed H.R. 1135, the Food Stamp Program and Commodity Distribution Act.

This legislation is a big first step in the direction of real welfare reform.

For 2 years now, Americans have been waiting for the current administration to end welfare as we know it.

Last night, that process began.

What this legislation will do is give that States the choice to determine how they want to run their Food Stamp Program.

One of the most important aspects of this legislation is that it would require food stamp recipients must work to be eligible to receive food stamps.

The hard-working taxpayers of my district in Tennessee would agree that if an able-bodied person is going to receive food stamps, then they should be required to work to receive them.

It simply is not fair to stay on the rolls and make no effort to better one's self and try to become a productive, tax paying citizen of society.

Another important part of this legislation is that it contains stiffer penalties for those caught abusing food stamps.

The Federal Government will now be allowed to seize property and proceeds from illegal food stamp traffickers without having to go through mountains of red tape.

As a former U.S. attorney, I once prosecuted an individual who tried to purchase a vehicle with food stamps.

So I know firsthand that we must crack down hard on waste, fraud, and abuse in the Food Stamp Program.

Mr. Speaker, the welfare reform process has indeed begun.

The welfare system of the past and present has been a tragic failure.

It has encouraged dependency, discouraged self-reliance, and created a burden for those of us who choose to be productive.

Only until our welfare system encourages work and self-dependence will it be truly beneficial to society.

H.R. 1135 will do this.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1135 when it comes to this Chamber for consideration.

DISCUSSION ON NEWSPAPER STORIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, earlier today it was my privilege to appear on C-SPAN with one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle from Illinois to discuss the morning newspapers, and a rather lively discussion

ensued, and it was very interesting to go over many different articles in the Nation's press.

One article, however, we failed to get to, and I would bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and indeed the attention of the American people, on the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal, an article entitled "Protest, Washington Style." Quoting from the article now:

Newt Gingrich and other speakers were prevented from addressing the National Association of Counties in Washington on Monday after 500 shouting protesters invaded the hotel ballroom and used megaphones to call for higher school lunch funding. Many of the protesters had been bused in from out of town, prompting Mr. Gingrich to ask some pointed questions. Why weren't they at work? Who are they? Who paid them? Well, it turns out the protest was organized by the left wing activist group, ACORN, a frequent recipient of Federal and state grants.

The Washington Times reports that 42 participants in President Clinton's new national service program are working for ACORN at a cost to taxpayers of more than \$1.1 million. Several operate out of ACORN's Washington, D.C. offices. We may never know if federally funded "volunteers" helped ruin meetings for 2,000 county officials, but we hope Congress plans some oversight hearings on the groups involved in Mr. Clinton's service program.

□ 2300

It was interesting today, Mr. Speaker, to see yet more protesters arrive here on Capitol Hill. And I find it especially interesting that it appears that some of these protesters are subsidized with tax money from you and me and from the American people, so now we have really reached a new low in the concept of protest.

And please don't misunderstand. I uphold the first amendment and applaud the first amendment, and certainly people have a right to peaceably assemble and petition the Government for redress of grievances. But the problem comes as certainly there is a cloud of suspicion that what we have now are protesters subsidized with tax money here to champion the tired old policies of the past.

And what is even more true, and I will come back to this fact until the American people have it clear in their minds, all this talk about cutting the school lunch programs, about cutting the Federal nutrition programs, can only be characterized as false.

Again, the numbers speak for themselves. This new Republican majority is willing to fund these programs \$200 million in excess of what President Clinton has called for this year. And moreover, we called for increases of 4.5 percent.

Now the guardians of the old order bankrupt of any new ideas come here and march to the will of this House and say, No, no, those are cuts. Again, only in Washington can it be considered a cut when you reduce a future planned increase.

My friends on the other side are upset because the increase will not be 5.1 percent. Instead, the increase is

only 4.5 percent. But I would ask, amidst all of these allegations, amidst the misreading of numbers, amidst this phantom number of \$7 billion with imaginary money that is not even there, who has been harmed?

We know who has been scared. Name for me the school children, show me the schools that are being deprived of lunches. They are not there. Again, it is the policy of this new majority to empower people, to enfranchise people and not to hold down people in the form of a permanent underclass but to truly feed the needy and to give the opportunities to feed the needy in the classrooms, the people who really need it, to have that opportunity at the local level. But the money is not being taken away.

And with reference to people coming to lobby us, to come to see us, I thought it was very interesting that in previous weeks folks would come bringing cut-out dolls of this nature and they would list names of very, very small children. Now, look, it is obvious a 3-year-old, precocious though she might be, did not assemble this doll. This was something done by adults, from government bureaucrats who have paid money into political action committees that have funded the tired old order 10 to 1 over Republicans. That is part of the problem. That is the real story. That is what we will move to correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. STOKES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HOYER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCOTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

[Mr. BECERRA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. DORNAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BILBRAY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) after 3:30 p.m. today, on account of illness.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. REED, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. STOKES, for 5 minutes today., for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SCOTT, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIAHRT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ENSIGN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BATEMAN for 5 minutes on March 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. TALENT for 5 minutes on March 9 and 15.

Mr. HAYWORTH for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KINGSTON for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mr. FOGLIETTA.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. UNDERWOOD.
Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
Ms. ESHOO.
Mr. FILNER.
Mr. SANDERS.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Ms. LOFGREN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIAHRT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRAPO.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. GALLEGLY.
Mr. GOODLATTE.
Mr. PACKARD in two instances.
Mr. BLILEY.
Mr. FIELDS of Texas.
Mr. BAKER of California.
Mr. STUMP.
Mr. PORTER.
Mr. FOLEY in four instances.
Mr. RAMSTAD.
Mr. DAVIS.
Mr. EMERSON.
Mr. SHAW.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 9, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

493. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's fiscal year 1994 annual report on the operations of the Office of General Counsel, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000e-4(e); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

494. A letter from the President, U.S. Enrichment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's annual report for fiscal year 1994.

The HEAP Act would allow parents to deposit up to \$5,000 per child each year in a college savings account with a maximum allowable deduction of \$15,000 per year. When money is withdrawn from a HEAP account for education purposes, one-tenth of that amount would be included in the gross income of the beneficiary for tax purposes over a 10-year period. The legislation also includes a 10-percent penalty for money withdrawn from a HEAP account for purposes other than paying for higher education.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides a HEAP of relief for middle class families who are often not eligible for low-interest student loans and other Government aid. By encouraging these families to save for their children, we help give future generations access to all the advantages of higher education. I urge my colleagues to support the HEAP Act and pay tribute to those who shaped this worthy legislation.

ISRAEL H. MILTON HONORED

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1995

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, next week Israel H. Milton, the Assistant Dade County Manager responsible for human services programs, will retire from our county government. I want to join with his many friends and admirers throughout our entire community in extending to him our thanks for his outstanding service and our congratulations for a job well done.

Israel Milton is a public servant in the very highest and best sense of the word. He is a veteran of more than three decades hard work and achievement in the area of social services.

Never one to shy away from difficult assignments, Israel Milton began his career in Dade County in 1967 as a social services administrator at the Kendall Children's Home. He also served as director of the Office of Neighborhood Service Centers and director of the Model Cities Program; became director of the Department of Human Resources in 1982; and rose to assistant county manager in 1992.

The talents and judgment he brought to these jobs and the breadth and depth of his experience will be sorely missed; people of his calibre are not easily replaced. He has always been accessible to the people of our community, constantly working to provide quality services and a better life for all our citizens.

Israel Milton is a graduate of Dorsey High School in Miami and Bethune-Cookman College. He received his Master's Degree in social work from Atlanta University.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my best wishes to Israel Milton and to his wife, Thelma Milton. Our community thanks you for your service and for the contribution you have made to the lives of so many people.

"PAID VOLUNTEERISM": AN OXYMORONIC IDEA

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I commend George Will's article in the Saturday, January 28th edition of the Washington Post for your attention:

TWO LIBERAL LOSERS

(George F. Will)

President Clinton's turbid State of the Union address was a metaphor for modern government—sprawling, metastasizing, undisciplined, approaching self-parody. It underscored the fact that his administration now is politically almost harmless, but is aesthetically excruciating.

The address was heavily larded—exactly the right word, that—with semi-conservative words about cutting taxes, spending and regulations. However, regarding two matters Clinton considers crucial—the American Corps "national service" program and the minimum wage—the address was half-baked and half-hearted liberalism.

AmeriCorps, says Clinton, will revive American volunteerism. The approximately 80 million Americans who volunteer their time to religious and civic organizations may wonder who needs reviving and how much it matters whether AmeriCorps eventually produces 100,000 more volunteers. Today 2.9 million of America's 80 million volunteers are ages 18 to 25, the ages of AmeriCorps "volunteers."

To Americans who use the English language to communicate thoughts rather than parody them, the use of the word "volunteer" in connection with AmeriCorps recruits must seem like the latest redundant evidence that Washington is stark raving mad. To plain-speaking Americans, a volunteer is someone who contributes his or her unpaid labor. Clinton's "volunteers" will be paid a \$7,400 annual stipend, plus \$9,450 worth of college expenses over two years. And this is not all that Clinton's little puddle of government-manufactured "volunteers"—little relative to the 80 million true volunteers who need neither financial incentives from, nor organization by, government—will cost taxpayers.

In addition to the health and childcare entitlements for AmeriCorps members, and AmeriCorps' Washington bureaucracy, money is spent to locate "volunteers" to take AmeriCorps money. The Omaha World-Herald says that AmeriCorps gave Nebraska's state government a \$457,622 grant to recruit 23 AmeriCorps members. That \$19,896.60 per recruit calls into question the effectiveness of the \$1.7 million AmeriCorps paid a Washington PR firm for national advertising.

According to the New Citizenship Project, a conservative advocacy group, of AmeriCorps' first 20,000 "volunteers," 1,200 are working for agencies of the federal government. The New Citizenship Project warns that AmeriCorps is ripe for politicization, citing a Washington Monthly report that a 1993 pilot project became an exercise in identity politics and political correctness, developing ethnic and homosexual caucuses. And the Los Angeles Times reported that a 1994 pilot project in San Francisco used its "volunteers" to protest "three-strikes-and-you're-out" crime legislation.

Clinton calls AmeriCorps the achievement "I would say I was most proud of." No minimum wage increase will be rival for that title.

In 1992 candidate Clinton endorsed increasing the minimum wage. During 1993 and 1994, when he had a congressional majority that would have done it, he did not ask for it, primarily because some sensible Democrats told him it was a dumb idea. Al From, head of the centrist Democratic Leadership Council, which once advertised Clinton as a New Democrat, says of the minimum wage proposal: "It's anachronistic, it's a loser, it's got no bite with the middle class. And it screams old Democrat."

Now that there is a Congress that Clinton knows will not enact an increase, he calls it urgent. However, during Tuesday night's oration, when he was pitilessly detailed about almost everything, he remained reticent about how much the minimum wage should be increased. Leaving aside the unwisdom of government telling employers what to pay employees, it is generally true that when you increase the cost of something, people buy less of it. There is evidence that is true of labor at the low end of the wage scale.

The first federal minimum wage—25 cents an hour—was enacted in 1938. Since then, the longest time between increases was from 1981 to 1990. During that span, teenage unemployment (teenagers are a third of all minimum wage earners) fell from 23.2 percent to 15.5 percent, and black teenage unemployment fell from 48 percent to 31 percent. Then the forces of compassion struck, raising the minimum wage twice, in 1990 and 1991. In 1992 teenage unemployment went up to 20 percent.

Now, it is problematic establishing causation for any phenomenon as complex and varied as joblessness. And some studies, including one by associates of the current secretary of labor, purport to show that the minimum wage can be increased somewhat without increasing unemployment. However, the question is academic because a former academic—Rep. Dick Armey, the ex-professor of economics who now is majority leader—says he will oppose an increase "with every fiber of my being," and he will have much company.

But this is of more than academic interest: The minimum wage is now \$4.25 an hour. Clinton is said to be thinking about seeking \$5 an hour. The New Citizenship Project calculates that AmeriCorps "volunteers" earn more than \$7 an hour.

SALUTE TO CHICAGO ATTORNEY AND FORMER ALDERMAN LEON DESPRES, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 87TH BIRTHDAY

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1995

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to salute a gentleman who is a Chicago institution and a lifelong friend of the underdog and of the working Chicagoan. Leon Despres, who turns 87 years young today, played a crucial role in the Chicago City Council during the senior Richard Daley's tenure as mayor of Chicago. This role, that of the loyal and principled opposition, is one that my Democratic colleagues and I are growing to appreciate more and more as we settle into our new roles in the 104th Congress. Unfortunately, I did not have the honor of serving in the Chicago City Council during the 20 years that Mr. Despres served there. However, he served as Parliamentarian of that body under the late, great

Senate bill 1. This is about a process so that we can finally start casting votes around here based upon information before the act instead of after the act.

Therefore, Mr. President, with all due respect, I now move to table the amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, under the previous order, I believe it was agreed that we would go out for our recess for the respective party conferences at 12:30. The hour of 12:30 having arrived, is it the Chair's opinion we should recess?

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair will recess.

Mr. GLENN. The hour of 12:30 having arrived, are we in recess now then, or does the Chair propose to put us in recess?

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate is prepared to stand in recess, but the Senator from Iowa is seeking recognition.

Mr. GLENN. Is it, Mr. President, under the previous order or is it the desire of the Senator from Iowa to speak?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, as a courtesy, will recognize the Senator from Iowa first. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, irrespective of the previous order, I be granted 7 minutes to speak as in morning business on a subject unrelated to unfunded mandates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, on the condition that upon the completion of the Senator's statement, the Senate then stand in recess under the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 7 minutes.

AMERICORPS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we have recently heard in the news quite a bit about AmeriCorps, and that is President Clinton's new program on voluntarism.

As many of my colleagues know, I spent several months investigating this whole matter, and I continue to review and will continue to review for a long time into the future the merits of AmeriCorps. There has been bipartisan criticism of this program and this concept of so-called voluntarism.

This administration seems to have learned nothing from its recent efforts to force a top-down solution to programs, for instance, like health care. The American people rejected at the ballot box last November a bureaucratic solution that the administration had for health care reform.

Now the administration believes the answer to voluntarism is to have it driven from the top down. They want to bureaucratize voluntarism. In health care reform, they wanted to make the choice for each citizen's health care. In this program, they want to make the moral choice for each volunteer, and they want to pay him for that.

That subverts the concept of voluntarism, in my view. It turns the notion of voluntarism on its head. Nevertheless, the administration wants to go forward despite the fact that 1.9 million Americans are already volunteering on their own and doing it without pay and they are doing it all over the United States because they are doing it by making their own moral choices within their own communities as they see the needs of those communities.

Mr. President, it is discouraging that the President has completely disregarded the findings of Vice President GORE's National Performance Review when it comes to the question of AmeriCorps or the expansion of the program. A founding principle of reinventing Government is that, according to Vice President GORE, you should not increase funding a program until it is a proven success. This administration has sought dramatic increases for AmeriCorps with little to no support the proposition whether or not it is succeeding.

The problem with AmeriCorps is the same problem that I see in the boondoggles of the Defense Department. As you remember, a decade ago, \$500 hammers got a lot of attention, the \$500 hammers that the Defense Department was buying.

In AmeriCorps, we recently uncovered that President Clinton's AmeriCorps is paying over \$70,000 for one—yes, Mr. President, that is one—volunteer for AmeriCorps. That \$70,000 could instead be used to provide dozens of young people Pell grants so that they could attend college. This point was made on this very floor 2 years ago by the then chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, and that was when we were considering authorizing AmeriCorps at that particular time.

Instead, we are spending this money on creating one job with the Philadelphia Bar Association. That \$70,000 job

in Philadelphia is, unfortunately, not an anomaly. AmeriCorps has already provided me with many, many grants where the costs will be over \$40,000 per year per job.

I am very pleased to announce to my colleagues today that the General Accounting Office has agreed to my request made in behalf of myself and Senator MIKULSKI to initiate an investigation into the actual costs of AmeriCorps. I am confident that the GAO investigation into AmeriCorps will help us all be better informed about the tremendous costs of this program.

As I read reports on the President's remarks, he intends to draw a line in the sand on this program. He intends to use this program to delineate the two political parties. I welcome this challenge because I believe the American people just repudiated the approach exemplified by the AmeriCorps Program. Just as they did not want to have a top-down bureaucratic solution on health care reform, they cannot fathom the same approach to voluntarism.

The American people do not want Government to make their moral choices for them. They do not want Government telling them for whom they should and should not volunteer, and they certainly can see through the rather thinly veiled attempt to subvert voluntarism by paying for it rather than using moral suasion.

Mr. President, I have received much data already from AmeriCorps pertaining to their grants. That data only further fuels my skepticism. I have also asked the General Accounting Office to independently analyze and evaluate the program. I will await their report this spring until I render a final judgment about the program.

But I must say, the celestial bodies seem to be aligned against the program, and the American people are against the approach embodied here. The administration would do better to more accurately apply the principles of reinventing Government to this concept. Rather than bureaucratizing and rather than drawing a line in the sand, we can be working together to make voluntarism work the way it has—and quite effectively and quite amazingly—since the earliest days of the Republic.

I yield the floor and yield back the remainder of my time.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, at 12:37 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Ms. SNOWE].