

to see—if we cannot get any agreement, then none of the amendments will pass in any event.

So I hope we could be permitted to have general debate equally divided between now and 6:15, by sponsoring of the two major amendments. And then at 6:15, the Senator from New Hampshire, Senator SMITH, will be recognized to offer his amendment on House Concurrent Resolution 34.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOLE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I say to the majority leader that I know the majority leader had said on Thursday evening that he was hopeful the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota would be up and he thought at that time it might have been disposed of on Friday. There was certainly no objection from me on that. I thought that was probably going to be the case. Now the Senator has pointed out that we have both the Daschle and the Dole amendments before the Senate.

I have indicated that I was quite prepared to just send my amendment to the desk, have it printed, and after we had disposed of the principal amendments of Senator DOLE and Senator DASCHLE, I would hope that we would be able to consider my amendment. But I would obviously respond to the request of the joint leadership in terms of working out an appropriate time. I am more than glad to do this, recognizing that we have a great deal of business before the Senate prior to the recess.

Mr. DOLE. If the Senator will yield, I understand the Senator will have it printed today but it will not be offered today.

Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. I have talked on it quite a bit, Mr. President. I am not sure that I really have to take any more time on it. I would be glad to send the resolution to the desk. Obviously, it would be a matter before the Senate. I would like to get it printed. I would send it to the desk and have it printed, and then I would be glad to work out with the majority leader and the minority leader the time when we could consider it. I am more than glad to accommodate. If we wanted to do it at the conclusion of the other two amendments, that would be fine.

I can assure the leader that I do not think it will take any more than 5 or 10 minutes equally divided to dispose of it. I will be glad to give an assurance to the leader and to Senator DASCHLE that we would not consider it until after the disposition of at least the two current amendments. They really are the heart and the thrust of the issue here, and they are our first priority. I think they are enormously important, and we ought to consider them.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further? The Democratic leader indicated to me that he was prepared to vote on the D'Amato amendment, which indicates that he must

have the votes to table. Would there be any objection to having it follow the vote on the D'Amato amendment, because his amendment was pending prior?

Mr. KENNEDY. I understand from the floor staff that Senator Daschle has indicated willingness to go to the vote on D'Amato tomorrow, and it is entirely acceptable to me to vote right after the D'Amato amendment on this amendment, if that is agreeable.

Mr. DOLE. The caveat, Mr. President, would be if we decided to pull the bill down because there are so many amendments. I do not want anybody to be blindsided. But it could happen, with 97 amendments, which would take quite a while, that we might just pull the bill down until after the recess. As long as the Senator understood that, I think we have an agreement. He could send it to the desk now, and have it printed with an understanding that following the vote on the D'Amato amendment, disposition of the D'Amato amendment, the Senator be recognized for a vote on his amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD for the information of Senators.

It is my understanding that we will have the vote on the D'Amato amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the appropriate place in the amendment, insert the following:

**SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX AVOIDANCE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should act as quickly as possible to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to eliminate the ability of persons to avoid taxes by relinquishing their United States citizenship.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is satisfactory.

Mr. DOLE. As I said, the only exception would occur—

Mr. KENNEDY. I understand what the Senator said. It could be withdrawn.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think there is a serious effort by the Democratic and Republican leaders and the White House to try to see if we can bring this to closure. If we cannot, we will pull the bill down. If we can, we will try to finish it tomorrow evening. There is no way we can finish it with 97 amendments. That would take the rest of this week and all of next week, and I have something else planned for next week. In any event, many other Senators have plans for next week.

I wonder if it would be all right, between now and 6:15, the time equally divided.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—this has been cleared by the Democratic leader—that all time between now and 6:15 p.m. be equally divided between the Democratic leader and Senator ASHCROFT, or their des-

ignees, for debate on the Daschle and Dole amendments.

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

Mr. DOLE. I further ask unanimous consent that at 6:15, whenever the Senator from New Hampshire is available, during that timeframe, that we proceed to House Concurrent Resolution 34, and that Senator SMITH be recognized.

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

**CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS**

Mr. DOLE. Morning business has expired.

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I would like to speak to the proposal that is before the Senate, and specifically I want to refer to a Reuter's news account that was issued this morning. I am going to read from the account. It says:

This administration believes a strong dollar is in America's interest, and we remain committed to strengthening the economic fundamentals that are ultimately important to maintaining a strong and stable currency.

That quote, Mr. President, is from our Treasury Secretary, Robert Rubin. The story goes on, however, and says that the currency market did not pay any attention to our Secretary of the Treasury driving the dollar down to yet another record low against the Japanese yen. Since the start of the year, the dollar has plunged more than 13 percent against the yen.

The story goes on and says that America's bulging budget—bulging budget—and trade deficits to its shrinking savings rate is driving the currency lower, and Washington—that is us—seems unable or unwilling to do anything about it.

Mr. President, Chairman Greenspan recently called the falling dollar “unwelcome and troublesome.” He said just recently that “Foreign markets were increasingly distressed about the huge amounts of Washington borrowing to pay for deficit spending.”

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 assistance, 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

Senator from California earlier today said, "Say goodbye to Big Bird," as if we were to curtail funding for public broadcasting there wouldn't be any worthwhile children's programming. This is nonsense and the American people know it. In fact, a recent Lou Harris poll found that public broadcasting is third on a list of Federal programs that should be abolished.

Only \$7.5 million of the \$300 million spent on PBS goes directly to children's programming. Where does the money go? It goes to purchase and develop programming for wealthy adults. According to one of its own member stations, WMET, "one out of eight contributors to PBS is a millionaire. One out of seven has a wine cellar, and one out of every three has spent time in Europe in the last three years." This is not a social welfare program, it is welfare for the rich. Mr. President, these are the types of people taking advantage of PBS, and taking advantage of the American taxpayer. As my friend Senator PRESSLER noted, the wealthy donors to public broadcasting could easily make up the 14 percent of Federal funding that CPB receives if they simply gave an additional \$55 a year.

Mr. President, I believe we also need to look carefully at the foreign operations budget. The House suggested rescinding \$191.6 million. The Senate cut only \$100 million. Well, I think we ought to be rescinding what the House proposed. The additional \$91.6 million would bring our total Federal foreign operations reduction to 1.4 percent. If we are serious about balancing the budget, and if we really care about kids, we must at the very minimum do that.

So, we have an opportunity to say to the American people that we heard the message of November 8. We understand that it is important for us to make serious cuts. The Senate has a \$13 billion rescission package. The House was at \$17 billion. Thus, we can add the \$1.3 billion in this amendment and still not make it to the House level.

Mr. President, during the debate on the balanced budget amendment, member after member who opposed the bill talked about making tough choices. Furthermore, they all indicated that they were ready to move toward a balanced budget. Let me suggest that now is the time to begin. It is time because that is what the American people sent us here to do. Unfortunately, the President continues to take us down a different road, a road of increased deficits and debt. Let this Chamber be different. Let this Chamber fundamentally alter the way Washington works. We should rescind the funds which were proposed by the committee and add to it what the majority leader has suggested. If we do, we will begin to demonstrate responsibility, and that brings me to my last point.

I think what Government does is teaches. We all talk about the value of education. The most important lesson we can learn is the lesson of responsi-

bility. Are we or are we not people who pay our bills? Do we live with the consequences of the decisions we make? Are we willing to accept responsibility for what we do? If our citizens make that kind of commitment, the coming era can once again be called the American century. Regrettably, as a Government, we have yet to make that commitment. Some of us are concerned that as citizens we have not made that kind of commitment either. Maybe our Government is not teaching responsibility the way it ought to. Maybe our example speaks so loudly to young people that they believe they are not responsible for the actions that they take. After all, when we continue to appropriate and spend, when we continue to obfuscate and mislabel, government fails in its obligation to the citizenry.

Mr. President, let us instruct the young people of this Nation properly. Let us show them that we have the willingness to exercise the discipline necessary to succeed in balancing the budget. In my mind, this means not only having a rescission bill, but also supporting the majority leader's amendment. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will do just that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment by Senator DASCHLE, and I am doing so primarily because of my belief that we should not make as drastic cuts in the education accounts as the majority leader would have the Senate make.

Let me put this in context, Mr. President. I know there is a lot of talk about, are you in favor of deficit reduction, or are you not in favor of deficit reduction? I honestly believe that all Members are in favor of deficit reduction here in the Senate. We want to find an appropriate way to accomplish that.

In my opinion, the test of whether we are serious about deficit reduction will come in two areas. First, our willingness to curtail spending in a whole range of areas—not just the areas being addressed by this bill, but all areas—defense, intelligence, community funding, agricultural subsidy funding, foreign aid funding, as well as the domestic accounts. Entitlements are a key part, when we are serious about constraining spending.

The second area in the test of whether we are serious is whether or not we will reject the siren call to cut taxes. There is a major effort, on the other side of the Hill this week to try to go ahead and cut everybody's taxes, particularly the taxes of the wealthy. In my view, that is not a responsible action if we are serious about deficit reduction. It does not make any sense to give speech after speech after speech here in the Congress about our concern about the deficit and then turn around and cut taxes and reduce the revenue

that the Government is receiving to keep that deficit from escalating. Those are the real issues.

Now I want to talk for a few moments about the impact of the proposed rescissions on education, because I believe very strongly that not only should we try to maintain funding in education but wherever possible we should try to increase funding.

As I travel around my State, Mr. President, and ask people in town hall meetings, "What percentage of the Federal budget do you believe is committed to improving education?" Some say maybe 5 percent, others say, maybe 10 percent, and we get into discussions over how much money is spent on education. I respond, "Let me tell you, it is 1.7 percent of the Federal budget that is committed to improving education in this country."

That is a figure which is down substantially from what it was a decade ago. In 1985 we committed 2.5 percent of our Federal outlays to improving education. This last year, it was 1.7 percent.

Mr. President, education is not the cause of our large Federal deficit. It has been taking its share of cuts all along and, in fact, even if the amendment of Senator DASCHLE is approved, there will be substantial cuts in education as part of this rescission bill. We are willing to accept that.

There are 19 different programs that the Department of Education operates dealing with education. The proposed amendment of Senator DASCHLE would try to restore funding to the level we appropriated and authorized last year in 7 of the 19—not in all of them—but in 7 of the 19.

Programs such as the title I grants which go to schools with disadvantaged children; the school-to-work opportunities, which help students to transition from school into employment; the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program; and the Immigrant Education Program, aimed at those people who are legally here in the United States legally working with green cards and their children need to be educated.

The Head Start Program. Mr. President, there are many students, many children in my State who would like to participate in the Head Start Program. However, there is inadequate funding for them to do that. In most cases, these are children of very low-income families. I think that the Head Start Program is a good investment for our country. I think we can legitimately be for deficit reduction without cutting back on the funding for the Head Start Program.

I want to urge my colleagues to think about priorities as we go about this cutting exercise. It does not do any good to rush ahead with cuts in all areas. The American people want Members of Congress to be very selective in the cuts that we make. The Wall Street Journal and NBC News did a poll recently that said that 79 percent of Americans believe that cutting Federal

spending for education takes this country in the wrong direction.

That is exactly what the majority leader is proposing that we do here today. He is proposing that we go ahead with major cuts in the Federal funds for education. I think it is a shortsighted approach. I think we will at some stage down the road regret our action.

This year, we are spending 1.7 percent of the Federal budget on education. We can continue to ratchet that down. We can get it down to 1 percent. We can get it down below 1 percent and we will still have a very large Federal deficit. Mr. President, we are kidding the American people if we suggest to them that cutting our funds for Head Start is going to solve the deficit problem. It is not going to solve the deficit problem. We need to acknowledge that upfront and go after some of the areas where real money is being spent in our Federal budget. There are many of those areas.

I urge my colleagues to join in some of the other proposals which will undoubtedly be made as we get into consideration of the budget resolution, which involves serious cuts in Federal spending for the future.

Mr. President, it is not as easy as just saying "Cut, cut, cut," regardless of the impact on whoever in our society, and "Cut, cut, cut" regardless of what priority is thrown out the window in the process. We need to be specific about where cuts make sense and where they do not make sense. Clearly we need to find ways to conserve funding and to restrain Federal spending.

I expect by the end of this legislative session, I will have done at least as much as most of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support cuts in funding for a variety of Federal activities.

However, cuts in education at this stage in our Nation's history do not make sense. They are not supported by the American people. Senator DASCHLE tries to restore a few of the funds that are otherwise proposed to be cut. I support him in that effort. I wish we could restore more. However, we are not able to.

Even if the amendment of Senator DASCHLE is adopted, there will be rescissions in virtually all the programs, lesser rescissions than are proposed by the majority leader but rescissions still. There are 12 of the 19 programs that are in the Education Department which will take significant cuts even if the Daschle amendment is adopted.

Mr. President, I will not belabor the point, but I do think the least we can do here in the U.S. Senate this evening is to try to maintain last year's level of funding in some of these key programs that relate to education. That is what Senator DASCHLE's amendment does. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes of the remaining 20

minutes of the majority time to the Senator from Arizona, Senator KYL.

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Let me take a couple moments, first of all, to address some of the comments of my colleague from New Mexico, because I think the debate is fairly framed by some of the things which he had to say. It does demonstrate the difference in approach that we take to this matter of reducing the Federal spending and trying to find ways to rescind spending from last year which is what the Dole amendment is all about.

The Senator from New Mexico makes a primary point that education funding should not be further cut. I would like to make two points with respect to this.

The first is, as far as I am concerned, it is not a matter of cutting spending. It is a question of who does the spending. Our idea here is that the Federal Government should do less of the spending and that the families of America should get to do more of the spending.

As a result, when we talk about a \$500 tax credit for children, for example, what we are saying is, who would you rather have spend the money on your children? The Federal Government or the family who is responsible for their care?

We would rather give the family the \$500 per child and let them decide whether they are going to enroll their child in a special education program, buy a new computer, get some books or in whatever way they feel it best to spend that money for their children's education—to do that, rather than to assume that the Federal Government can put better use to that money than can the families of America. That is the theory for our approach to this question of Federal spending.

Second, to get right to the point of the rescission package that is before us, the Dole amendment, says that we should add about \$1.3 billion in rescissions, in other words in cuts to the package that has been put before the body from the Appropriations Committee. This would conform, or get close to conforming, the Senate package of rescissions with the House package, at roughly \$16 or \$17 billion.

Let us talk about how it might affect education. One of the items we would like to rescind more of the money on is the AmeriCorps Program that the Senator from Missouri was talking about a moment ago. The AmeriCorps program in the House rescinds, or has rescinded in it, about \$416 million to a level of \$158 million, close to \$159 million, for next fiscal year. The Dole amendment would conform the Senate position to the House position. Right now, the Senate position is to only rescind half that money.

How does the AmeriCorps program affect education in our country? Here is one way. The AmeriCorps Program spends as much money on one person, one so-called volunteer—who, of

course, as we know is not a volunteer at all but is paid for work, \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year, \$40,000 in Alaska—as could be spent to fund eight Pell grants for needy students to come to school. As we know, the Pell Grant Program is based on need; it goes to needy students. So we could send eight needy students to college for what we are spending today on one volunteer in the AmeriCorps Program.

This chart makes the point. At this level here, you have the 3.9 million young people in America who are volunteers today, not being paid a penny for their volunteer service, and here you have the maximum of 20,000 young Americans who will participate in the AmeriCorps Program.

What is the cost? Bear in mind, these almost 4 million people get paid nothing. These are the youngsters, the youth of our country, young men and women, teenagers and young people who are doing volunteer work who are between the ages of 16 and 24, as compared to these 20,000. What is it costing? This makes the point about the Pell grants, as I said. Here are the number of people, Pell grant recipients, who could be funded with the money for one AmeriCorps volunteer in the State of Alaska.

Incidentally, we might ask the question, why does it cost over \$40,000 a year for an AmeriCorps volunteer in Alaska, but we will leave that for another day, perhaps.

The point is, with this Alaska volunteer, if we rescinded the money for that AmeriCorps volunteer, we could send over 28 needy young Americans to college next year. That is what education is all about. So when some of our colleagues say we need to pay more attention to education, I say you bet we should, in two respects:

First, we should not waste it on programs that really do not help the needy. We should put it where it does the most good. That means going along with our package of rescissions here with respect to AmeriCorps.

Second, instead of talking about cutting education funding, we ought to talk about who actually does the funding. Who does the spending? It ought to be the families of America, not the U.S. Government.

I was curious about the chart that was behind the Senator from New Mexico, and I gather has been used by some of the Senators on that side of the aisle. The whole point of the chart is who gains and who loses, and that is the way a lot of liberals look at the American Government. It is a zero sum game. We need to take from them so we will have something over here. It is never taught that John F. Kennedy used to engage in trying to expand the pie. Remember what he said, "A rising tide lifts all boats."

His point in saying that, by the way, was we needed to have a capital gains cut for corporations. It does not sound like the Democratic rhetoric that we hear today. But this was a Democrat

President who understood if we are all better off we are all better off, and you cannot be employed if there is no employer, and employers need money to pay for people, to pay for their employees. So he understood that making everybody better off is the name of the game, not arguing over the size of the existing pie.

That is what the chart that the Senator from New Mexico was standing next to basically tries to portray—who gains and who loses.

Our idea is that is the politics of envy. As I said, it is a zero sum game. Our general point should be to reduce Federal spending generally so there is more left over for the American family to spend so there is more left over for savings and for investment, for growth in the American economy so that our children and grandchildren will have a better future.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. KYL. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. This bill cuts \$13 billion from the Federal budget. That is roughly 1 percent.

If we cannot muster the fortitude to take 1 percent out of the budget here and now, what does it say for future deficits?

Mr. KYL. I say to my colleague from North Carolina, that is the same question I had been asking all last week when various people said to me, "My goodness, you are cutting something out of this and cutting something out of that?"

I said, "This is just the beginning. If you do not have the fortitude to do this, how are you ever going to balance the budget?"

By the way, these were the same people who were against the balanced budget amendment on the basis we were elected to make the tough decisions. Looks like they are running for the woods now.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. What it amounts to is not only have we failed to pass the balanced budget amendment, we are here in deep debate over whether we can take 1 percent out of it. We saw, by failure to pass the balanced budget amendment, very clearly that the value of the dollar against every other industrialized currency throughout the world took a deep dive. The Senator from Georgia talked about it earlier. Now we are further reinforcing the idea throughout the financial communities of the world that we do not intend to reduce the budget. We are simply going to talk about it.

Mr. KYL. I think the Senator from North Carolina makes an excellent point there.

Mr. President, might I inquire how much time remains on this side, for the Senator from Missouri?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Nearly 12 minutes remain.

Mr. KYL. Let me sum up. If the Senator from North Carolina has more to talk about here, that will be fine. Otherwise, let me take a minute to sum up

because I know the Senator from Pennsylvania has something to say about this, as well.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. I thank the Senator for allowing me to ask the question.

Mr. KYL. Let us just sum it up this way, because there are a whole list of programs that are the subject of the rescission in the amendment of the Senator from Kansas, the distinguished majority leader.

The majority leader's amendment—what we will be voting on tomorrow—is to add some rescissions, some additional reductions in spending to programs like AmeriCorps, as we pointed out, foreign operations, the foreign aid program that the Senator from Missouri talked about, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting that the Senator from Pennsylvania has talked about, the Internal Revenue Service—there are a whole variety of them. My colleague from Arizona, JOHN MCCAIN, had suggested about \$337 million in cuts that the President himself requested and that this body has not seen fit to include in its rescissions package.

Let me conclude with this. It is not as if we are trying to do something rather odd here in suggesting a little more in the way of rescissions. On the AmeriCorps Program that we were talking about, what was the vote in the House of Representatives for rescinding twice as much as the Senate is proposing to rescind? Was that a partisan vote? Democrat and Republican? The vote was on March 15, 382 to 23. This is a bipartisan understanding of what we need to do to get our budget deficit under control here. So, by a vote of 382 to 23, the House of Representatives voted to rescind about \$416 million from AmeriCorps.

It seems to me that the Senate could do just as well.

So I hope that our colleagues will support the Dole substitute when it comes to a vote, and I appreciate the Senator from Missouri yielding time.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of the time allotted to the majority leader's amendment to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding. I would like to follow up on what the Senator from Arizona and others have spoken about with respect to this amendment by the Senator from Missouri, both the senior and junior Senators with respect to the AmeriCorps Program.

I would first like to touch on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. We are proposing in this amendment to increase the amount of rescissions—in other words, to reduce the deficit—by an additional \$1.3 billion, restore the California disaster relief funds of \$1.3 billion, and add \$1.3 billion in cuts with the Dole amendment.

The principal area that we are trying to deem the cuts, so to speak—the biggest one—is the President's own rescissions package, which is \$337 million of what he termed pork, special interest demonstration projects put in by Members of Congress, both the House and Senate. They are the President's own rescission. We are saying let us vote on your President's own rescissions, and let us reduce the deficit as he would like to have seen done with these rescissions.

Another big area is the AmeriCorps Program, which is the national service program, which we have heard some talk about, which I will mention briefly.

But the one that I think has gotten a lot of publicity which I think is just an amazing program that gets funded here is the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. This is a very controversial measure. I think I have received more mail on attempts to cut the Corporation for Public Broadcasting than any other single issue that has been before the U.S. Congress.

That is interesting in the sense that it is only \$285 million in the budget. I was reminded by a television station in Pennsylvania, WHYY, that it is only .003 percent of the national budget, so it is not significant. "Why are you picking on us?" I heard the Senator from New Mexico say, "Well, education overall is only 1.7 percent of the budget. Why are you picking on us?" We are not going to balance the budget on education. We are not going to balance the budget on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, nor on AmeriCorps. If you keep going down, do you know what are going to come up with? We will not balance the budget because we will never get any of this stuff. We will never balance the budget.

What is the answer? Let us cut the big programs. OK. Let us all line up here. Everybody who wants to cut Medicare, come on down the aisle. Come on. Come on down the aisle. There is nobody coming down the aisle. Nobody wants to cut Social Security? Come on. It is a big program, \$200 or \$300 billion. Come on down the aisle. Where is everybody? Where is everybody who wants to cut Medicaid? Where is everybody that wants to cut national defense? Where is everybody who wants to cut the big programs? The Government is made up of a few big programs but lots of little programs. A lot of these little programs are very good programs. A lot of them are well-meaning programs. But, frankly, a lot of them need to be pared back or need to be eliminated.

I happen to believe the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is one. The reason we are having so much trouble, frankly, is because of letters like this sent out by the president of WHYY-TV in Philadelphia, and as a result of numerous public broadcasting commercials and public broadcasting, both on radio and television, to write your Congressman and Senator and

say, "Do not let them take Barney and Big Bird off the air. Do not let them take our subsidy away. Go out there and lobby on our behalf," hiring lobbyists and people to come down here and try to convince us to keep the money flowing. Keep that money flowing to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

I have written a letter of I think three or four pages in response to the constituents who have asked me. It is a letter that I gave a lot of thought to, and I said here are all the reasons why I think the Corporation for Public Broadcasting should be cut.

These stations in Pennsylvania decided they are going to write a letter responding to my letter and lobbying and pointing out all the flaws in my letter.

I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD following my statement a copy of this letter and a copy of my response point by point.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President.

I will tell you that, while he says all these things are in fact not true, the fact of the matter is they are all true. Everything that I have in that letter is exactly right. He is providing information. I can go through just some of them. I suggest in my letter that there are many private sector sponsors who would like to be involved, and who could—and in fact are—supporting public broadcasting. And we could in fact privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which is the entity by which the Federal funds flow through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. GRAMS. I yield an additional 2 minutes from the time allotted to the majority leader for his amendment.

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

I say you can privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which is an entity located here in Washington that the Federal dollars are allocated through. He responds and says that public broadcasting stations may not by Federal regulation be for-profit enterprises. Well, I did not say anything about for-profit stations being owned by the private sector. What I said was that we could privatize the organization that provides some funding to those stations, which in fact we can, and which the Senator from South Dakota, Senator PRESSLER, is in the process of trying to do by statute.

This is the bait and switch which is going on in this letter. In his letter he says:

The Senator describes American public broadcasting—an effort in constant threat of financial starvation, forbidden to sell anything and forbidden to make a profit—as "well-endowed."

I do say they are well endowed. I justify that by saying that "Barney" and

"Sesame Street" combined have royalties of about \$2 billion of which the Corporation for Public Broadcasting gets virtually nothing.

Various other programs—I have my share of "Shining Time Station Puzzles" for my 4-year-old and my 2-year-old. I have my share of other things from the "Puzzle Kids," whatever they are called, something like that. I do not know—"The Puzzle Gang." I have a bunch of this stuff—Mr. Rogers, a wonderful man from my hometown of Pittsburgh, who does a tremendous job for the community, does a tremendous show. But these assets can and should be used, instead of going to public broadcasting, go to the taxpayers, who go out and work darned hard for their dollars, to have it funneled through here to pay for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, to pay for a lot of the other things.

He mentions one other thing. He says the Senator's comments are ideological, that I come at it from an "ideological standpoint." He is absolutely right. I do come at it from an ideological standpoint. My ideology is that the Federal Government should not be supporting these things, that we need to reduce the size of Government. But it certainly is not from the ideological standpoint that I do not agree with what is on there. That is irrelevant. Does the Federal Government, when we have limited resources, have a role of supporting broadcast television in an era where broadcast television is almost as much a dinosaur as the crank phone when we are going to cable and direct satellite communications? We should support public broadcast television? It is ridiculous. We have to move into the 21st century in the U.S. Senate just like public broadcasting has to move in the 21st century in telecommunications.

That is what this is all about. I can tell you that we are going to have a battle about this. I do not know if we are going to win. I tell you, if we do not win, I question the sincerity of the people in this Chamber to really do anything about reducing the deficit. I really question whether we are really willing to stare at children who are facing 82 percent tax rates, as PAUL COVERDELL says, in 10 years only having five Federal programs left if we just do nothing. How can we stare those children in the face, that we say, as in the Daschle amendment, we care about so much? How can you care about someone and let them keep 18 percent of what they earn? How can you care about someone if you are not willing to stand up and defeat the special interests and do what is right for the long-term interest of the American children? This Daschle amendment, putting more money in programs today, is not the answer. Preserving the fiscal integrity of tomorrow is what really is going to help America's children.

I yield the floor.

## EXHIBIT 1

## TEXT OF SENATOR RICK SANTORUM'S LETTER TO CONSTITUENTS

Federal funds for public broadcasting are administered and distributed by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB). The CPB makes direct grants to public television and radio stations, as well as grants to the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) and national Public Radio (NPR) for program projects and productions. In 1994, the CPB received \$253 million from Congress.

The majority of funding for public television and radio does not come from the CPB, but rather from member stations, educational institutions, corporations, and private citizens. For example, in 1993 the CPB provided only 14.2% of the industry-wide spending for public broadcasting. It is also important to note that PBS and NPR are not divisions of the CPB; they are private, non-profit organizations that utilize federal funds to supplement their operating budget. In 1993, the CPB provided only 13.9% of the total PBS budget and 4% of the total NPR budget. It is therefore not accurate to suggest that "Sesame Street" and other popular PBS shows would be forced off the air if CPB funding were reduced or eliminated.

In this time of federal downsizing and fiscal reform, tough decisions need to be made about government spending. Last year Congress reduced funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), which is vital to Pennsylvania senior citizens. Congress has also taken steps to close the Philadelphia Naval Shipyards, which employs thousands of Pennsylvania residents. With cuts of this nature taking place, it is hard for me to justify the continued use of federal resources to subsidize the well-endowed public broadcasting industry.

If Congress acts to scale back, privatize, or eliminate the CPB, I am confident that the resulting loss of funds for public television and radio will be compensated by new corporate sponsorship and public support. Several major corporations have already expressed interest in supporting a privatized Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

In addition, PBS, a major contributor and supporter of public television, has yet to utilize its full range of funding options. You may or may not be aware that commercial products related to Barney, the amiable children's character on PBS, grossed almost \$1 billion last year. PBS receives almost none of these profits because it chose not to secure licensing rights for commercial products related to PBS shows. PBS will also receive very little of the \$800 million grossed by "Sesame Street" products. To put it bluntly, I do not think taxpayers should pay to put Barney on public TV for Barney to make billions of dollars. If PBS were to secure even a small percentage of these earnings through product licensing, the lost share of federal funds would be easily replaced, or even doubled.

Congress has also provided other means of support or public broadcasting besides direct funding through the CPB. Over thirty years ago, Congress directed the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to designate specific VHF television channels for educational broadcasting. This FCC frequency allocation program continues to allow public television and radio stations to remain exempt from the sizeable fees and costs paid by private commercial stations. Congress has also given non-profit status to public broadcasting stations, allowing them to receive

tax-deductible contributions and avoid paying corporate taxes, which amounts to a federal government subsidy. I continue to support these significant accommodations made by Congress for public broadcasting.

After considering the factors of private funding, commercial licensing, and additional federal supports for public broadcasting, I have reached the conclusion that the future of public broadcasting in the United States is not dependent on continued funding through the CPB. The CPB has played an important role in expanding access to public broadcasting and improving program quality since its establishment in 1967. Now that these primary goals have been achieved, I believe it may be time for Congress to evaluate proposals to downsize, privatize, or discontinue this organization.

Americans have shown a strong commitment to supporting public television and radio. This commitment will continue as long as PBS, NPR, and their local affiliates remain committed to the production and broadcasting of programs that enrich the educational and cultural life of our nation.

(tv 12 WHYY 91 fm),  
INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST,  
Philadelphia, PA, February 21, 1995.

Thank you for sending the copy of the letter you have received from Senator Santorum. It seems clear that the national conversation about public broadcasting is based more on political posturing than on reasoning and fact. That conversation needs to be elevated.

The Senator suggests that "tough decisions need to be made about government spending." He's right, and most Americans agree. Why, however, does he join those who aim so fiercely at a national instrumentality that provides educational and cultural services and earns the great majority of its money from non-federal sources? Why does he join those who single out, with great fanfare, a national educational effort that accounts for only .0003 of the national budget?

To me, the answer is that Senator Santorum writes from an ideological standpoint, and his arguments are the common ones in the current national discussion about public broadcasting. The danger is that misinformation is too often treated as fact.

The Senator describes American public broadcasting—an effort in constant threat of financial starvation, forbidden to sell anything and forbidden to make a profit—as "well-endowed." The facts are, simply and clearly, otherwise.

The Senator suggests that "several major corporations have already expressed interest in supporting a privatized Corporation for Public Broadcasting." This is a pretty far-fetched notion, since CPB is merely a funnel for federal money. Does he mean that a private corporation will provide the \$285 million each year currently appropriated by CPB? It seems unlikely. In addition, public broadcasting stations may not, by federal regulation, be owned by for-profit enterprises.

He goes on to suggest that commercial products resulting from the Barney series could fuel PBS, which shows a basic lack of understanding concerning public broadcasting and how it subsists.

The Senator's suggestion that "Congress directed the Federal Communications Commission to designate specific VHF television channels for educational broadcasting" is incorrect. The FCC's Sixth Report and Order of 1952, which set aside both VHF and UHF channels for educational use, was not ordered by Congress.

He goes on to suggest that the "non-profit status" of public broadcasting stations was "given" to them by Congress. That is untrue.

The nonprofit status was ordered by the FCC, which prohibited commercials on the new stations, in order to eliminate possible competition between commercial and educational stations. He also claims that "private commercial stations" pay "sizeable fees and costs" that the educational stations do not. This is simply not so.

It's important that the current conversation about public broadcasting in America be elevated to a reasonable, civil level, a level on which fact, opinion and fantasy can be separated, a level on which ideology plays a minimal role and a level on which service to Americans is the goal.

We appreciate your continued interest.

Sincerely,  
FREDERICK BREITENFELD, JR.,  
President.

THE ERRONEOUS WHYY LETTER  
From: Frederick Breitenfeld, Jr., President,  
WHYY, TV12, 91 FM, Independence Mall  
West, Philadelphia, PA.

WHYY/Frederick Breitenfeld, Jr.	Facts/RJS Position
"Why . . . does [RJS] join those who aim so fiercely at a national instrumentality that provides educational and cultural services . . ."	My aim is fierce at deficit reduction. Government spending cuts should be even handed. CPB can't be excluded from deficit reduction cuts affecting all federal spending.
"Why does he join those who single out . . . a national educational effort that accounts for only .0003 of the national budget?"	Should Congress only single out massive federal programs? Should CPB, merely because it's a small program, not contribute its share to deficit reduction?
"To me, the answer is that Senator Santorum writes from an ideological standpoint . . ."	Yes! Less federal government and eliminating the deficit are the ideological reasons underlying these cuts. I believe the vast majority of Pennsylvanians share this view.
"The Senator describes American public broadcasting—an effort in constant threat of financial starvation, forbidden to sell anything and forbidden to make a profit—as 'well-endowed.'"	It sounds as if Mr. Breitenfeld agrees that the CPB should be able to reap the commercial rewards of its educational ventures such as "Barney" and "Sesame Street," all the more reason for reduced federal funding.
[Regarding RJS's mention of corporate support of CPB privatization]: "Does he mean that a private corporation will provide the \$285 million each year currently appropriated to CPB?"	No. I mean there are many corporations which, through tax incentives, would readily support an independent, privatized CPB.
"He goes on to suggest that commercial products resulting from the Barney series could fuel PBS, which shows a basic lack of understanding concerning public broadcasting and how it subsists."	Fact: Barney grossed almost \$1 billion dollars in 1994, PBS should be allowed to reap the reward of its product.
"He goes on to suggest that the 'non-profit status' of public broadcasting stations was 'given' to them by Congress. That is untrue. The nonprofit status was ordered by the FCC . . ."	Congress passed the following: "There is authorized to be established a non profit corporation, to be known as the Corporation For Public Broadcasting, 'which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government.'" 47 USC 395(b)
"He also claims that 'private commercial stations' pay 'sizeable fees and costs' that the educational stations do not."	Commercial stations pay taxes. Commercial stations pay processing and regulatory fees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a reminder, there are 2 minutes remaining of the majority leader's time.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. 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. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to reiterate why we believe this amendment is important.

Fundamentally, it goes to the heart of what it is that we as Democrats believe we are here for: protecting working families, investing in children, and

doing that in a meaningful way without reducing the overall commitment to deficit reduction one iota.

That is really what this amendment does. It provides the kind of commitment we need for working families, and the commitment especially we need for children. But it also recognizes the need for deficit reduction because children and working families are directly affected by that as well.

We do so by restoring some of the cuts that were made in areas that directly affect children in the most significant way—children dependent upon child care, so that working families can meet their obligations at the workplace; Head Start for children who depend upon a program that has now been in use for more than 30 years, clearly which has shown to be one of the most important ways with which to prepare children to be better students and to be more able to cope with all of the challenges in early life.

We also protect young adults interested in national service. These young people are committing themselves to their country in a way that makes a significant contribution to our country through national service and community assistance, and at the same time to generate the ability to go back to college or to go to college in the first place to advance their education in as many ways as they can.

We also recognize that women, infants, and children of all ages really depend upon adequate nutrition. If they do not have adequate nutrition, they really do not have the ability to ensure good health. If we learned anything in the debate over the last couple of years about health care, it is that perhaps the best investment we can make is an investment in preventive care. Making sure people stay healthy is the best way to ensure that they are not going to need expensive care later on.

That is exactly what the Women, Infants and Children Program does. It assures adequate nutrition, adequate nutrition assures adequate good health, and with good health we assure the opportunities for young people and for women to be productive citizens in this country.

Aid to schools, of course, is something that we have long felt is perhaps the single best investment this country can make. As we look at the real defense of this country, as we look at ways to maximize the security and the strength of this Nation, there is no better way to do it than to ensure that our schools have the resources they need to prepare young children to be good adults later on.

Obviously, we have gone through some very disappointing days last week, in that we thought we were going to have a good debate as early as last Thursday on this very issue, whether we ought to be able to protect 1 million children who are affected by all of these programs. We were denied that debate. And, unfortunately, as well, the majority has now offered a

second-degree amendment that would gut this amendment and would further the attack on some of these programs directly affecting kids and families.

So we are anxious to debate priorities as we go about the difficult task of balancing the budget. But I hope that we would not replace a vote on the priorities we place on kids and families with a vote on cutting the deficit further. We really ought to accomplish both things.

We recognize the importance of deficit reduction. We recognize the importance of investment in children and families. That balance is really what we are trying to strike in the first place. We agree that the deficit has to be reduced. We agree that the \$15.3 billion that bill now provides is a significant reduction and ought to be supported.

Where we apparently disagree is whether or not we could take some of the funding in the out years for FEMA, funding that goes beyond what even the House has proposed, and use it to direct resources to people who are really dealing with emergencies right now.

It is an emergency if you are a young family and cannot get child care. In some cases it is going to be an emergency if some of these schools do not get impact aid funding or some of the money that they are counting on in this year's budget to ensure that they meet their obligations later on.

So it is really a very fundamental question of providing the delicate balance between addressing those concerns, the investments in the families of 1 million children, and investing, as well, in meaningful deficit reduction over the course of the next 24 months.

We also, of course, had an opportunity to address the issue of billionaires who renounce their citizenship in order to avoid paying taxes on their fortunes. I am very pleased that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has indicated his determination to ultimately resolve this issue. I think the Senate will go on record one way or another, hopefully sooner rather than later, that that is not something that we support; that we recognize that, as we are trying to make very tough decisions about priorities and about kids and where the resources ought to go, to say no to child care, no to Head Start, no to AmeriCorps, but yes to billionaires who renounce their citizenship is not a set of priorities I think anybody in this Chamber is very comfortable with. So we want to find a way to deal with that issue, as well.

I applaud the effort that others have made to talk about priorities as we deal with the rescission package and the offsets required for FEMA. I hope, as we go through this whole debate, we will be very cognizant of the need to ensure a proper balance between that investment and meaningful deficit reduction.

We want some bipartisan cooperation here, as well. We want to ensure that our amendment is adequately debated,

that we have a vote on this amendment; not one in the second degree, not on some substitute, but an up-or-down vote on this amendment, so we can say, without equivocation, these are our priorities, unaffected by whatever additional amendments others may want to offer.

We want to have a clear statement of priorities and a clear statement of intent with regard to what our investment truly is.

We are at a crossroads. I think that crossroads, to a certain extent, is going to be affected by decisions we make on this particular bill. We can choose to work together and find ways with which to ensure that Democrat concerns can be addressed as well as Republican concerns.

But second-degree amendments used to prevent us from having an up-or-down vote on something we hold to be very important sends the wrong message, I believe, about our desire to work together to accommodate both sides as we take up very serious legislation.

We have legitimate amendments that reflect our thoughts about the direction our country should take on balancing the budget. Whether it is in this bill or whether it is in bills that will be taken up at a later date, I hope that the majority would allow votes to be cast on each and every one of these issues.

We have a difference of opinion with the majority over how best to cut \$1.3 billion. We have about \$1.2 trillion to go as we balance the budget over the course of the next 7 years. We are not going to get there unless we work together.

The approach taken by the majority on this bill so far does not bode well. The overwhelming majority, if not all of our colleagues, on the Democratic side support the amendment that we have laid down.

Let there be no mistake. This was not done at the behest of the President of the United States, as has been suggested. This proposal was the response of our caucus. We feel compelled to stand up for children. We feel compelled to speak up for working families.

If the other side moves to table our amendment and has the votes, there will be others offered to address the needs of working families by cutting other less urgent priorities. But we are willing to offer them in a deliberate process that can be performed expeditiously, and I hope the majority would respect that.

If, on the other hand, our amendment would be agreed to, we could complete our work on this bill even more expeditiously. And I hope that remains a possibility. I hope that Republicans and Democrats could agree that, indeed, we must reduce the deficit, indeed we must find ways with which to maximize the opportunities to fund FEMA, but I think we would also agree that respecting the investment that we have

made in our commitment to kids and our commitment to schools and our commitment to working families ought to be respected, as well.

So, we really have a choice here, Mr. President. I hope that we could support both the need to ensure that the Federal Emergency Management Administration has the resources necessary to continue its extraordinary work in providing emergency assistance to communities all over the country, and I hope that we could also move ahead with meaningful deficit reduction.

But I also hope that in addition to those two priorities, what I have said about our commitment to investment in kids in education could be at the top of the list as well.

There have been calls on the other side of the aisle to privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the majority leader's amendment is the first step in laying that groundwork by cutting the funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. That is another issue. I hope that those of us who are opposed to taking that draconian approach toward public broadcasting will have the opportunity to debate it up or down.

But the issue here is not public broadcasting; it is not anything other than what we have listed on this chart. The issue here is child care; it is Head Start; it is giving kids an opportunity to earn college access and college tuition by participating in national service; it is ensuring we have good preventive care; it is ensuring that we have the kind of investments in schools that we really need if, indeed, we are serious about maintaining the commitment to schools to maximize their educational opportunities to the children who walk in the doors each and every day.

So those really are the issues here, Mr. President. We hope that people understand the need to restore the child care opportunities for 5,000 children, as we have listed. It tells working families that we want them to continue to work and to generate all the income their talents will allow and we are going to assist them in their child care needs. Without child care, many low-income parents may find themselves on welfare. Our amendment will enable those parents to continue work.

We had an opportunity just last week to meet a couple who participated in a news conference with us on minimum wage. It was a couple from Pennsylvania who had been on welfare who came to the conclusion less than a year ago that they were not going to allow themselves to be dependent anymore, who decided they were going to go out and find jobs, and find the kinds of opportunities in the private sector we have been admonishing them to go out and find.

Unfortunately, all they could find were minimum-wage jobs or something slightly above minimum wage. I think, in one case, one of the jobs they had paid \$5 an hour rather than \$4.25. They did not have health insurance. They

have two children. The children get sick from time to time. They have no way with which to address their children's illness. They try to keep their health care bills low, but they said, "It was so much easier when we were on welfare. We had Medicaid. We could go into the hospital and we knew at least we had minimal coverage. We had income that was almost as good as what we have right now, and we did not have to worry about child care."

That is exactly the dilemma a lot of young families are facing. They do not want to be on welfare. They want to find alternatives. What we are trying to tell them is if you go out and do the right thing, we are going to reward work. We want to reward work by making sure that your income at the end of a hard-working week is not going to relegate you to poverty, even though you may be struggling.

We know that you have to go out and find perhaps a second job, and we are willing to accept that. But if you go out and make sure you do what we expect you to do, that is, not rely upon welfare to meet your needs, we want to the extent we can help you with meaningful child care, and with meaningful pay for the work that you do each and every day. We want to send you the message that we are glad that you made the decision not to be on welfare and that you are going to continue to be productive citizens within your community by working at jobs that we hope will begin paying more.

But that is really the issue here with regard to taking care of their children, with regard to educating their children, with regard to providing them with adequate nutrition, with regard to ensuring that once their children go to school that they have the necessary resources to be taught and to be as competitive in the United States as they need to be, given the competition in other countries.

So, Mr. President, that is really what our message is. We want to make work pay. We want to make work pay by providing meaningful opportunities for children who may need child care support. We want to provide meaningful opportunities for children who are beneficiaries of the Head Start Program. And we also, as I said, want to help 36,000 young people who will benefit from national service by the continuation of a program that, in our view, has worked exceedingly well in the very short period of time that we have seen it in operation.

If our amendment is not adopted, a promise will be broken to tens of thousands of young Americans, the communities they serve, and the charitable groups they help. These organizations and communities have now been told we are going to have this program there; it is going to work; you can count on people assisting you as you go through the difficult decisions you have to with regard to how you are going to cope with your budget and how you are going to address many of

the operational challenges that you face every day.

This program is really a partnership, a partnership with communities, a partnership with organizations, a partnership with young people who recognize that when there is an expectation that assistance can be provided for college that, indeed, the reciprocal responsibility is to ensure that those children and those young people understand that there is a commitment required of them, as well.

So national service is something I hope is around for a long period of time, a program that I believe deserves our full support. Simply to eliminate it, to forget its success already, would be very shortsighted, indeed. In fact, I hope that Republicans can join us, as they have in the past, in recognizing just what a tremendous opportunity it is for a lot of young people.

So, Mr. President, I think the message is very clear; it is pretty simple. The message is simply that we want to do what everybody here says we ought to do, and that is reduce the deficit to the extent that we can; provide the funds necessary to ensure that the Federal Emergency Management Administration is given the adequate funds necessary to continue in their role; but then, third, we also recognize the very delicate balance that we have in providing the investment that we need to provide in ensuring the continuity of a lot of the services that we now provide schools, children, and working families.

So I hope that as we make our decision about this amendment, we understand that there is a need to maintain that balance; we understand that it sends exactly the wrong message to say no, we are going to have to cut child care, Head Start, cut funding for something as valuable as national service, but somehow we are going to protect those expatriates who renounce their citizenship in order to save tax dollars. We should not say that we are going to protect the billionaires, but we are not going to protect the children.

I know that there are many people in this Chamber who would support that notion, but I think it sends the wrong message if we are on record as willing to allow the billionaire expatriates to avoid paying taxes and yet vote to cut successful children's programs as dramatically as this.

So I hope, Mr. President, we can be cognizant of the message our vote on this amendment will send. We want to ensure that deficit reduction, that FEMA funding, and that investments in kids and working families are all protected. This amendment does that. It does that by restoring some of the balance that was lost, especially in the House, restored in part in the Senate Appropriations Committee, and now can be restored almost in its entirety by voting in favor of the amendment we are offering now.

We will have more to say about it certainly tomorrow morning and in the

coming debate over perhaps the course of the next day or so. I hope we can convince our Republican colleagues that this is an amendment worthy of their support.

I would like to see a strong bipartisan message that Republicans and Democrats support the commitment we have made to kids, the commitment we have made to working families. I certainly hope that before the end of this debate, Republicans and Democrats can demonstrate that support and vote in favor of this amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 40 minutes to be equally divided on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, can the President inform the Senate as to what the current unanimous-consent agreement allows with regard to remaining time on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are nearly 26 minutes left under the unanimous-consent order on this debate.

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask the Senator from Iowa whether it is his intent to seek 40 minutes in addition to that 26 minutes? I have not yielded back the 26 minutes, so I want to protect that in case other Senators may be interested in coming to the floor to speak on the amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY. My request would be in addition to the 26 minutes.

Mr. DASCHLE. I have no objection.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I rise to speak in strong support of the committee's actions regarding AmeriCorps. I particularly want to commend Senator BOND for his work in this area. But I also have had an opportunity to hear Senators KYL, ASHCROFT, SANTORUM and FAIRCLOTH speak very eloquently on the very same subject. I compliment them for their fine remarks.

I know that Senator BOND has been closely reviewing the AmeriCorps Program and has found, as I have, that there are many unanswered questions concerning AmeriCorps, and further increases at this time do not seem to be advisable.

I have been looking closely at AmeriCorps since last July when I began a series of letters requesting information and data about AmeriCorps. Unfortunately, I did not receive answers to many of the questions that I asked, or the information I received was either misleading or incomplete.

Recently, AmeriCorps has promised me access to much of the data that I requested, and I hope this reflects a genuine change of attitude and a willingness to cooperate.

However, even from the information that I have been provided, there are many reasons to question the merits of this program. Let me first focus on the cost of the program, because in reviewing the actual AmeriCorps grant awards, we have found program after program where costs are \$30,000 to \$40,000 per AmeriCorps worker.

For example, the organization ACORN recently received a grant of over \$1 million from AmeriCorps. ACORN also receives funds from Fannie Mae as well. This program is for 42 AmeriCorps workers, and the cost per worker of over \$41,000.

In comparison we could help 20 young people go to college through the use of Pell grants with that same amount of money. Let me add that the costs of the ACORN program do not include the significant Federal overhead, nor the fact that many AmeriCorps workers drop out of the program. Thus, the cost per successful worker, which ought to be the true cost measurement of this program, would be significantly higher than \$41,000.

As I mentioned, the cost of \$41,000 per worker is by no means out of the ordinary for AmeriCorps. Legal Services Corporation received almost \$1 million from AmeriCorps with the cost per AmeriCorps worker of over \$48,000. Recently, AmeriCorps finally admitted that in one grant to a Los Angeles school district the taxpayers were paying a consultant \$50 an hour—that is an hour, Mr. President.

We are being told that AmeriCorps is beneficial. I do not know what benefit the taxpayers are getting by having somebody on an hourly wage earning the equivalent of over \$100,000 per year. This is outrageous and, of course, it gives other boondoggles a bad name.

Mr. President, let me compare AmeriCorps workers with the Boy Scouts, for instance—a well-known group of people who are out doing good every day. They do not receive any money from AmeriCorps. In fact, they were turned down for funding by AmeriCorps so that funding could be provided to such traditional volunteer groups as the EPA and the Department of Agriculture.

The Boy Scouts have over 5.3 million young people and adults performing volunteer work and helping in their communities. According to the Boy Scouts' 1993 annual report, for the National Capital Area Council, their total expenses were \$4.8 million, for over 50,000 Scouts, that is \$95 per Scout per year.

Well, that sounds about right, does it not? The Federal Government pays someone \$50 an hour for 750 hours of work for a total of \$37,500 to consult about volunteering. And the private sector can give you almost 400 actual volunteers with the same amount of money without a dime of cost to the taxpayers. Let me say that these Scouts are doing just great work. For example, last November, 40,000 Scouts in the DC area distributed 1 million

bags to doorsteps of homes in their communities to help a food collection effort. The next week the Scouts returned to collect the filled bags and to bring them to a central distribution center, which was distributing the bags then to the needy during the holiday season.

I want to now clarify a few points regarding AmeriCorps. First, AmeriCorps workers are spending a significant amount of their time doing work other than helping their communities. For example, under AmeriCorps' own regulations published in the Federal Register, AmeriCorps workers can spend taxpayers' money studying for the GED. I do think that it is fine and good that young people are taking time to study for the GED. However, it is questionable whether our taxpayers' money should pay some young people to study for the GED, when hundreds of thousands study for it without receiving a single dollar from the taxpayers.

The second point I want to make, in summary, is that AmeriCorps was presented to Congress as a way to help young people pay for college. Yet, according to AmeriCorps' own admission, at least a fifth of the workers have not attended college and probably will not attend college. They are not receiving an educational award. They are instead getting cash awards, as was revealed by NBC news very recently. For many, this is just another Government jobs program.

Mr. President, AmeriCorps is a program with costs that are far exceeding the estimates provided by the administration. It is a program that may not be managing the taxpayers' money properly. In many respects, it is a questionable use of taxpayer funds. Since we could certainly stretch these dollars a lot further in programs such as Pell grants.

Finally, AmeriCorps is a proposal that is duplicating, at enormous expense, services that are being provided by the private sector. I, like Senator BOND and so many others, am a skeptic of this program. I am holding off final judgment until I receive the information promised me by AmeriCorps and by the results of the General Accounting Office report that is reviewing the cost of the AmeriCorps Program. Once the data is in, the program may need reinvention. Certainly, we can accomplish the goals of this program without awarding grants with costs of \$40,000-plus per worker.

To increase funding for AmeriCorps at this time, with so little known and with so many problems that are known, is not in the best interest of the taxpayers. We need to proceed cautiously with this program until all of the data is in.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against any efforts to increase funding for this program.

I yield the floor and yield back any of my unused time.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. How much time is remaining on the Republican side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just over 12 minutes remain in the debate.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I want to continue the discussion on the Dole amendment which, again, provides an additional cut in spending of \$1.3 billion for this fiscal year, the year we are in right now. It would supersede the Daschle amendment that would put back another \$1.3 billion in spending, and it leaves in place the \$1.3 billion that was going to be taken away from the original purpose of this bill, which was a disaster relief fund.

So \$1.3 billion is scheduled to go to California under this bill. Again, the reason for this bill even being here is because of the earthquake disaster in California.

The amendment of the Democratic leader takes \$1.3 billion, takes that away, and replaces it with a whole bunch of other programs.

What we do is leave the money there, take his programs away and, in fact, reduces the deficit by \$1.3 billion more.

We think that is the general direction that we should try to reduce the deficit and programs that we believe merit further scrutiny and reduction without being disruptive here in the middle of a fiscal year.

One of the programs, as the Senator from Iowa just very articulately said, is the AmeriCorps Program. This is the one area where not only is there a contention whether we should cut it, but where the Democratic leader wants to increase funding for AmeriCorps from the current bill, and the majority leader wants to decrease funding from the bill.

It is the one area we have in common on the two amendments, but we are going in opposite directions. I think it is appropriate, because it probably represents the best discussion of the differences between the direction of the two parties when it comes to the role of Government in providing services to individuals, and, really, the concept of what Government should do and what can be left to the private sector.

Interestingly enough, we have a program such as the AmeriCorps Program which hires Corps volunteers. Most people say, if you hire someone, they are no longer a volunteer.

That is somehow lost on the people who created the AmeriCorps Program, because hiring a volunteer is, in fact, part of the vernacular. They hire volunteers in the AmeriCorps.

What do the volunteers get paid? We heard the number around here, I will give you a number, from Wisconsin, which is put together by Representative TOM PETRI from Wisconsin. That AmeriCorps volunteer, the one who was, in fact, mentioned by President Clinton, I guess it is Kentucky, a woman who was mentioned by President Clinton in his speech on the state

of the Union, who teaches second-graders to read in rural Kentucky, a compelling story that the President used during his State of the Union Address. This person gets paid \$9,000—not a lot of money—but \$9,000 in stipend pay. In addition, she gets a voucher to pay for her higher education of a little over \$5,000; she gets roughly \$8,000 in child care benefit paid to by the Government under this program; she gets Medicaid coverage which is \$4,000 for her family of five; because most of her benefits are tax free she qualifies for another \$3,200 in earned income tax credits, making this job that she has equivalent to a job that pays \$34,000 in the private sector. Now, that is a lot for a volunteer.

I happen to agree with what the President of the Ohio-West Virginia YMCA said:

The national service movement is about institutionalizing Federal funding for national and community service. It is about changing the language and the understanding of service to eliminate the words "volunteer" and "community service" and in their place implant the idea that service is something paid for by the Government.

That was someone from the YMCA.

This is dangerous program. People say, wow, dangerous program. Is that not extreme? How can this program be dangerous? This is dangerous to the whole philosophy of who America is, what we are all about.

Are we a country that is a great country because we have great Government employees? I would think that the people around the world look at America and they say we are a great country, but probably not anywhere in their top 50 of their reasons is that we have great bureaucrats, that is the reason America is a great country.

I can guarantee on the top 10 of any list is that America has a great spirit of community and helping your neighbor and voluntarism. As de Tocqueville said, "America is great because it is good. When it ceases being good, it will no longer be great."

Paying volunteers decreases our goodness. It is not the American spirit. It is not reaching out to help your neighbor just because they are neighbors, not because you get paid for it.

Do not tell me all these compassionate stories of how these people are so wonderful because they are helping. They are wonderful. It is great to help. But they are no different than the insurance agent who helps someone who comes and has their car wrecked and comes and helps then. It is their job. It is a wonderful job. It is an important job. It is necessary for the insurance person who helps. But do not raise this to some elevated standard of national and community service when, in fact, it is paid bureaucrat.

I have a suggestion. I happen to agree that there is a lot of work out there that can and should be done by folks in the genre of the AmeriCorps Program. We have a solution for that. It targets the people who need the jobs. It targets the people that need the training, who need the work experience.

I heard the Democratic leader say "all these young people in AmeriCorps." Again, talk to the facts. You can be 60 years of age and be in AmeriCorps. It is not focused at young people. You can be a multimillionaire and you can be in AmeriCorps. There is no age other than up to 60, and there is no income qualifications.

Now, I can tell Members that we have a pool of people who desperately need help, who desperately want to work to feel that they can give back. The community needs them as much as they need the community. It is people on public assistance. People on welfare.

We create a program as we do in the Republican welfare reform bill that puts people needing job skills, training, and just some success in their life, give them the opportunity to go out and work that job. Why not give them the chance? Why give some rich doctor's kid \$34,000 a year to go to school?

That is not what this program should be about. That is not a program, I do not think, this body wants to defend. It sounds so grand and it sounds so wonderful when they talk about how wonderful voluntarism is, but, folks, look at the facts.

As well-meaning as this program is, this is a program that is another social experiment based in Washington that is destructive of our nature and our character as Americans. We should end it. Quickly, decisively, and hopefully, tomorrow.

I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. President, as has been mentioned during the course of the debate on the Daschle amendment, part of the Daschle amendment applies to restoration of some \$210 million for the AmeriCorps Program. This program has been addressed earlier, in the course of the afternoon, and I will take a few moments to comment upon it.

First of all, Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to hear from my colleagues who talk about how even a stipend which effectively is the minimum wage should not be available for individuals who want to volunteer in their community.

There are many in this institution who would evidently like to preserve voluntarism just for the very wealthy individuals in our country. There are a lot of needy kids, a lot of poor people, who have a sense of idealism and a commitment to service, and who would like to be able to take the time that others who have the financial resources can take in order to volunteer and to do good works.

The AmeriCorps concept is to give people an opportunity to work in their communities. It does provide a stipend which is basically the minimum wage. It does provide an award at the end of service to encourage people to go back to school, or to go to school. These are people who otherwise probably would not be able to afford it.

The educational award is about \$4,700. We basically took what was going to be an average cost for tuition in State universities across the country. Most of those State universities' costs have gone up. But it is still a good start. So AmeriCorps lets young people go there—it combines service and education.

I am so interested to hear some people say that some of these programs are not going well. Talk to your Governors. This is a State and local responsibility, not a Federal program. Ask your Governors how it is working. I know that in Massachusetts, the participants do a superb job.

There are outstanding business men and women. There are local community leaders and activists—all of whom are involved in the shaping and the fashioning of the program.

If there are some programs that are not working, I am sure Eli Segal wants to know about them. We will get busy trying to do something about them. But the fact of the matter is, this is not a Federal program controlled from the top down. This is a program that is developed and run in local communities, with local support and initiative.

I would like to mention a recent study which surveyed what 1,654 AmeriCorps workers accomplished in 5 months. These 1,654 workers are only 8 percent of the 20,000 total AmeriCorps participants.

These 1,654 people taught and tutored 15,480 children from preschool to junior high school. These children had no other opportunity to get this kind of additional educational help and assistance.

These 1,654 people established after-school programs for 4,650 children. Those are children of working-class and working families, children who probably would have been left unattended if they had not been involved in those afterschool programs. The AmeriCorps participants work under supervision to develop tutorial programs and other effective programs.

These 1,654 people organized community service projects for 4,400 children.

These 1,654 people escorted some 8,500 children in schools through safe corridors. We can say, what does that really mean? The fact is, if you get children who live in difficult areas with high crime rates, the AmeriCorps people work out a system so the children can go safely to the school and return to school. Maybe it is difficult for us to understand what is happening out there in many of the urban areas—in the inner cities. But you have thousands of children who are so intimidated that they will not go to school. The AmeriCorps members have developed programs that have the broad support of the children and the parents, programs that permit the children to go to school through safe corridors.

These 1,654 people have been doing work with gangs to reduce gang violence, as well as work with victims of domestic violence and other troubled teenagers.

The list goes on—a number of immunization programs as well. I will include in the RECORD a list of the accomplishments—these are all accomplishments of only 1,654 volunteers, or 8 percent of the total, and these were randomly selected.

I should also mention the work that has been done in southern Texas on immunization programs. There are thousands and thousands of children today who are immunized, and without that program they would not have been immunized.

A study recently released of the first 5 months of the AmeriCorps program surveyed 52 program sites—or about 8 percent of the total sites. 1,654 participants—out of a total of 20,000—were working at these sites. Here is a sample of what they accomplished.

On education, the 1,654 AmeriCorps members worked largely in poor urban and rural areas;

They taught and tutored 9,068 preschool, elementary school, and junior high school students in basic educational skills;

They developed or ran enriched learning programs such as computer-based instruction, scientific experimentation, and peer tutoring for 6,414 children;

They established after-school and vacation programs for 4,656 children;

They organized community service projects for 4,469 children;

They provided literacy or employment training for 694 adults; and

They provided intensive educational support—including regular counseling—to 30 troubled teenagers living in group homes and 22 homeless preschoolers.

On public safety, the 1,654 AmeriCorps members worked to reduce violence in families, in schools, and on the streets;

They escorted 8,500 children to school through safe corridors;

They started 258 neighborhood safety programs and patrolled 250 vacant buildings;

They resolved 414 school conflicts that might otherwise have ended in violence, and taught conflict resolution to 8,119 children;

They counseled 1,350 potential or actual gang members and taught alternatives to violence;

They answered crisis hotlines and made referrals for 878 victims of sexual and domestic violence, and provided counseling for 470 such victims; and

They counseled 1,180 teenagers about alcohol and drug abuse.

On health, the 1,654 AmeriCorps members provided medical services and information to low-income families;

They trained 1,144 inner-city residents in CPR;

They provided emergency medical services to over 1,500 people;

They screened 1,100 low-income children for lead toxicity and other health risks;

They distributed 150 car seats to low-income families, and immunized 158 people;

They provided health counseling and transportation to 220 low-income families and over 5,000 individuals, and provided health information to over 4,500 individuals; and

They conducted workshops and distributed information on AIDS and tuberculosis to over 7,000 people, and conducted 301 HIV tests and counseled patients on the results.

On meeting basic needs, the 1,654 AmeriCorps members provided food, shelter, and support for senior citizens, low-income families, and homeless people;

They helped 123 elderly persons, 50 visually impaired adults, and 9 visually impaired children to live independently;

They organized weekly social activities for 400 nursing home residents;

They built wheelchair ramps at five low-income homes, four public buildings, and three parks;

They trained and supervised 58 volunteers and then repaired the homes of 256 senior citizens;

They renovated 238 inner-city housing units and 99 rural homes, and are working on the renovation of 121 more;

They refurbished 2 homeless shelters and began to renovate a home for senior citizens, a home for battered women, and a home for the formerly homeless;

They distributed food to more than 16,625 low-income people and packed 7,000 dinners and 32,000 breakfasts for the hungry;

They found shelter for 400 homeless families, and they sorted and distributed clothes to 350 homeless individuals;

They secured hospice housing for 27 people with AIDS and helped weekly to feed 1,250 people who are HIV-positive;

They provided housing information to over 500 low-income and homeless families; and

They found donated furniture, repaired it, and delivered it to 300 newly housed families;

On environmental and neighborhood restoration, the 1,654 AmeriCorps members responded to emergencies, restored the natural environment, and improved urban neighborhoods and parks;

They inspected and repaired 87 small dams, protecting 200 farms;

They provided disaster recovery assistance to 350 small land owners recovering from a flood, including advice on floodplain management;

They fought 2 major forest fires, saved 1 national park road from washing out, and joined 5 search and rescue efforts;

They planted 212,500 trees;

They restored 320 acres of wild land and 27 miles of riverbed and stream banks;

They removed 2,000 pounds of trash from an urban river;

They surveyed 5,700 acres of National Forest land and monitored reforestation efforts;

They built, restored, or maintained 311 campsites, 88 miles of trails, and 17 bridges, 4 beaches, and 3 duck blinds;

They converted 29 overgrown lots into green space, built 7 community gardens, and planted trees along 30 city blocks;

They created 4 playgrounds and restored, repaired, or maintained 19 historical landmarks;

They distributed 1,375 water-conserving toilets and 1,700 water-conserving showerheads in low-income neighborhoods; and

They renovated 11 community buildings, including an inner-city medical clinic, community centers, and public schools.

This is only a small sample of what community service participants have done. These examples are from a survey of 52 randomly selected AmeriCorps sites between September 1994 and January 1995. In 5 months, just 1,654 participants accomplished all this.

In all, there are 20,000 AmeriCorps participants in the field this year—and they will work for at least 9 months. They are doing important work—work that makes their communities and the Nation a better place.

In addition, hundreds of thousands of children are learning about community service through their schools with the help of grants from the “Learn and Serve” part of the Federal legislation. These children are learning the ideal of service, and they will keep it all their lives.

They are also getting things done in their communities. In Springfield, MA, Putnam Vocational High School had the highest dropout rate in the district. It received an \$1,800 grant through the “Learn and Serve” part of the program, and a group of students built a health facility for the school and the community. The students did the carpentry, electrical wiring, and construction work as part of their vocational courses. The result is a new health clinic that includes four examining rooms, two counseling rooms, a lab, and an auditorium for health education classes.

Is this the kind of initiative Republicans want to stop?

To my colleagues who say that we need to be spending our tax dollars wisely, I ask, isn't it wise to give young people the opportunity to tutor young children, build low-income housing, and work to prevent gangs?

We must not let partisan politics derail this important initiative. If you want to know whether community service is a good investment, ask the 20,000 Americans who are participating in full-time service through AmeriCorps or the more than 300,000 students from kindergarten through college who are doing service that is integrated into

their academic studies through "Learn and Serve."

Even more important, ask the people whose lives they have touched. Ask the homeless preschoolers who received counseling and education. Ask the children who can go to school with less fear of being shot. Ask the senior citizens who received support and home repairs. Ask the low-income families who received hot meals or new homes. Ask the small farmers whose land was protected from floods. Ask the parents who lived next door to the polluted river.

I do not know where the opposition to this program is coming from. With all the problems we have in this country, we are trying to give an opportunity to some 20,000 young Americans who want to do something for their communities. I can't believe the hours that are being taken to try and demolish that program. Surely we have other needs in our Nation and better things to do than trying to dismantle the voluntary service programs in this country.

Yet, Mr. President, it seems that there are those who want to do this. I think it is appropriate that we have a chance to debate this issue.

I want to just mention some of the businesses that are involved in partnerships with the nonprofit organizations that develop and sponsor the AmeriCorps programs.

In my own State, Timberland is a well-known and enormously successful corporation. It helps pay for participants' uniforms, sponsors individual teams of young people, provides employment opportunities for City Year graduates, and runs a national marketing campaign to benefit the program.

Timberland invested some \$5 million to be used over the next 5 years to help City Year expand in new communities across the Nation. They know that this is not just some program that is not worth its salt. They are not in there to just throw \$5 million around—throw \$5 million away. This is one of the really outstanding companies that has decided that City Year is a good, valuable program, and they are down there, working with these young people and helping to develop, on the basis of success in Boston, this program in other cities around the country.

The Bank of Boston is also allied with the City Year Program in Boston. The bank director, Ira Jackson, told the Boston Herald last week, "Our commitment to City Year has been the most successful philanthropic investment this institution has made in its 208-year history."

This is the Bank of Boston, and its association with the City Year Program is their best philanthropic investment in 208 years.

J.P. Morgan supports a program called AmeriCorps Leaders which places experienced graduates of community service programs in new programs to help them get started.

IBM helped develop an AmeriCorps program called Project First that aims to improve students' technology skills. Community service participants serve alongside retired IBM retirees in public schools to help bring the new technologies into the classrooms and integrate computers into the curriculum. In Boston, for example, they might work with children and with computers in the many schools that do not have a great range of electronics. They work with them, tie them into graduate students—for example, over at MIT or other technical institutes—to help those children work, to help them figure out their homework, to give them additional assistance with school. It is a very creative, imaginative program that is already paying off significantly with enhanced academic achievements and accomplishments. It is also an enormous source of satisfaction for the volunteers.

General Electric, in partnership with the United Way, has invested some \$250,000 in national community service.

These corporations I am mentioning, if they had listened this afternoon to the critics of these programs, they would not have understood what they were hearing. They would not have recognized the program that these critics were describing. They would have wondered what they are doing with their dough. These are major American companies and corporations that generally get value for every dollar that they spend. They have been enthusiastic about investing money in national and community service programs.

This is a partnership program. These programs are developed in local communities, with the help of businesses and nonprofit organizations, and then they are approved at State level.

Mr. SANTORUM assumed the chair.

Mr. KENNEDY. You know, this has been a modest program. We agreed to phase it in over 3 years—\$300 million, \$500 million, \$700 million. We are not saying this program will answer all the problems facing us. But certainly, we as a country ought to be able to challenge our young people to give something back to the community in return for all it has given to them. That is basically what this program is about. We are saying, "Look, during the period of the 1980's and early 1990's, we did not provide a lot of opportunities for young people who wanted to be a part of the process and be involved in the community."

Sure, voluntarism is a time-honored tradition and of significant value. Sure, it is taking place. Sure, there are a lot of young people in this country who do not need this kind of stipend and do not need this support. But I do think that, when you review these programs, you will find—I know in my own State, with which I am more familiar than with other parts of the country, although I have met AmeriCorps workers from all over—you will find that the participants are outstanding.

Maybe some of my colleagues who have been the most critical have spent a good deal of time in their States and in their local communities visiting these programs and talking with the participants. Maybe they have. I see my friend and colleague, the Presiding Officer now, from Pennsylvania. I should tell him that I have heard good witnesses from Philadelphia who talked about this program. Pennsylvania has been an important leader in developing these programs, both in cities and in rural areas. We have had inspirational testimony about the difference that this program has made in those young people's lives.

I think we ought to be able to reach out to young people across this country who are trying to make a difference for their communities and for their Nation. I think we ought to support them in their efforts. I am proud of the AmeriCorps Program. I am proud of the young people who serve in this program, who are trying to give something back to their communities. I think the program deserves the support of this Congress. I am very hopeful it will have that support.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I yield myself time from the distinguished minority leader's allocated time. How much time is remaining under that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 33 minutes and 48 seconds.

Mr. BREAUX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, my colleagues, I have listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon, and last week to some extent, to my colleagues speak on the program known as National Service or AmeriCorps. Unfortunately, I think it has become more of a political debate than it has been a debate on the merits of this concept.

I was thinking the other day that if two Members of Congress, perhaps two Members of the Senate, would have the opportunity to sit down one evening and pretend that they were neither Republicans nor Democrats and they would say to each other, "Well, let us for the sake of argument see if we can in the privacy of this room sit down and come up with a program, not thinking about who gets the credit, but come up with a program designed to bring about new ideas and how we might teach to our young men and women in this country something about community, something about opportunity, and something about responsibility, what type of a program would we write, if we were not concerned about who gets the credit?"

I would think that in that room perhaps they would look out over the history of our country and say, "All right, when Congress had that opportunity in the past, what type of programs did

Congress write?" I think they would think back to one of the most successful programs being the GI bill. The GI bill was based on a very simple premise; that was, people who served their country have an opportunity to get back something from their Government but that they got something from their Government because they had given something to their Government in the first place. That was what the GI bill was based on. It said to returning GI's who had served this country in the military that because of your service, your country is going to help you. We were going to help you go to the college of your choice. And as a result of that program, we gave literally hundreds of thousands of young Americans the opportunity to go to college, not because it was a handout, not because it was a grant, not because it was some sort of entitlement, but it was based on the theory that they had given something to their country and, therefore, their country was going to give them something back. And what we gave them was an opportunity for an education.

I would think then that the two Senators would say, "All right, let us see if we can now craft a program that builds on that GI bill, that concept that has served so many millions of Americans who have gone to college under the GI bill, let us see if we can craft a program that teaches young Americans something about responsibility, teaches them something about the communities that they live in, and something that also gives them an opportunity to better themselves. And, oh, by the way, let us make sure that program that we write will cost no more than one-thirtieth of 1 percent of our national budget."

That would be a real challenge. But I guarantee you, if the two Senators did not care who got the credit, they would come up with something that is very close to the National Service Program, the program known as AmeriCorps, which today is facing the prospect of being slashed and burned and killed before it has a chance to ever-present young Americans with opportunities, to teach them responsibility, and teach them something about their community.

Suppose people when we talked about the GI bill had said, "We are not going to do that. Let them go out and earn their own living, let them work. We are not going to have a GI program to help kids get to college. We don't care what their status is. We are not going to do that." How many young Americans would not have had the opportunity to be as successful as they are as a result of that program?

So what we have, I think, Mr. President, is a National Service Program that should be allowed to continue. It should be allowed to prosper. It should be allowed to flourish. What that program says to young Americans is that we are going to ask you to work in your community, not in a far-off coun-

try in another part of the world, although those services are needed, but we are going to ask you to work in your State, in your city, in your county. We are going to ask you to work with your local people who have identified what their problems are, what their concerns are, where they need help, if they need help in education, if they need help in police protection, if they need help in environmental clean-up programs, if they need help in health services for their local community. We are going to ask you to go back to your local community, and we are going to ask you to work in that local community. We are going to pay you a minimum wage stipend because we know you are not going to be able to do it if you do not have some form of assistance to allow you to feed yourself and clothe yourself and help you live your life.

We are going to pay you a minimum wage and ask you to do that, knowing that you could be making a lot more money in some other job, particularly if you have already graduated from college and are now paying back these loans. But in return, if you do that, we are going to help you go to college. We are going to help you with a grant to go to college based on the fact that you have worked in your community to make it a better place to live. That is the concept of reciprocal responsibility. That is saying to young men and women that your Government is going to help you if you give something back, if you give something back to your community and this country right here in America.

That is the whole essence of what the AmeriCorps Program is all about. It is not a giveaway program. It is not saying we are just going to give you money because that is what Government is all about and go to college because your Government is giving you something and asking nothing in return.

Those two Senators, who would not care about which party got the credit, would be very proud of this new direction, of this new partnership, of this new way of thinking, that says, yes.

We have programs that give grants to go to college. In most cases you have to show that you are poor. In most cases you have to go through a lot of paperwork to show that your parents do not have enough money. But this program will be based on the fact that we want to help anybody who believes enough in their country to believe in working in their local communities, assuming some responsibility at a time in their lives when that is very, very important, connecting that young person to their community in a way that perhaps they have never had the experience in doing before. And based on what they do, your Government will help you go to college with assistance. I would suggest that program would be one that we could all be very proud of.

We know, unfortunately, the problem is Congress sometimes gets involved

with who gets the credit, who gets the blame. I think a good program like this should have enough credit for everybody to take claim for it.

I was interested just the other day in reading an article by one of our Republican colleagues from the House. He said in talking about this program and the Republican effort to slash it and to kill it and to, in effect, terminate it, this Republican House Member said, "We have a wounded President." He further said that AmeriCorps "is something that this President deserves to be proud of, but it is a target for those people who do not even want to give him that."

I would suggest that is the real message that we are leaving on the floor today, not that this is not a good program, not that it does not teach a young person something about his own community or her own community, not that it does not teach them responsibility, that a government will help you if you do something. There is no free lunch. And I would not suggest they are not going to have it because it gives a young person opportunity by allowing them to have a college education. No. I would suggest that this House Member hit the nail on the head when he said that we have, in his opinion, a wounded President, this is a program that this President can and should be proud of, but that it is a target and it is a target not because of the merits; it is a target because of the politics. I would suggest that is not how we should legislate the future of young men and women in this country.

We have heard a lot of numbers thrown out on the floor today about how much the program cost. It is costing us one-thirtieth of 1 percent of our national budget.

Is that too little to invest in giving young men and women an opportunity, a sense of community, and teaching them about responsibility? I think not. In return for each full year of commitment, a 2-year maximum, a volunteer can receive \$4,725 in tuition assistance and health care and a stipend which is approximately the minimum wage.

So we pay young men and women a minimum wage to work in their local community doing things that are extremely important in that local community, and then, after they have done it, we say we will now help you with tuition for you to go to college.

I think that is a bargain. I think that is a new way of thinking about the role of individuals and their Government, that their Government is going to help them when they show responsibility and a willingness to contribute to their local community. I would suggest that is much better than just sending them the check and saying, "Well, we are the Government; here is the check; go to college."

What we are saying with this program is that we are going to help you if you do something in return. I think that makes a great deal of sense.

Some people say, "Well, if you pay someone a minimum wage, they are not a volunteer." The former distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia, SAM NUNN, my good friend, almost laughed at that suggestion because we all know now we have a volunteer army. Does anybody suggest it is not voluntary anymore because we pay them a salary? Of course, not. We pay everybody who volunteers in the military. We pay them more than a minimum wage. We pay them a livable salary. But the whole military is voluntary now. No one is drafted. No one is required to serve. It is an All-Volunteer Army, and yet we still pay men and women who voluntarily join the military.

So I would suggest that paying a young person a minimum wage stipend in order to work in their local community does not detract from the fact that this is a voluntary program. Many of these young graduates who return to work in their local communities are voluntarily doing it. They could earn a great deal more if they would go right into the private sector at a high-wage job. But, no, they are saying this is what I wish to do. This is a way to pay back my Government for what it has done for me. It is still clearly a voluntary program.

I do not understand why we are arguing about this. Some of the polls that I have seen say that over 90 percent of the American public, when they are explained in a rational and reasonable tone what the national service program is all about, say this is a good idea; why did we not think of it before? Why do we only have grants coming out of Washington that you have to go through weeks and months of paperwork to make sure you have the right income level to finally qualify? Why not say to all Americans we are going to help you if you are willing to serve in your community?

That is the essence of what national service is all about. That is the essence of what AmeriCorps is all about. The Peace Corps was a successful program. We sent men and women from our country to far-off lands to help improve conditions in those far-off countries and people thought it was a good idea. It was and it still is.

Here is a Peace Corps Program for our own country to help urban areas, to help rural areas, to help local officials who desperately need young, talented, future leaders of this country working in their communities. I think the beautiful thing about it is that it is a partnership, it is a reciprocal partnership between you and your Government to help people quit thinking the Government owes them something, that just because they are born the Government owes them something and is going to pay for it. It is a partnership.

Again, if I could have those two Senators who did not care whether they were Republican or Democrat, who did

not care that this was Bill Clinton's idea, I guarantee they could walk out of that room and say we thought of something that really makes sense. Let us make sense.

Is it perfect? Of course, not. Nothing is perfect. Are there some examples of how things should not have been done? Of course. But the program is in its infancy stage. Let us let it breathe for a few years to try to get it on track. If there are some problems with it, let us fix the problems and make sure they do not occur again. But do not kill the program. Do not say to the young men and women of America, we are going to continue to try and teach you there is something like a free lunch, because this program is just the opposite. This program says you will get from your Government help and assistance when you agree to give something back.

Funding was \$575 million for fiscal year 1995, one-thirtieth of 1 percent of our budget. Can we not invest one-thirtieth of 1 percent in the lives of future Americans, young men and women who want to learn about community, who want to learn about responsibility, who want to have opportunity given to them for what they have invested?

I think that is a wise expenditure of tax dollars. I think we are going to see great dividends paid, maybe not right now but in future years; that when somebody sits back and compares some of the good programs that Congress has done they will point to the GI bill as one of our most wonderful programs, but at that time, if we are successful, they can also say that when Congress had the opportunity in the 1990's they built on the GI bill and passed a national service program, and now, maybe 10, 20 years later, it is producing the results we would like to see.

Mr. President, I will be offering an amendment to help restore some of the draconian cuts that were passed by the House on this program. My amendment would allow for still a 20-percent reduction in the spending from last year. Most programs come in and say we need more money, more money, more money. My amendment is going to say, all right, in this time of fiscal balance and concern about deficits, let us reduce last year's spending by 20 percent even though we have more money and more requests than we did before. Let us reduce by 20 percent the President's request for the National Service Program, but let us keep it viable. Let us keep it working. Let us keep the innovative ideas that are coming out of that program so that we can say, when we had the opportunity to teach our young men and women in this country the things that are needed in order to make this country great, we stood up and were counted and voted in favor of my amendment.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 16 minutes and 7 seconds.

Mr. BREAUX. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the minority leader's time.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Daschle amendment. This amendment is essential to restore funding for critical national education and children's needs that were disproportionately targeted for reduction in the rescission bill.

Last week, the Children's Defense Fund released its annual report, "The State of America's Children." CDF reports that child poverty has reached its highest level in more than 30 years. Last year, one in every four children in our Nation was poor.

CDF reports:

An American child is reported abused or neglected every 11 seconds; is born into poverty every 32 seconds; is born to a teen mother every 62 seconds; is arrested for a violent crime every four minutes; and is killed by guns every two hours.

Mr. President, no great nation can long survive if it does not provide adequately for its children. I know of none of my colleagues who would disagree with this statement. But, I know of too many who are prepared to violate its spirit by reducing funding for proven and vital programs, by slashing welfare programs to save money, and by elimination the safety net that protects American families.

The rescission bill before us today contains \$13 billion in cuts in Federal programs. Overall, this is a much better bill than the one that passed the House. But, nonetheless, a large and disproportionate share of these cuts are targeted at programs that benefit children and youth.

#### CHILDREN

This bill contains a 20-percent reduction in the President's investment programs. That reduction translates into a \$42 million cut in Head Start.

Mr. President, last year I authored the Human Services Act that reauthorized the Head Start Program. At the time, I was prepared for a real challenge and a spirited defense of the legislation on the floor. Instead the legislation passed unanimously with no dissension and no acrimony. Head Start is a proven program that gives disadvantaged youngsters an early and important step forward in their educational development—yet this rescission bill goes after it.

The bill before us also includes an \$8.4 million cut in the child care and development block grant. Currently, eight States have more than 10,000 children on child care assistance waiting lines. And many more child care slots will be needed as we seek to move people from welfare to work.

The Women, Infants, and Children's Program takes a \$35 million hit in this bill. WIC has always been a popular and bipartisan program. The program is a wise investment providing nutritional assistance to low-income pregnant women and children. It saves money and lives in the process. Last year, I

joined with 70 of my colleagues in requesting full funding for this vital program.

The Daschle amendment would restore the cuts in these three important programs, and it would pare back cuts in education.

#### EDUCATION

Today, our Nation faces tremendous and unparalleled economic challenges. Increased global economic competition and rapid advances in technology have created major structural changes in our work force.

If we are to meet the economic challenges of the 21st century, it is critical that we invest in the education and training of our work force—even if it takes us a little longer to get our budget fully into balance.

Yet at precisely the time in our Nation's history when our educational challenges are greatest, the Federal commitment to education has diminished. Since 1979, we have cut in half the Federal commitment to elementary and secondary Education as a share of total education spending. This decrease has exacerbated the disparities in education spending across school districts and threatens to compromise our future economic productivity.

Education takes a heavy hit in this bill. It includes a \$100 million cut in the only Federal program that seeks to combat violence and drug abuse in our schools—the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

It includes a \$72 million cut in the title one program for disadvantaged children. It includes a \$68 million cut in the Goals 2000 Program. This cut would deny seed money for implementing comprehensive reform plans to about 1,550 schools.

The Daschle amendment recognizes that these shortsighted cuts cost our Nation more in the long-run than they save today.

#### HOUSING

The largest cuts in the rescission bill occur in Federal housing programs. The rescission bill includes more than \$4.5 billion in cuts in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's current budget. If enacted, these cuts will hurt low-income people struggling to find decent housing and reduce economic opportunity in our urban communities. Forty percent of public housing residents are single women with children.

Even without the recommended rescissions, current funding levels for HUD's public and assisted housing programs serve only about a third of the persons eligible for benefits. In Connecticut, there continues to be a shortage of affordable housing. There are 15,000 homeless people in my State, including more than 3,000 children.

The Daschle amendment would restore \$500 million to the public housing modernization account. These funds are critical for families living in public housing. Without them, we will have more roofs with holes, rusting stair-

wells, and boarded-up windows. Unless we restore these funds, thousands of families will be forced to raise their children in substandard housing.

The Daschle amendment is essential to help us maintain decent living conditions at many public housing developments across the country.

#### NATIONAL SERVICE

The rescission bill cuts national service by \$210 million. The AmeriCorps Program has provided thousands of Americans with the opportunity to serve in their communities and earn a post-service benefit for further education and training. Currently, 20,000 young Americans have answered this call to service and are working in communities across the country to meet vital needs. The AmeriCorps Program represents all that is best about America. The Daschle amendment recognizes this fact and restores funding for this program.

#### CONCLUSION

After consulting with high-paid political pollsters, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have begun cloaking their political goals in the guise of helping kids.

They have learned to talk about deficit reduction in terms of its impact on our children's future prosperity. And they have learned to talk about tax cuts in terms of their impact on families with young children.

They've become better at framing issues to score quick political points and worse at thoughtfully examining the impact of their policies.

Clearly it is important that we reduce our deficit and our debt. But a child who is denied food on the table, adequate child care, or a decent education is not worried about what may happen to them 20 or 30 years down the road. They are worried about their health and safety in the present. And we should be too.

The cuts in this bill compromise the immediate nutrition, housing, and developmental needs of thousands of our children. The Daschle amendment lessens the severity of these cuts.

The Children Defense Fund's report should powerfully focus our resolve to strengthen our investment in children's needs, not to lessen them.

I urge my colleagues not to undermine our commitment to our kids. I urge my colleagues to support the Daschle amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields back the time.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH. I yield back the remainder of the time on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields back the remainder of the time.

Mr. BREAUX addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

#### RINGLING BROS. AND BARNUM & BAILEY CIRCUS ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules

Committee be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 34 relative to the Ringling Bros. Circus and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration under the following time agreement: 1 hour under the control of Senator SMITH to offer an amendment regarding elephants. I further ask that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on the Smith amendment, to be followed immediately by a vote on adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus Anniversary Commemoration.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that the resolution that we have before us is a resolution to allow the Ringling Bros. Circus to come on the Capitol Grounds at some point this next week. I believe it is Wednesday. I could be wrong on the date.

As a youngster, I enjoyed the circus many times, as most of us have. I have no objection to many of the acts that you see in the circus. My objection here to this resolution is the issue of using elephants in a way that they are used in the circuses throughout the United States, in this case Ringling Bros., because they are planning to bring, I cannot get the exact number, a certain number of adult elephants onto the Capitol Grounds.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 449

(Purpose: To prevent the use of elephants in the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus celebration)

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am going to offer an amendment, and that amendment should be at the desk. I will offer that amendment at this time, an amendment to the underlying resolution. It is a very simple amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] proposes an amendment numbered 449.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 9 through 13, and insert the following: "performers, on the Capitol Grounds, on April 3, 1995, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate may jointly designate.