Mr. BOND. I conclude my remarks by just saying that this country must invest in its future. A research laboratory in space can provide unimaginable benefits to the American people. The space station is the only facility where research can be conducted for long durations in microgravity. The unique environment has only begun to be explored scientifically. American taxpayers are certain to benefit just as they have from other basic research, probably in ways we can never expect.

With that, Madam President, I yield the remaining time to our very distinguished colleague from Ohio, the former astronaut.

Mr. GLENN. I thank the Senator.

The Senator from Arkansas is as accomplished an orator as we have I think in the whole Congress. He would come closer to equaling Daniel Webster, I think, than anyone around here in his ability to give an oration.

Back in 1852, when we were thinking of buying some territory out West from Mexico, Daniel Webster rose in the Senate—he was opposed to that—and said as follows:

> What do we want with this vast worthless area, this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust and cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or the mountains that are covered to their very base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast, a coast of 3,000 miles rock-bound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it? What use have we for this country? Mr. President, I will never vote one cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific coast one inch nearer to Boston than it is now.

Madam President, I think probably the view that Daniel Webster took of that acquisition of territory west of the Mississippi is a little bit like the Senator from Arkansas proposes now with regard to the station.

I wish to see something come out of the station. We already have things coming out of the preparation to even have a station. As the floor manager mentioned just a moment ago, we do not even have the station up yet. So to say that that is not producing is exactly right. It is true. It is in the process of being put up. Over one-fourth of it has already been built, 50,000 pounds by our country, 60,000 pounds by other people. Less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of our budget is the total cost of the space station project right now.

From what we can see from the space shuttle with the cultures of crystals and of the experiments that have already been done on growing culture, culturing colon cancer cells, breast cancer cells, ovarian cells, what can be done with regard to AIDS, the experiments with regard to osteoporosis, right now a solution to any one of those would be more than worth all of the money that we are putting into this. This is an investment for the future.

To say that every scientist and physicist is against it is just not true. My distinguished colleague read into the RECORD a few moments ago a partial list of those who are for it—the American Medical Association, the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council, and so on.

This is one country that should have learned throughout its whole history that money spent on space research usually has a way of paying off in advance—more than anything we ever see at the outset. And with this being the first time we have ever had the ability to do microgravity research, it has the greatest potential payoff also.

Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 10 seconds.

Mr. GLENN. I have 10 seconds remaining. I yield back the remainder of my time. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2.15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:46 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2776

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 2:15 p.m. having arrived, there will now be 4 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form to be followed by a vote or in relation to the Bumpers amendment No. 2776.

Who yields time?

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, not seeing the proponent of the amendment on the floor, I suggest that the time be equally divided, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the quorum be dispensed with.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask for 1 minute on behalf of the opponents.

Mr. BOND. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I absolutely oppose the amendment being offered by the Senator from Arkansas. I thank him for his support of the space program and also for research in the American life science community, but I want to make three points.

The Senator says this is a condo in the sky for going to Mars. We absolutely reject that. We go to Mars, and we are going by robots; we are not going by astronauts. This is to be a science lab, not a condo.

Second, the space station at one time was overweight and underpowered, not unlike the Federal bureaucracy. We streamlined the space station design to make sure that weight, power, and mission match.

And last, but not at all least, there was a question whether we could really assemble the space station in space. When we gave the Hubble space telescope a new contact lens and our astronauts showed the deftness with which they could do mechanical assembly in space, they showed that we could do it. So we now have designs to the mission. We can put it together in space. And it is a science lab, not a condo for astronauts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 1 minute 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BUMPERS. Let me just reiterate, No. 1, much has been made of the fact that the American Medical Association favors the space station. Let me point out that the American Physical Society—40,000 physicists in America—are adamantly opposed to the space station. Why? Because they say the benefits are going to be negligible. You cannot do anything in space with microgravity. Dr. Bloembergen at Harvard says, when you put men on the space station to do microgravity research, you just mess it up. The steps, a bump, destroys microgravity research.

And what is there about a lack of gravity that is going to cure cancer and AIDS and all the rest of it? The answer is nothing. Here are people who really are concerned about the deficit: The Cato Institute, the Concord Coalition, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Taxpayers Union, Progress in Freedom Foundation, Progressive Policy Institute. Not only do the American physicists oppose it, every one of those organizations strongly oppose it.

This bill, just this bill alone, ravages housing for the elderly, ravages sewer projects, and torpedoes the AmeriCorps Program to make room for this thing. We are going to cut $40 billion out of education in the next 7 years to pay for this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

The Senator from Missouri has 25 seconds.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I think the argument made very compellingly by our good friend from Arkansas just shows that physicists do not know anything more about biomedical research

in space than we do. I will take the word of the people who are at NIH and who are involved in biomedical research to say that it is important.

This country has an opportunity to invest in the future. A research laboratory in space can provide the benefits we need. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, No. 2776. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 64, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 463 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Abraham	Exon	Levin
Ashcroft	Faircloth	Lugar
Baucus	Feingold	Moynihan
Bradley	Harkin	Nunn
Brown	Hollings	Pryor
Bryan	Jeffords	Simon
Bumpers	Kennedy	Snowe
Byrd	Kerrey	Specter
Chafee	Kerry	Thomas
Cohen	Kohl	Warner
Conrad	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	

NAYS—64

Akaka	Glenn	Mikulski
Bennett	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Graham	Murkowski
Bingaman	Grams	Murray
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Boxer	Gregg	Packwood
Breaux	Hatch	Pell
Burns	Hatfield	Pressler
Campbell	Heflin	Reid
Coats	Helms	Robb
Cochran	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Coverdell	Inhofe	Roth
Craig	Inouye	Santorum
D'Amato	Johnston	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kassebaum	Shelby
DeWine	Kempthorne	Simpson
Dodd	Kyl	Smith
Dole	Lieberman	Stevens
Domenici	Lott	Thompson
Feinstein	Mack	Thurmond
Ford	McCain	
Frist	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—1

Gramm

So the amendment (No. 2776) was rejected.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, in discussions with the distinguished ranking member, I think we have an order for the amendments that are coming up. I want to thank our colleagues for getting the amendments in order and getting time agreements.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator STEVENS, followed by Senator CHAFEE, be recognized for up to 10 minutes to present an amendment which I believe is acceptable on both sides. After action on that amendment is completed, we ask that Senator MIKULSKI and Senator KENNEDY be recognized to present an amendment on national service with a 2-hour time limit, with a vote on or in relation to that amendment to occur at that time; following disposition of that amendment, that Senator SARBANES be recognized to present an amendment on the homeless, that there be 1 hour divided in the usual form which would apply to both of those amendments; and upon the expiration or yielding back of the time, that a vote on or in relation to the Sarbanes amendment occur.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I have an amendment which is acceptable by both sides dealing with arsenic in the safe drinking water. We have discussed this with the staffs.

What I want to do is present that right after the Stevens amendment, and if it is acceptable, if I had 4 minutes equally divided——

Ms. MIKULSKI. Reserving the right to object, on the arsenic, would the Senator go ahead with this? I need to be sure that the authorizer on our side, and Senator LAUTENBERG—not only do I wish to cooperate with the Senator from Rhode Island, but these got fairly prickly as we were moving into the full committee, so I just want to make sure we have one good thing done, and check in the meantime about the arsenic.

Mr. CHAFEE. Fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Alaska is recognized to offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2779

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask the pending amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the pending committee amendment is set aside.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] for himself and Mr. MURKOWSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 2779.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

SEC. 308. None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used to implement the requirements of section 186(b)(2), section 187(b) or section 211(m) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7512(b)(2), 7512a(b), or 7545(m)) with respect to any moderate nonattainment area in which the average daily winter temperature is below 0 degrees Fahrenheit. The preceding sentence shall not be interpreted to preclude assistance from the Environmental Protection Agency to the State of Alaska to make progress toward meeting the carbon monoxide standard in such areas and to resolve remaining issues regarding the use of oxygenated fuels in such areas.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment that Senator MURKOWSKI and I have discussed with the managers of their staff and the chairman of the authorizing committee, I understand will be accepted.

It provides for a 1-year exemption from the oxygenated fuel requirements of the Clean Air Act for Fairbanks, AK. There are unique circumstances in Fairbanks that justify this limited exemption. I do thank the other Senators who have worked with us on this amendment.

Alaska exceeds the carbon monoxide requirements on the Clean Air Act only on days when there are temperature inversions caused by extreme cold, which really means when it is below 50 below zero.

When the oxygenated fuels requirement of the Clean Air Act was applied to Fairbanks to correct the carbon monoxide levels, serious health problems were reported. The MTBE additives developed for the area were simply never tested for use in the extreme cold of the Fairbanks area.

In addition to waiving the requirements to use the oxygenated fuels, this amendment would also prevent Fairbanks from unfairly being added to the list of cities with serious nonattainment problems.

Given the transitory nature of the oxygenated fuel requirements by Fairbanks with respect to carbon monoxide, other Senators have agreed additional measures coming from the declassification should not be required for Fairbanks.

Through negotiations with our staff and the staffs of the authorizing committee and this committee, Senator MURKOWSKI and I have agreed this is the last time we will seek a waiver of the oxygenated fuel requirement for Fairbanks using the appropriations process.

However, we do hope that the Senate will agree with us to fix the problem legislatively through an amendment to the Clean Air Act.

Again, I do thank my colleagues for their help in this matter.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, although I generally oppose legislative riders on appropriations bills, I want to say that I support this amendment by my colleagues from Alaska.

The city of Fairbanks has made extraordinary progress against the carbon monoxide nonattainment situation.

In 1977, Fairbanks experienced nearly 100 days—100 days—in 1 year when carbon monoxide levels exceeded the health standard. Last year, the city of Fairbanks only had 5 days when those standards were exceeded.

There is no question but what the city of Fairbanks has done an extraordinarily good job. It is a tribute to the

city and I might say it is also attribute, Mr. President, to the efficacy of the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act is working.

Fairbanks is currently classified as a moderate nonattainment area. If it does not fully meet the standard by the end of this year, Fairbanks will be reclassified as a serious nonattainment area. Reclassification would trigger a series of additional requirements under the Clean Air Act—including transportation control measures—that may not be necessary to reach this standard.

Fairbanks believes that it can meet the standard without the imposition of these expensive additional measures. Because of the dramatic progress that has already been made, I think it is reasonable to extend the deadline in this case. The Senators from Alaska have stated that they will not seek another extension on an appropriation bill in the future.

As to oxygenated fuels, some States have experienced complaints in cities where MTBE has been used as an additive. But MTBE is not the only additive available. Ethanol, grain alcohol, can also be used as an oxygenate. Everything we know about air pollution tells us that burning alcohol presents less pollution concern than burning gasoline, the fuel the alcohol replaces.

So, there are alternatives for Fairbanks if it cannot reach attainment using existing measures. In fact, Anchorage, AK, used ethanol as a fuel additive last year and recorded its first year ever with no exceedances of the carbon monoxide standard. This experience has been repeated all across the country. When we passed the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments more than 40 cities were in nonattainment for carbon monoxide. Today that number is less than 10 and much of the credit goes to the oxygenated fuels program in the Clean Air Act.

Mr. President, we all look forward to the day when every American city can boast of healthy air. Fairbanks has made great strides already and will reach that goal soon. In light of its accomplishments, I think we can provide the city with some flexibility.

Mr. President, I have the assurance of the two Senators from Alaska that this is the last time they will be in for this exception. I am supportive of it and commend them and commend the city of Fairbanks.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The Stevens-Murkowski amendment relieves Fairbanks of oxygenated fuels requirement and transportation control measures under the Clean Air Act for upcoming winter because Fairbanks' carbon monoxide [CO] exceedances are a result of temperature inversions—not simply CO emissions, and Fairbanks' residents experienced negative health effects when they initially tried methyl tertiary butyl ether [MTBE] as an oxygenated fuel.

The oxygenated fuels program was instituted in Anchorage and Fairbanks on November 1, 1992, according to the law, using MTBE as the oxygenate additive. Fairbanks' and Anchorage residents began to experience unusual health problems—nausea, vomiting, dizziness, disorientation, headaches, and other symptoms.

Our Governor canceled the program in Fairbanks on December 11, 1992, due to these health problems. The EPA had not done any studies on MTBE in the Arctic conditions that exist in Alaska. So, many Alaskans justifiably fear the use of oxygenated fuels in their gasoline.

Let me also note that Alaska does not have a serious non-attainment problem. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the city of Fairbanks.

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

FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH,
Fairbanks, AK, February 22, 1995.

Hon. FRANK MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senate, Hart Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Thank you for taking the time to meet with me while I was recently in Washington, DC. I appreciate the time you took to talk with me about Fairbanks' concerns regarding federal Clean Air Act requirements. We continue to have problems with certain requirements of the Act, due to a combination of extremely severe temperature inversions and high cold-start emissions caused by our cold temperatures. According to National Weather Service staff, Fairbanks has the strongest temperature inversions in North America.

As you can see from the enclosed chart, the number of days each year that Fairbanks exceeds the ambient carbon monoxide standard has dropped dramatically from previous levels to fewer than five per year. The decrease is largely a result of federal emissions controls on new cars, with some additional benefits due to the basic emissions inspection and maintenance (I/M) program the Borough implemented in 1985. Although substantial progress has been made in reducing emissions, several exceedances occurred recently during an extended period of extreme temperature inversions and calm winds. These conditions resulted in extremely stagnant air dispersion for several days.

As you know, our residents remain adamantly opposed to the use of oxygenated fuel in our community. Unfortunately, this program is mandated directly by the Clean Air Act, and not even EPA has the legal authority to exempt Fairbanks from this requirement. As a result of the nonattainment status, the Fairbanks North Star Borough may soon be subject to additional Clean Air Act mandates which would require the implementation of local transportation controls. None of these programs appear feasible or acceptable to our community, yet could be imposed upon us by a federal law that doesn't recognize the uniqueness of the Fairbanks North Star Borough.

When we spoke in Washington, you talked about current efforts in the Senate to address the costs versus benefits of federal mandates. The above Clean Air Act provisions are a good example of this issue. It makes no sense to impose federally mandated control strategies which may not provide significant benefits on a community where those strategies would cost millions of dollars, particularly when they aren't likely to eliminate a problem that is largely caused by Mother Nature. We are not asking to be completely exempted from Clean Air Act requirements. We'll do our part to ensure that the control measures we are responsible for (e.g., the current I/M program) are effectively implemented. We need your help in eliminating federal mandates that will not help our community attain the goals of the Act. We would also like some recognition in the Act that we shouldn't be penalized for Alaska's unique weather characteristics.

We will be providing your staff with several options that could possibly be pursued to provide Fairbanks with relief from the above Clean Air Act provisions. Thanks again for taking the time to talk with me on this subject. We truly appreciate the efforts you've made on behalf of Interior Alaska in the past regarding this issue, as well as any additional actions that you can take to assist us further in the future.

Sincerely,

JIM SAMPSON,
Borough Mayor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we have some of the cleanest air in the country. Fairbanks has made significant, dramatic reductions in CO violations. You will notice that most of these reductions occurred before the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments; so, the Clean Air Act was effective in Fairbanks without the oxygenated fuels requirement. These reductions are clearly attributable to Fairbanks' inspection and maintenance program. Fairbanks has reduced their violations 43 percent—from 37 in 1985 to only 2 in 1992, and most recently we seem to be down to 5 or fewer violations a year.

Those exceedances that do occur are during thermal inversions. Typical automobile fleet turnover and the U.S. car fleet operating more efficiently at cold temperatures could also bring Fairbanks into compliance eventually.

I want to thank Senator CHAFEE and Senator BOND for accepting our amendment. Fairbanks air quality has improved significantly over the years. We want to continue to work with the EPA to improve our air quality by means that make sense in our Arctic climate and not be subject to a one-size-fits-all mandate that does not make sense in Alaska. We welcome the current political climate that recognizes the need for flexibility and common sense in our environmental regulatory policy.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I just ask the Senate to remember the extreme temperature conditions that exist in Fairbanks. I started my life in Alaska, in Fairbanks, and I can attest to temperatures below 65 degrees below zero myself.

These temperature inversions are the problem. They are not the normal problem that causes carbon monoxide limitations to be exceeded. The oxygenated fuels I think would have a minimal impact on that problem anyway because we are not certain they will even solve the problem when we are down below 60 below zero.

So I thank the Senate. I thank Senator CHAFEE for being willing to deal with this. Again, our commitment is, we will not raise this as an exception through the appropriations process. We are going to pursue the authorizing committee for a permanent solution to this problem as we deal with the Clean Air Act.

I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Am I correct that this amendment will be accepted?

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, if I might add that when we passed the Clean Air Act amendments in 1990, more than 40 cities were in nonattainment for carbon monoxide. Today that number is less than 10. Much of the credit goes to the oxygenated fuels program as well as other steps taken by the various cities.

So I think we can look forward to the day when every American city can boast clean air. Fairbanks, as I mentioned, has made great progress and we believe will reach the goal of complete attainment soon. In light of those accomplishments, I think we should provide Fairbanks with some flexibility, and I am happy to support this amendment.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. BOND. The amendment is acceptable on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alaska yield his remaining time?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we agree to the amendment. I have no other statement to make on it.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. I know what the situation here is. I am one who does not believe that MTPE will make a difference when there are temperature inversions that cause nonattainment. We will have to deal with that in the Clean Air Act, however, and we agree not to pursue it with the appropriations process again.

I thank the Senator. I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 2779 offered by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment (No. 2779) was agreed to.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Rhode Island has another amendment that will be acceptable on both sides. I modify the unanimous-consent agreement and ask unanimous consent that he be given 5 minutes to present the amendment with respect to arsenic in drinking water.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. I further ask unanimous consent that on the Mikulski amendment on national service and on the Sarbanes amendment on homelessness, that no second-degree amendments be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2780 TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT BEGINNING ON PAGE 143, LINE 17 THROUGH PAGE 151, LINE 10

(Purpose: To amend the provisions with respect to arsenic)

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator seek to set aside the pending committee amendments?

Mr. CHAFEE. I do so ask.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment beginning on page 143, line 17, be the pending amendment.

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

The clerk will now report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) proposes an amendment numbered 2780 to the committee amendment beginning on page 143, line 17, through page 151, line 10.

On page 149, line 18, insert ''(for its carcinogenic effects)'' after ''arsenic.''

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, this amendment would modify one of the environmental riders on this appropriations bill. The appropriations bill precludes the Environmental Protection Agency from taking final action to set a standard for arsenic under the Safe Drinking Water Act. This delay is presumably justified because some uncertainties in the science on the cancer-causing effects of arsenic.

My amendment would continue the delay imposed by the rider for a standard to deal with the cancer threat from arsenic, but it would allow EPA to go forward and revise the standard to protect against the other adverse health effects of arsenic.

Arsenic is a naturally occurring substance frequently found in drinking water, especially in water supplies from ground water sources.

Arsenic causes several adverse health effects, the most important of which are vascular diseases and skin cancer. Arsenic has been known to be a cause of cancer by ingestion since 1887 because it was sold in patent medicines. Ironically, many of these medicines were intended to treat skin diseases. Using arsenic as a medicine proved that arsenic itself causes skin cancer.

The other major health problem caused by arsenic is a weakening of the vascular system—the vessels that circulate blood in our bodies.

Arsenic is currently regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act and has been regulated by the Federal Government beginning long before there was an EPA. The current drinking water standard, established by the Public Health Service after World War II, is 50 parts per billion. That standard was set to address the vascular diseases, but was not designed to address the cancer risk.

The 1986 amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act required the arsenic standard to be rewritten and to address the cancer risk. EPA was directed to establish a new arsenic standard by 1989. For cancer-causing substances such as arsenic, the goal in the Safe Drinking Water Act is to eliminate all exposure—to reach zero, if we can. But most often that is not a practical reality. Instead, the standard is set based on the treatment technologies that large drinking water systems can afford. With technology available today, it is possible to reduce the concentration of arsenic in drinking water from the current 50 parts per billion to levels below 10 parts per billion.

However, some have argued that arsenic may not be a typical cancer-causing substance and ought not to be regulated in the typical way. According to this argument, there may be a safe threshold for arsenic. In other words, it may be that the first bit of arsenic one consumes will not increase a person's cancer risk. It may be that some higher concentration must be reached before the cancer effect takes hold. Drinking arsenic below this level would not increase risk because the body would slough it off before it reached the target organs. If there is such a threshold—and depending where it is—a standard at less than 10 parts per billion—even though we could achieve it—might not make sense, if our only concern is the cancer risk.

Unfortunately, there has not been sufficient study to answer this question about a threshold. Recent studies from Taiwan suggest that there is not a threshold and that the cancer risk from drinking water at the current 50 parts per billion standard is quite high. If those studies are correct 2 in each 100 people drinking arsenic-laden water at the current federal standard would be expected to develop skin cancer. On the other hand, many other scientists have attacked weaknesses in the Taiwan study and argued that it cannot be relied upon to determine whether there is a threshold or not.

Resolving this scientific dispute about the potential cancer-causing properties of arsenic can be done. A gathering of scientists that occurred last spring produced a research plan that would result in a definitive answer. The study would take a period of a few years to complete and would cost about $15 million.

Mr. President, I have brought this amendment to the floor of the Senate to make a simple point. We have a responsibility to the American people to make sure these studies get done and are completed as soon as possible. We have delayed too long.

There is a great deal of disagreement in this body and across the country today about the proper role of the Federal Government in ensuring that our drinking water is safe. But one thing everybody agrees on is that the Federal Government has a responsibility to conduct the research necessary to determine the potential adverse effects of

the contaminants that occur in our drinking water. It would not make sense for every state or every city to conduct its own drinking water research program. That is a job for the Federal Government.

But we have not been doing it. We invest next to nothing in drinking water research in these appropriations bills each year. A recent briefing by EPA's Office of Research and Development indicated that less than $5 million per year is being spent to investigate the adverse health effects of drinking water contaminants.

Arsenic is a perfect example of this failing. It has been known to cause skin cancer in humans since before 1900. It has been regulated—but not to prevent cancer from drinking water—by the Federal Government for decades. In 1986, Congress passed a law requiring that the arsenic standard be revised and that the revision address the cancer risk. The new standard was due in 1989.

But nothing was done. EPA took no action to revise the standard. Finally, in 1993 EPA was sued by a public interest group to force the Agency to issue the cancer standard. In response to the suit, EPA appeared in court and asked for more time, because the research had not been done.

Now, this appropriations bill comes before us and provides EPA with the extension they have been seeking. This extension would not be necessary, if the appropriations bills adopted in previous years had provided the small amount of research money for the needed research. Tens of thousands of Americans are consuming arsenic in their drinking water at levels that may be a threat to their health. This is not new information. But we are not ready to take action to protect public health, because we have delayed and delayed and delayed in making the small investment in research that is necessary to arrive at a sound public policy regarding arsenic in drinking water.

Recent studies on the noncancer health effects of arsenic indicate that the current 50-part-per-billion standard may not even prevent the other arsenic-related diseases. One approach might be to immediately revise the arsenic standard for drinking water based on these other effects, press ahead full speed on the cancer research, and revise the standard—if needed—to reflect the cancer risk when that research is completed. That is an approach that we will consider when the Senate takes up the bill to reauthorize the Safe Drinking Water Act.

My amendment today sets the stage for this debate. Instead of prohibiting a revision of the standard for arsenic altogether, under my amendment EPA would just be prohibited from issuing a standard for the cancer effects. They might revise the standard based on the data for other health effects. My amendment does not require EPA to issue a standard. And it does not prejudge the issue of whether the standard should be tightened to prevent vascular diseases. We would want all the studies on those effects thoroughly reviewed by the Science Advisory Board and others before a standard-setting effort was begun. But it would not be blocked. That is the point.

Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the manager of the bill and believe that it is agreeable to him. I want to commend Senator BOND for including $1 million in this bill for research on the cancer-causing effects of arsenic. That is a start. And we appreciate it. I am sure that we can count on him to see this research program through to the end, now that it has been initiated.

So, Mr. President, my amendment lets the prohibition that is in the basic bill dealing with cancer-causing substances, cancer threats remain, but lets EPA go forward with revising the standards to protect against, as I say, other adverse health effects.

Mr. President, this has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

I ask for its acceptance.

Mr. President, I would like to say that I have discussed this amendment with the managers of the bill and the ranking member. I believe it is agreeable to them.

I commend Senator BOND for including $1 million in this bill for research on the cancer-causing effects of arsenic. That is a start. We appreciate it. I hope we can count on him—and I know we can—to see this research program through to the end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment (No. 2780) was agreed to.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. I thank the ranking member and the manager of the bill for their consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate is to proceed to the National Service Program amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2781

(Purpose: To restore funding for national and community service programs)

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments pending before the Senate be laid aside.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I have an amendment that I would like to send to the desk in behalf of myself, Senator KENNEDY, Senator ROCKEFELLER, Senator DASCHLE, and Senator BREAUX.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. BREAUX proposes an amendment No. 2781.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 27, line 5, strike ''$5,594,358,000'' and insert ''$5,211,358,000''.

On page 27, line 6, insert the following after ''That'': ''in addition to the appropriation of $5,211,358,000 made available under this heading, in order to achieve an effective program level of $5,594,358,000 for the 'Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing' account for fiscal year 1996, in carrying out the programs and activities specified under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall use $383,000,000 from any combination of unobligated balances or recaptures from prior year appropriations in the 'Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing' account, and from any reduction in amounts provided during fiscal year 1996 from the 'Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing' account (or from the 'Renewal of Expiring Section 8 Subsidies' account) to any public housing agency whose project reserve account is determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to contain funds in excess of the needs of that public housing agency: *Provided further,* That''.

On page 30, line 5, strike ''and''.

On page 30, line 7, insert before the colon the following: ''; and (3) shall give priority to projects designated for purchase by nonprofit organizations in allocating any funds for the sale of any projects in the preservation pipeline''.

On page 128, after line 20, insert the following new section:

SEC. 225. INSURANCE OF MORTGAGES UNDER THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT.

Section 203(b)(2)(A) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking ''75 percent'' and inserting ''86 percent''; and

(2) by striking ''38 percent'' and inserting ''50 percent''.

Beginning on page 130, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 131, line 2, and insert the following:

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the Corporation for National and Community Service (referred to in the matter under this heading as the ''Corporation'') in carrying out programs, activities, and initiatives under the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (referred to in the matter under this heading as the ''Act'') (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.), $425,000,000, of which $335,000,000 shall be available for obligation from September 1, 1996, through August 21, 1997: *Provided,* That not more than $26,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses authorized under section 501(a)(4) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12681(a)(4)), of which not more than $12,000,000 shall be for administrative expenses for State commissions pursuant to section 126(a) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12576(a)): *Provided further,* That not more than $2,500 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further,* That not more than $93,000,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, shall be transferred to the National Service Trust account for educational awards authorized under subtitle D of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12601 et seq): *Provided further,* That not more than $209,000,000 shall be available for grants under the National Service Trust program authorized under subtitle C of title

I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12571 et seq.) (relating to activities including the Americorps program): *Provided further*, That not more than $5,000,000 shall be made available for the Points of Light Foundation for activities authorized under title III of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12661 et seq.): *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used to administer, reimburse, or support any national service programs run by Federal agencies authorized under section 121(b) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12571(b)): *Provided further*, That not more than $19,000,000 shall be available for the Civilian Community Corps authorized under subtitle E of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12611 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not more than $43,000,000 shall be available for school-based and community-based service-learning programs authorized under subtitle B of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12521 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not more than $25,000,000 shall be available for quality and innovation activities authorized under subtitle H of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12653 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not more than $5,000,000 shall be available for audits and other evaluations authorized under section 179 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12639): *Provided further*, That no funds from any other appropriation, or from funds otherwise made available to the Corporation, shall be used to pay for personnel compensation and benefits, travel, or any other administrative expense for the Board of Directors, the Office of the Chief Executive Officer, the Office of the Managing Director, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, the Office of National and Community Service Programs, the Civilian Community Corps, or any field office or staff of the Corporation working on the National and Community Service or Civilian Community Corps programs: *Provided further*, that none of the funds made available under this heading may be obligated until the earlier of the date on which the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation submits a plan to Congress to restructure the National Service Trust program authorized under subtitle C of title I of the Act (relating to activities including the Americorps program) in accordance with a budget smaller than the budget requested for the program in the President's fiscal year 1996 budget, or the date of enactment of an Act that reauthorizes the National and Community Service Act of 1990.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $1,500,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 hours of debate equally divided in the usual manner. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. President. At this time, I yield myself no more than 15 minutes, reserving the balance of my time to allocate to other Senators and also for summation argument.

Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment to the VA–HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill.

My amendment restores funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service. It is in the amount of $425 million. The offset necessary to do this is taken from inside HUD to cover the budget authority in outlays needed to restore funding for national service.

The amount of funding this amendment provides allows another year of operation at a level that is 48 percent below the President's 1996 request, and it is also 10 percent below the fiscal year 1995 rescinded level.

In addition, my amendment would prohibit direct grants to Federal agencies, generating an additional 11 percent of savings. And, finally, my amendment would fence all funds from obligation until the Corporation submits a plan that restructures the program operation to reflect its reduced budget or until national service is reauthorized, whichever comes first.

Mr. President, why do I do this? I do this because I so strongly and passionately believe in national service. This is not just yet another social program. It is a unique American social invention designed to help create the ethic of service in today's young people. It creates an opportunity structure under which young Americans receive a reduction in their student debt or a voucher to pay for their higher education in exchange for full- or part-time community service.

This is not another handout. This says to young people, we know that your first mortgage is your student debt, but we want to give you an opportunity to reduce that student debt by doing service in your community. And if you do that, you will earn a voucher to reduce that student debt to the tune of about $4,000 a year.

The projects themselves do not come from some Federal bureaucrat deciding what is best for local communities. It is driven by the choices of local organizations, primarily nonprofits, and organizing around four basic areas of activity: education, public health, the environment, and public safety. It gives these young men and women a chance to get a college education in exchange for community service. This is not a Gucci-styled, show-up-once-a-week concept. These community workers spend an average of 35 hours each week contributing to their communities. They get a modest monthly allowance, and they get other support.

Why is this important? We want to do three things with national service. We want to help students reduce their student debt. We want to also rekindle the habits of the heart that made America great with the spirit of voluntarism. And third but not at all least, we want to deal with the new volunteer deficit that is facing the United States of America when many of our nonprofits are withering on the vine for the lack of community participation.

What are some of the examples of what these volunteers do? In my own State, in Montgomery County, they operate a community assisting police program where volunteers engage in community education and outreach that addresses the need for crime control, prevention, and the reduction of fear in six underserved communities.

Some of the projects that they do are coordinating a school awareness crime program. They provide bilingual assistance and referrals to crime victims. They work actually in a community policing station side by side with the police officers. They are not new cops, but they are cop extenders because while the police officers are doing the policing, these volunteers are helping doing prevention, community education, and also providing much-needed bilingual assistance.

In Vermont, there is something called the Vermont Antihunger, Nutrition and Empowerment Corps. This group operates five sites in Vermont, developing a statewide approach to hunger to increase participation of low-income and rural residents in Federal food assistance programs and teaching them about nutrition and how to buy and plant food.

In Washington State, we have a conservation corps providing a 1-year program that combines fieldwork and on-the-job instruction for doing things like watershed restoration, reforestation, stream and salmon habitat rehabilitation, and forest fire and oil spill response. It takes hard-to-reach kids and puts them with other young people who have recently graduated from college, both doing hands-on work. I know that we have not only turned the environment around but we have turned around some at-risk kids.

YouthBuild Boston is a program that puts 18- to 24-year-old volunteers to work renovating buildings to provide low-income housing.

The program engages disenfranchised youth in rebuilding their communities and provides them with the education and skills to become self-reliant and responsible citizens.

The program has had such success that it has expanded its services from housing renovation to include environmental, public safety, and education projects.

There are over 1,000 programs operating nationwide which involve 20,000 volunteers.

These programs are doing exactly what Congress intended to do when we authorized this bill in 1993. In fact, many of the programs are operating with a larger degree of success than even we had hoped. National service was designed to address those two programs I talked about—student indebtedness as well as how to instill a sense of obligation and habits of the heart in young people.

There has been a sharp drop over the last 20 years in the number of Americans who volunteer in their communities. Harvard Prof. Bob Putnam has identified this trend and says that we need to promote more civic activity. Fewer people attend the PTA. But also what we know is that groups like the Red Cross, Meals on Wheels, Girl Scouts, and Boy Scouts face fewer and fewer volunteers. What we want to do is instill this sense of citizenship, this sense of obligation. And we also want to say, as part of an overall Government framework, now we have a clear message that for every right there is a responsibility, for every opportunity there should be an obligation. And this

is what we are trying to create also through this legislation.

National service is the latest in a long series of social inventions designed by this country to create higher education. Earlier today we debated the space station. We are known worldwide for our scientific invention. But also we have been a genius in social inventions—those tools that enable people to pursue the American dream.

(Ms. SNOWE assumed the chair.)

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, we are the country that invented night school so that immigrants, working in factories during the day, would have a chance to learn English, learn citizenship, learn the skills to move ahead in our society. That was a social invention. We created the GI bill for returning vets because we said that if you gave to this Nation, we will make sure you will be able to participate in the American dream.

National and community service is part of that framework. How can we make sure the access to higher education is not only for the wealthy? In my own home State of Maryland, to go to an independent college like Loyola or Notre Dame of Maryland, the kind of school I went to, it now costs anywhere from $12,000 to $18,000 a year. For most middle-income families, the whole idea of $72,000 for 4 years of education is beyond their dream. The same thing for our public schools. It still then would be about $8,000 or $9,000 a year—or $45,000.

In this country, we believed that intellectual ability and character was randomly distributed through the population, so that it was only an elite few that could have access to higher education and thus remain elite. We wanted to make sure it was available to others. So that is why national service is important.

There are many critics to national service, and Senator GRASSLEY, of Iowa, has rightfully raised many of those concerns.

I joined with him, asking GAO to evaluate the AmeriCorps Program. I felt if we could not stand to be evaluated, we could not stand to be authorized and we could not stand to be funded. In our quest, we asked them to identify the resources required to field an AmeriCorps participant, evaluate whether an AmeriCorps program was meeting its mission, and make recommendations on how the national service corps could be more efficient and effective.

Well, GAO answered two of the three questions we asked. GAO estimates that the amount of resources available from the Corporation to field a participant are in line with the Corporation's estimate. Most impressive in GAO's finding is that national service programs are meeting the objectives that Congress set when we passed the bill in 1993.

Some will come to the floor and argue that the cost to the taxpayer of about $26,000 is excessive. Well, I want to point out that in the report it says, ''It is important not to equate our funding information with cost data.'' Most AmeriCorps programs are still in their first year of operation.

Also, the $26,700 figure is misleading because it represents all resources from Federal, State, local, and private. It is not a total cost to the taxpayer. You know, in fact, we require matching funds. And Congress expects that the federally appropriated dollars would be used to leverage matching contributions. So we see that what they say it costs is really excessive.

Also, some have suggested in the tight budget times we cannot afford to continue this. Well, I do not think we can afford not to continue it. The GAO report goes on to recognize that these grants have really served communities. They have served rural communities and they have served urban communities. GAO said in the seven AmeriCorps programs in the four States it visited that ''During our site visits we observed local programs helping communities.'' This one sentence makes it all worthwhile.

GAO says, ''In our site visits, we observed that these communities are actually being helped.'' I could go on to talk about what they do, but what GAO says is, ''We observed participants renovating inner-city housing, assisting teachers in elementary schools * * * analyzing neighborhood crime statistics to better target prevention measures * * *'' working with the police, developing a community food bank for people with special dietary needs—and I could go on.

Others would say that is going to be done anyway. Well, I am not so sure it is going to be done anyway. You have the downsizing of State and local governments. They are shrinking funds available for nonprofits. And also there are few people to volunteer.

This bill rewards the kinds of values, like sweat equity and work, that are at the heart of the American family. It does not identify with victims. It does not whine. It is not morose about the issues facing our society. I think this goes right into the values of the Nation. These are not Democratic Party values; these are not Republican Party values. These are American values: Hard work, neighbor helping neighbor, making sure that the access to the American dream is there for all Americans.

So, Madam President, I hope we will support the appropriation of national service. I also hope that we support the reauthorization when it comes up. I really think this is very important legislation. I think it really warrants the Senate's attention and their vote.

I yield back such time as I might have left, reserving other time that has been allocated to me.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 6 minutes and 46 seconds remaining.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts 15 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I welcome the opportunity to join with my friend and colleague, the Senator from Maryland, in urging the Senate to accept this particular amendment that will restore the national service program and the service learning programs and renewing this country's commitment to service. I think all of us in this body are very much aware of the strong commitment that the Senator from Maryland has had in terms of the voluntary service programs. As one who has been involved in this effort for some period of time, Senator MIKULSKI has really been the leader here in the Senate in the development of these important programs, and has given us the opportunity in our Human Resources Committee to hear the testimony of many of the young people in Maryland who have been involved in voluntary programs, and conservation programs, and many others.

We are very much aware of not only her strong commitment as a policy maker but also her strong personal interest in the national service program, community service program, and other volunteer efforts. I welcome the chance to join with her in what I consider to be an extremely important vote here this afternoon.

Madam President, I think, as Senator MIKULSKI has pointed out, the issue of voluntarism is really as old as the country. And I think many of us feel that the outlet for this voluntary spirit has not always been very evident. Only in very recent years did we see the development of a new major volunteer opportunity. That was in the early 1960's—we can go back to the period of the 1930's and cite some of the programs in the time of the Depression, but really the 1960's and the development of the Peace Corps Program marked the dramatic beginning of a national commitment to service programs.

I had an opportunity, recently, to visit with some of the volunteers at the 25th anniversary of the Peace Corps. At a luncheon that was held over in the other side of the Capitol building, I sat down with the first volunteers for the Peace Corps and I asked them about why they participated in the Peace Corps. Virtually, all of them gave—phrased somewhat differently, a uniform response. And that was: We were asked and it was the first time that we were ever asked to do anything for anybody else. The Peace Corps asked them to do something for their country and also for the communities that they would serve, and they responded.

I think all of us who have watched the program grow and develop, and have heard the various discussions and debates about its stability and about its future in recent years, have learned a very important lesson from the Peace Corps. We have seen a large number of Peace Corps volunteers working on Capitol Hill and in different agencies of Government. They are individuals who

involve themselves voluntarily in service. They give something back to the community. And they have maintained this spirit of voluntarism and an interest in the broad public policy issues of our country.

That has been true of Peace Corps volunteers, and it has been true of the Vista volunteers as well. I think there are more than 1,250 Peace Corps volunteers who are somehow related to activities on the Hill. They are working for Members of the House, the Senate, extended staffs, an in other areas of service to the Congress. It is an extraordinary record. I think all of us have seen similar examples in our own States, through our visits and travels.

I think one of the most important purposes of this whole program is to try to reach out and bring the idea of service to young people. Service learning programs, involve children as young as kindergartners, and continue the effort through the 12 years of school, to reach out to those individuals in the 12th grade. The AmeriCorps Program provides another kind of opportunity. It allows individuals to offer full time voluntary service to their community and earn educational benefits through their service. Hopefully they then maintain that sense of voluntarism during the time they are in school and in college, and continue it through the rest of their lives. The precedent set by Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers indicates that they will.

The programs that involve our seniors—Foster Grandparents, Senior Companions, RSVP, provide great service to communities. These volunteers are elderly retirees, who in many instances, are living on just a few thousand dollars a year. They are providing service to their communities and receiving a very minimal amount of resources for the great value that they represent in their communities.

Two superb programs in my own State, in Bedford and Fall River, come to mind immediately. These communities have very high unemployment and face many different challenges. The service that these programs provide to those communities is extraordinary. Those of us who support this program, want to see that concept of voluntarism started in the early years and continued on for young people and adults through the AmeriCorps Program, continued into college, the workplace and on into retirement.

As part of the whole AmeriCorps Program, we have seen a great deal of commitment from the private sector. The challenge, when this program was established, was to try and ensure private participation and matching funds. The Senator from Maryland has talked about it, as well. We can, during the debate, go into greater detail on that part of the program. But it is already well documented that we have successfully involved the private sector in providing incentives and opportunities for service.

The fact remains, Madam President, that the concept of voluntarism exists not only for those individuals who have financial security. It will be said, in the course of this debate—it always is—it will be said that if we are going to talk about voluntary, why do we not talk about really voluntary. That is fine for those families, young and old alike, who have financial independence. But the idea of contribution of service back into community does not define itself by financial resources. The desire to serve exists among many people, young and old, those that have resources and those that do not.

We should not deny the opportunity for service to those individuals who come from humble beginnings and a family that does not have great resources. They know the concept of service and we should not deny them that. That is the point of the AmeriCorps Program: provide a small stipend and give them an opportunity to continue their education after they meet their service obligation. That is the AmeriCorps Program and it has been a great community resource.

We have seen the examples of real results where these programs have taken place. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD examples of the services provided in a number of different cities in my own State in projects that would never have been done unless AmeriCorps had been involved. The value of those projects far exceed the value of money paid to the individual AmeriCorps members. These are projects that generally would not be done without this program.

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

MASSACHUSETTS AMERICORPS PROGRAMS—1995–96 PROGRAM YEAR

PROGRAM AND COMMUNITY

YMCA Earth Service Corps—Becket, Fall River, Boston, Brockton.

Berkshire Conservation Team/Berkshire [1]—Pittsfield.

Boston University Health & Housing Fellows—Boston.

Academics for Changing times/Cambridge Community Services [1]—Cambridge.

City Pride/Old Colony Y Services Corp.[1]—Brockton.

City Year Boston [1]—Boston.

Linking Lifetimes AmeriCorps/Corporation for Public Management [1]—Springfield.

Greater Holyoke Youth Service Corps [1]—Holyoke.

City C.O.R.E./Lawrence Youth Commission [1]—Lawrence.

Local Initiatives Support Corporation—Boston.

Lowell Neighborhood Service Corps/Greater Lowell YWCA[1]—Lowell.

MAGIC ME/Boston—Boston.

National Alliance of Veteran Family Service Organizations—Roxbury.

National Council of Educational Opportunity Association—Northfield.

National Multiple Sclerosis Society—Waltham.

Neighborhood Green Corps—Boston, Worcester, Springfield.

Athletes in Service to America/Northeastern University—Boston.

Notre Dame Mission Volunteers—South Boston.

Action for Children Today—Boston, Worcester, Fitchburg.

Youth STAR/ROCA Revere Project [1]—Revere.

Summerbridge Cambridge—Cambridge.

Elder Leaders in Community Care/UMass Boston [1]—Greater Boston.

US Catholic Conference—Somerville.

United States Department of Agriculture/Public Lands and Environment Team—Dorchester.

National Service Legal Corps/Western Mass. Legal Services—Springfield.

Cityworks/Worcester Community Action Council [1]—Worcester.

YouthBuild Boston [1]—Roxbury.

YouthBuild USA [2]—Somerville.

I Have a Dream Foundation—Boston.

Youth Volunteer Corps—Boston, Lawrence.

PLANNING GRANTS AND COMMUNITY

Coalition for Asian Pacific American Youth/UMass Boston [1]—Boston.

New Bedford Youth Corps [1]—New Bedford.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Funded through the Massachusetts National and Community Service Commission.

[2] Parent organization in Massachusetts. Operating sites in other states.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, service is of great value to the community, and also of value to the individual who participates in the program.

Madam President, the Mikulski amendment will allow the programs in schools across this country to continue to provide the opportunity of service to young children.

In Springfield, MA, we have kindergarten children who are involved in folding napkins and preparing centerpieces and involved in the feeding programs for the homeless people in that area. They are just small children, and they are finding out about what homelessness means. They are finding out about the joy that takes place when they are able to involve themselves, as kindergarten children, in the preparation of napkins and centerpieces for those homeless individuals.

We find sixth graders who go out and visit nursing homes and perform in pantomime the race between the rabbit and the turtle and they see the joy that they are giving to those seniors. They often receive requests for performances. They go out during study hall to do service to the community. They learn that good citizenship is an important value in our society. This is important.

We have 8th through 12th graders, under supervision, providing day care programs for the sons and daughters of working families. They are working and even providing some reading and tutoring for these young children.

These 8th and 12th graders write these extraordinary books. They write them themselves—and read them to the other children. They are more popular than the books that are bought or were already available at these centers. The impact of that on those students is significant and profound.

We have more than 30,000 of them involved in these programs now in my own State of Massachusetts and that number is expanding. They do not need

[1] Footnotes at the end of article.

extensive resources and training to be able to run these programs. They have to have a program developed by students that has an education function, service to the community, and make application to the State boards.

That is another very important underlying concept. These programs are basically structured and run by the States. The grant decisions are not Federal they are controlled by the States.

We have, in my own State of Massachusetts, a good program. The men and women who are part of it have all been individuals who have been very, very much involved in voluntary service over the period of their lives and have been involved in a wide range of different kinds of service activities. They review to make sure that these programs work and work effectively. Some programs, clearly, work better than others, and there is obviously a responsibility to ensure that those programs that do not work are halted or discontinued and others that do work should go forward.

I know there have been examples that have been raised during the course of the various discussions on this of programs engaging in improper advocacy activities. When the very few allegations, have been substantiated, the programs have been abandoned. I think that is important. I think those of us who are supporting the Mikulski amendment certainly support that concept. Overall, the service provided by this program has been extraordinary.

I mentioned, Madam President, one particular school in Springfield, MA, that had one of the highest incidences of trouble in terms of violence, one of the highest dropout rates and also one of the highest incidences of teenage pregnancy.

There was an introduction into that whole school system of a community service program. There was a good deal of effort by very enterprising students, members of the faculty and several of the parents. They really made an impact on this student body.

Now it is the second best high school in Springfield, MA. If you go up there and talk to the parents, if you go up there and talk to the students, if you go up there and talk to the teachers, if you talk to the local merchants, if you talk to the other people who have received the service and seen the difference—there is no question in any of their minds about the fact that the service opportunity that was available to these young people made the big difference. It reduced violence and increased the academic benefits to the students themselves and changed, in a very significant and important way, the attitudes of these students about their school, about themselves and about their community.

We all know about the challenges that we are facing in many of our urban areas and in many of our school systems about how we are going to enhance education, academic achievement; how we are going to do something about violence; how we are going to do something about teenage pregnancy; how we are going to do something to encourage our young people to move around and learn.

There are a lot of different ways of trying to do it, and we have tried to do it in a variety of ways. Do not discount service as also an important contribution to those effort. When service and service opportunities are done right, they teach excellent lessons. I think the record demonstrates that.

Madam President, I see others who want to speak to this issue.

I will just say I think this program is an extremely modest program. The basic concept is to give an opportunity to people to give something back to their community. Many of us have the opportunity to visit different service sites in our own States or communities. The number of volunteers that are out there to try and provide help and assist is absolutely extraordinary.

I visited recently a station that feeds those who are HIV positive, and I asked them about the volunteers that they get to assist in feeding. They said the number of volunteers is off the charts. People really care. They do not want to have their names listed. They are people you would consider to be successful in terms of financial standing in the community. People really care.

We, as a society, do not offer sufficient kinds of opportunities for that kind of voluntarism. We provide important opportunities in many different areas, and I certainly acknowledge the work that is done by many of the very nonprofit voluntary agencies. But this is special and unique, a school-based program.

I ask for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield 1 more minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. It really provides a very, very important opportunity. I think our greatest hope is that that opportunity will be expanded on over the years in the future to make voluntarism something that is basically a part of the American ethic from the earliest part of our lives until the twilight years of our lives.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Madam President, I regret having to rise to oppose the efforts of my good friends from Maryland and Massachusetts to restore funding for the Corporation for National Service. I know that the Senator from Maryland has been a champion of this and every other measure that contributes to community service, that motivates people of all ages to take an active part in their community, to be contributing members of the community, to do something with their lives that is more than just getting a paycheck, and I know how important this program is to her.

But as I weigh the priorities, Madam President, I cannot see how we would allocate the scarce resources to pay for a program which the Government Accounting Office has concluded costs, per participant, over $26,000 per year. That is a level of expenditure that I just do not believe can be sustained in our current budget.

As I indicated when we began consideration of this measure, we are trying to move from the present condition of deficit spending, where we are going $200 billion in the tank every year, to balancing our books and stopping or ending the deficit, stopping the addition of debt, almost $5 trillion worth, that is now on the backs and on the credit cards of our children and grandchildren.

Good intentions alone, unfortunately, are not enough. We must establish some priorities, and it is very difficult. But to me, I cannot see AmeriCorps ranking high enough on that priority level. I do not dispute that the program has provided some benefits to communities. I know that individuals have benefited from it. Yet, we have had to make tough choices.

I had leaders of the Nation's mayors and county officials come into my office to ask about what I was proposing in this VA–HUD bill for the communities. I discussed with them the choices that I had to make at the subcommittee level, and that the full committee had to make between the community development block grant and AmeriCorps. The local officials who judge what really makes a difference for their communities said, ''Well, we like both of them, but there is no question that the community development block grant is more important in our community.'' That is a decision made at the local level by people elected by and responsible to the people in that community. And I cannot argue with that.

I wanted to accommodate my colleague from Maryland. I do know that there are some benefits to the AmeriCorps Program. But when the choice came to funding community development block grants or AmeriCorps, as a supporter of block grants, one who has worked with county and city officials throughout my years of service, I felt we must go with those elected by the people at the local level, who said this is their priority.

I note also that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said that this is a very worthwhile program and that the private sector matches it. Yet, I understand that only about 8 percent of the funds come from the private sector. This basically is a Federal Government program. We used to have a program called CETA, Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, way back many years ago when I was Governor. That program funded all kinds of jobs. After evaluation of Government-funded jobs, on a bipartisan basis, the leaders of this country, both at the State and

national level, decided that Comprehensive Employment and Training Act funds were not the way to go.

We have seen in the Federal Government's use of the AmeriCorps jobs how expensive they can be. It will surprise some of my colleagues that $14 million out of AmeriCorps funds went to fund Federal agencies. I bet you thought that we were cutting employment in the Federal Government, because that is what we have heard. Guess what? We cut employment in the Federal Government on the one hand, and we come in through the other door, through AmeriCorps, and use AmeriCorps funds to hire people paid for by the Federal Government.

In some of those programs, the cost per participant was more expensive. For instance, one HHS program costs more than $45,000 per participant. The Navy has a wonderful Seaborne Conservation Corps. It costs $66,715 per participant. That, to me, is a pretty expensive volunteer program. AmeriCorps, across the board, costs $20 per hour. HHS projects cost $33 an hour. The Navy project costs $49 an hour. That, Madam President, is for a volunteer.

When the program was authorized 2 years ago, it was authorized as an expansion upon the concept of voluntarism. Certainly, I believe and support voluntarism in this country. It has made our country great. Most of us would not be elected to this body, or any other body, if we did not have voluntary support in our campaigns. Most good works in the community would not go forward without voluntarism. But it would be cheaper for the Federal Government to simply pay salaries for additional staff members for not-for-profit agencies than to continue this program.

We do have good programs that assist in voluntarism. The VISTA program in the Labor-HHS Subcommittee is one that I have seen work. You have to have some paid people to organize volunteers. Yes, that is one of the things you do have to have—somebody to help organize people to make sure the volunteer efforts are effective. I agree with that program. But this is different. This is paying people to be volunteers. To me, they are no longer volunteers.

The point was made very eloquently by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that voluntarism is only for the wealthy, unless you are paid. I do not agree with that. The figures are that over 80 million Americans are engaged in volunteer work. I know people from all parts of the economic scale, all up and down the spectrum of wealth, who volunteer. They volunteer in churches and schools and community organizations, community betterment projects, in programs that they think are important. And these people volunteer regardless of how much they have in the way of economic resources, or even paychecks.

Voluntarism is the spirit of America. But it is not paid voluntarism. Let me emphasize that under the proposal in this bill, no members of the National Service Corps that are currently serving will be cut off. The Corporation just announced the fiscal year 1995 awards in the last few weeks. These programs will run until September 1996. It gives us an opportunity to see one more year of the experiment and to allow the not-for-profit agencies one more year to prepare for a possible change in their Federal subsidies.

From my perspective, we have not seen the administration provide any kind of support or real push to get this program in a position where it can be saved. We have asked them for their input. We have told them of the problems. We have asked how they are going to reform it. And in our hearing, the ranking member asked Mr. Segal, the chief executive officer of the Corporation, to provide the subcommittee with workable options to save the Corporation because she suggested that perhaps the request for 1996 was unrealistic.

I do not know if Mr. Segal has responded but in the amendment that has been offered by the Senator from Maryland, I commend her because she has demanded they come up with a plan, they come up with a program, to show how they can be effective in a new, reconfigured, smaller, leaner process.

I can assure you that if the administration wants to save this program, it is going to have to be reconfigured. It will have to be slimmer. It will have to get rid of the abuses.

The champion of this effort to reform the program and make it more efficient and less abusive of the process has been the Senator from Iowa, who is prepared to speak. He has invited the Corporation, administration officials, to work with him and with me on restructuring the program to ensure its survival.

The latest I have heard, they simply responded that it was OK that Federal volunteers were paid $66,000 a year——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BOND. With that, Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Iowa 30 minutes, and ask the Senator to reserve such time as he does not use.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, first of all, the job that the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Missouri have on this entire budget that is within the jurisdiction of their subcommittee is a very difficult process. They are fitting all the needs that come within those programs within the 602(b) allocation they have been given.

I commend the chairman for the fine work that he has done on this bill and how pleased I am to work with him in reforming the AmeriCorps Program. He has a tough budget problem.

We have a program here, AmeriCorps, that has not worked out the way the administration has said it would work out. I think that is why we are calling for either reinventing this program within the definition of the President's statements when it was first enunciated, when the program was inaugurated, or else lose the program.

That is what my letter to the President in late August said. This is the problem pointed out by the General Accounting Office. We feel that until the problems are corrected, either reinvent it, in other words, or lose it.

We have not had the cooperation of the White House on that point. That is why I think one of the reasons that the chairman felt necessary to zero out this program at this particular time and use the money someplace where there is a greater need for it.

In the process of stating my position in support of the chairman and against the amendment by the Senator from Maryland, I do not take exception to the rationale that the Senator from Maryland or the Senator from Massachusetts gave for the necessity of promoting a great American tradition of voluntarism. I do not take exception to their points that we need to promote a communitarian spirit within our American society. I do not find any fault with anyone who says that we ought to have as a characteristic Americans giving back to the community, because we receive a lot from the community.

I do not find any fault with helping people to get education. I do not find any fault with what I have seen on television for the most part, although lately there have been some stories that are real boondoggles within these programs. Over the vast amount of the TV coverage of this program, I do not find one program of voluntarism that I find fault with.

Compare what it costs with what the managers and the President said that it would cost. We have a program that, according to the General Accounting Office, is costing $26,650 per position. Now, the workers get about $13,000 plus.

We are in a position where the President said 1 Federal dollar would leverage 1 private-sector dollar. The General Accounting Office says that only 8 percent of the $26,650 comes from the private sector.

So we have a program that is 40 percent or more in overhead and administrative costs, bureaucratic costs, when that money could better be used going to the worker. If you want to compare this whole program with another use of the money that I do not think we would find any fault with, at $26,650 we can finance 18 Pell grants for one person being educated under the provisions of AmeriCorps.

This program is not coming out of the pipeline according to the rhetoric that it went into the pipeline. We need to refocus this program so that the money goes to those who are volunteering and that the programs are within the $13,000 of Federal costs that the President and the Director said they would.

This is a period of time when there is a great need to establish very stringent budget priorities. The middle-class American taxpayers are asking us to balance the budget. They want us to make sure that good use is made of their taxpayers' money. Hard-working taxpayers should not have to fund $18.26 for every hour of community service by Government-paid volunteers.

This Congress is committed to setting priorities that would say the money ought to be within the cost that the program was enunciated. These were programs that were going to cost much, much less than $18.26. These are good goals, but it is a high priced method to accomplish the goals of voluntarism when we have $26,650-a-year costs per position. If we keep the Federal costs within the $13,000, that means we are not going to have the high bureaucratic overhead that we have in this program that is pointed out by the General Accounting Office. That is the main reason for my letter to the President, that he needs to reinvent this program or face losing it.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. This is an amendment that, if passed, would undermine efforts to reform AmeriCorps and only ensure that the taxpayers' money continues to be wasted in this program.

I hope I come to the floor with some credibility on the issue of trying to consistently support the wise use of taxpayers' money. I hope, as has been said by some critics of our effort to reinvent this program, that it is not a political attack by Republicans on the President's most-favored program.

I remind my colleagues that I have fought for many years against waste of the taxpayers' money, particularly in the Reagan and Bush administration. I fought against waste in the Pentagon. I still continue my efforts to watchdog the taxpayers' money at the Department of Defense.

It was well over a year ago before there was such a political price on this program that I started looking into the AmeriCorps Program, this program that is administered by the Corporation for National Service.

Similar to the Department of Defense under Reagan, AmeriCorps is one of the fastest growing programs in the budget. The administration wants to spend billions over the next several years of taxpayer dollars on this program. Just as with the Pentagon, I found that there was a tremendous waste in the AmeriCorps Program. In many cases, AmeriCorps gives the Pentagon a run for its money in the boondoggle department. For example, while the Air Force paid $7,600, as this chart shows, for a coffee pot, the AmeriCorps Program managed to work with the Navy to produce a $66,715 volunteer.

As we remember from a few years ago, the Department of Defense bought a $600 toilet seat. But the AmeriCorps workers give us a $49,652 volunteer. The Department of Defense a few years ago paid $500 for a hammer. But AmeriCorps pays $42,758 for a volunteer in new England.

There is no disputing the fact that the coffeepots, the toilet seats, and the hammers at the Department of Defense actually work. They actually work. There is no doubt in my mind that the volunteers under AmeriCorps at the Seaborne Corp., or the Magic Me, or the Youth Conservation Corps will work. But what we in Government have to do is find a more wise way to use the taxpayer dollars, whether it is with the $7,600 coffeepot at the Department of Defense or whether it is the $66,000 volunteer in AmeriCorps.

My long experience is that when the Department of Defense and their supporters are confronted with a $500 hammer story, they at least claim that there will be an end to business as usual. They state that there are going to be reforms. Frankly, sometimes these reforms are real and sometimes they are not very real at the Pentagon.

Here with AmeriCorps, we have an amendment that says all is well—that there is nothing wrong with paying nearly $50 an hour for service to the community, nothing wrong with 50 percent cost overruns, and nothing wrong with the taxpayers footing 92 percent of the bill. When it comes to AmeriCorps, $1 of Federal money was going to leverage $1 of private sector contribution to the program. This amendment is the same as Congress saying $500 hammers are completely acceptable, and voting to increase the Pentagon's hardware budget.

I do not find such waste of taxpayers' money acceptable at the Pentagon, and I do not find it acceptable at the AmeriCorps Program.

So, as I said, I wrote to President Clinton last month offering to work with him to reinvent the AmeriCorps Program. I asked him to sit down with Congress and work cooperatively with us in finding ways to have the AmeriCorps Program meet original goals as defined by the President of the United States—not by anybody in this Congress—by the goals that he hoped to achieve and the costs of those programs, and the amount that would come from the private sector and the amount that would come from the taxpayers.

Unfortunately, while the President has found the time to give inspiring speeches in support of AmeriCorps, he has found no time to roll up his sleeves and find common ground with the Congress. It is unfortunate at a time when I asked for common ground with the President that he is giving speeches all over the country wanting to find common ground with the Republican Congress, but never does the common ground of the President ever seem to be the same common ground that we ask for from here.

It is unfortunate that many young people could be denied assistance to go to college because the administration has refused to sit down and talk with the Congress about reforming AmeriCorps and more efficiently using scarce tax dollars.

The administration, at the last hour, at least has responded to our letter today. My letter was sent on August 29. The administration has finally sent a letter in response. Frankly, the letter says nothing. The administration has wrapped up its same tired lines and excuses with a new ribbon. Sadly, it offers nothing new in the way of cooperating with Congress or finding the common ground that is the President's watchword of the last 2 months.

In sum, the administration's response says continue to waste the taxpayers' money on these $66,000 volunteers, continue to hire over 2,000 volunteers to work for the Federal Government, and continue to spend half of the money on overhead and administration instead of helping young people pay for college.

It reminds me of the story of the emperor's clothes. Everyone in the administration is just too afraid to tell the President that AmeriCorps has no clothes, that it is a boondoggle, at least from the standpoint of these high-paying jobs, at least from the standpoint that it is not fitting within the $13,000 of Federal costs that the President defined as what the programs would cost, at least from the standpoint of $1 of Federal money not leveraging $1 from the private sector.

The amendment that is before us, as well intended as it might be to continue the promotion of the communitarian spirit in America, is really just a continuation of the status quo of business as usual.

My colleagues should clearly understand though that this amendment is not the life or death of AmeriCorps. This is about whether there will be a reform of AmeriCorps to stop the waste of the taxpayers' money.

There will be long discussions with the administration regarding the VA–HUD appropriations bill. I am confident that there will be funding for AmeriCorps when the day is done. This amendment is about whether we will undercut efforts to reform this program.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. I want them to vote for protecting the taxpayers' money. I want them to be able to help more young people attend college. At the same time, I think we ought to take into consideration that while we are talking about preserving 20,000 AmeriCorps positions, for every one AmeriCorps position, you want to remember that there are 190 young Americans, totaling up I think to 3.9 million Americans, young Americans, I want to emphasize—that is by our Department of Commerce figures—who volunteer every year without getting paid for it.

We need to remind these volunteers who do not get paid that their work is worthy work, even though they do not get paid. The best way I know to do

that is to make sure that the President's objective is met of having these positions paid relatively small amounts of money to earn a stipend to go to college, to leverage $1 of private sector money for every $1 of Federal money spent, and staying within those guidelines that the President set—not that we set—is the best way to show the 3.9 million young people who volunteer that their work is appreciated as well.

Perhaps we can accomplish the President's goals of young people being educated, promoting the communitarian spirit, helping people in need, without jeopardizing either the public sector attempt to do that or a gigantic private sector attempt that has been characteristic of American society for decades before there was ever a President Clinton.

I yield back my unused portion of the 30 minutes and yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I am about to yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Illinois, a staunch supporter of national service. He has been waiting patiently.

Before the Senator from Iowa leaves the floor, I would like to say three things. First, I know that the Senator is not out to torpedo the program but to reform the program. He was one of the first to raise concerns about the program, and as he recalls, I joined with him in the GAO report.

I also have in my possession the letters that he did send to the President asking for a reformed framework. I would like to recognize and acknowledge the validity of the Senator's concerns about that, and I think the Senator should have gotten a better response. I think I was owed a better response.

Third, I wish to say to the Senator, however, if this amendment goes down, national service is zeroed out. So it will not be about reforming national service; it will be about ending national service. So we will talk more.

But I would like to thank the Senator for his work on this issue. I think he raises important points. We disagree on the amendment.

I also thank the Senator for the tone in which he presented this argument. I think good people can engage in this kind of conversation with civility and keep the focus on the issues. So I would just like to thank him.

Having said that, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SIMON. I thank my colleague from Maryland, Mr. President and Members of the Senate.

First, I wish to say Senator GRASSLEY has contributed in the area of waste in the area of defense, no question about it. And when he talks about waste, I think we have to take it seriously.

I should point out that the figure he uses of $27,000 is the total amount, including tools and equipment. For example, Judy Wagner of my staff just gave me a report where in one community they built a farmers' market. That includes all the aid equipment. In terms of Federal expenditures, it amounts to $17,600 per volunteer. That is a very different thing.

Second, I point out to both Senator GRASSLEY and my colleague from Missouri, Senator BOND, that some of the abuses they have cited are of people who have worked for the Federal Government. The Mikulski amendment knocks out service for Federal agencies, and I think properly so. So that moves us in the right direction.

Back when I was a Member of the House, I held hearings on this whole idea of service, and one of the people who testified was Harris Wofford, our former colleague, who then was President of Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania. I would, frankly, today vote for a 1-year requirement for everyone to serve this Nation in some capacity, and if you wanted to serve in the military, you got a little extra incentive of some kind or another, but you had to work for a mental hospital or park district or something. Frankly, it was good for me when I served in the Army for 2 years to come and be in a mix with a great many people, and I think it is good for others.

In terms of return on investment, I quote Stan Litow, an IBM executive, who reviewed the cost-benefit study and came to the conclusion that this program is sound. ''This program works,'' he said.

Senator BOND made a reference to CETA. The CETA Program, frankly, was for unemployed people. This is a very different thing, and it brings in people to work together in areas where they have not often worked. This is different from the VISTA Program. There is obviously much cooperation.

I remember being in an impoverished area of Cincinnati. I walked into a little, one-person store, and there was a man explaining to this person who was running the store how to keep books. I walked out, and I thanked him for volunteering to do this. He told me at that point he was the treasurer of Procter & Gamble, and he said, ''I should thank you.'' He said, ''I didn't really understand our country until I volunteered.''

I think we have to learn about one another more than we are. We are going to have to learn what it is like in another neighborhood. I think this is part of that. I read in—this may surprise the Presiding Officer—one of Rush Limbaugh's books—and I confess to having purchased two of his books and giving him a little bit of royalty—he said, ''We are not being asked to sacrifice as Americans today.'' I think he is correct, and this is a way of bringing out the noble in people.

Government leaders can appeal to either the noble or the greed in all of us, and too often I think we pander to the greed. It is easy. But we should be appealing to the noble. And that is what this program does. I think it is a good program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SIMON. If I may have 30 additional seconds.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I will be happy to yield the Senator an additional minute.

Mr. SIMON. I thank my colleague.

I remember—and I am sure Senator MIKULSKI will remember—that during the 1992 campaign when Bill Clinton was going around making speeches, the one line in his speech that got enthusiastic applause was when he said, ''We are going to establish a volunteer service corps.'' I do not imagine the Presiding Officer was at any of those rallies and did not hear that line, but it was a response from the American people. They like the idea of appealing to people to volunteer for things.

Now, if there are improvements that should be made in the program—and there probably are—let us make the improvements. I think the Mikulski amendment makes some of those improvements. But let us not kill the program. That is what we do without an amendment. So I hope my colleagues will vote for the Mikulski amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I support the mission of AmeriCorps. I have met the people, young and old, participating in Vermont's program, and I have seen the benefits in their faces and in the benefits in their faces and in the communities they serve.

Engaging Americans of all ages to help communities solve their own problems is a worthy goal. AmeriCorps builds a sense of community responsibility and is certainly a better investment than the $1 billion this Congress plans to spend for each B–2 bomber.

The greatest threat facing our cities and towns today is the loss of a sense of community responsibility. The best weapon against rising crime, hunger, and illegitimacy is for every American to take an active interest in their community.

AmeriCorps provides inspiration by inviting Americans to give something back—to reestablish the local ties that have been so important to this country. I cannot think of a better program to invest Federal dollars in.

Senator MIKULSKI has been a tireless advocate of the AmeriCorps Program, which now has 20,000 participants from all different backgrounds. The accomplishments of those participants are evident everywhere.

The 130 AmeriCorps members in Vermont are fighting hunger and malnutrition, improving trails and wildlife habitat in the Green Mountain National Forest, and helping rural communities develop fire protection plans. Others are helping troubled youths get back on their feet and aiding the blind.

AmeriCorps is an experiment that is working. The least we can do is to allow that experiment to continue.

I urge my colleagues to support Senator MIKULSKI'S amendment providing funding for the Corporation for National Service in 1996.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Senator LEAHY has been a longstanding supporter of national service. I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. President, much has been raised about the concerns over the fiscal responsibility of national service, and the GAO report, I believe, shows that we are getting a dollar's worth of services for a dollar's worth of taxes. In the interest, also, of not running up the printing cost of the Federal Government, I would like to include only the executive summary of the GAO report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that the executive summary of the GAO report on the Corporation for National and Community Service be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES DIVISION,
Washington, DC, September 7, 1995.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
U.S. Senate.

The Corporation for National and Community Service (the Corporation) administers the AmeriCorps*USA program, the largest national service volunteer program since the 1930s. AmeriCorps*USA participants perform community services that match priorities established by the Corporation, such as addressing educational, environmental, and public safety needs. The Corporation provides grants to individual programs, which obtain additional resources from other federal agencies, state and local governments, and the private sector.

While there has been interest in assessing AmeriCorps*USA's cost-effectiveness, such an assessment is difficult because the program has operated for less than a year. We recently reported on total resources available to support AmeriCorps*USA programs in the 1994–95 program year and, to a lesser extent, on benefits of certain programs. We found that total resources available for AmeriCorps*USA participant equaled about $26,700 for program year 1994–95.[1] We also found that, at seven programs we visited, participants were providing benefits to their communities, but we did not attempt to quantify these benefits.

Recently, in an effort to provide perspective on the potential cost-effectiveness of AmeriCorps*USA programs, a benefit-cost study was conducted of three AmeriCorps*USA programs based on short-term and projected data.[2] The benefit-cost study was commissioned by financial sponsors of the three AmeriCorps*USA programs it examined. The sponsors wanted more information about benefits derived from the programs relative to program costs. These programs were AmeriCorps for Math and Literacy, which targets at-risk children from kindergarten through second grade in Ohio and Texas schools; East Bay Conservation Corps, which addresses environmental needs in California; and Project First, which provides access to computers for students in Georgia, New York, and North Carolina. The study analyzed each program separately, and it did not claim that the three were representative of all AmeriCorps*USA programs. The study estimated that these programs returned between $1.68 and $2.58 for each dollar invested.

Based on concerns you and others have raised about the study, you asked us to evaluate it. We agreed to provide an overview of benefit-cost analysis; evaluate how the study's specific methodology compares with that of other benefit-cost analyses, and assess the study's conclusions.

To develop this information, we reviewed the study, held extensive discussions with the authors and used some of the study's data to try to replicate its results. However, in most cases we accepted the study's calculations as given and did not verify them. We did our work in August 1995 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS: AN OVERVIEW

Economists typically use benefit-cost analysis to evaluate the worth of particular investment projects. Calculating the ratio of expected benefits to expected costs is one method analysts can use to provide policymakers with evidence as to whether a project is worth undertaking. The analysis results in a benefit-to-cost ratio that is either greater than 1 (meaning the project returns more than $1 per $1 invested) or less than 1 (meaning that less than $1 is returned per $1 invested). The analysis may also compare a variety of investments to see which one returns the greatest benefit per dollar of cost.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance on benefit-cost analysis of federal programs[3] focuses on the entire economy, thus including net social benefits and costs. Social benefits of federal programs are the value of the program's output to private citizens, and this value is typically difficult to measure. Both direct and indirect benefits are usually included in the analysis. A job-training program, for example, may have the direct benefit of preparing individuals for employment, thus raising their future earnings. It may also have an indirect benefit of reducing welfare payments or crime rates, assuming that, had the individuals not received training, some might have received welfare or committed crimes. Even when the social benefits of a project are clear, attaching a dollar value to them is often problematic.

Social costs of a federal program are opportunity costs—the value of the forgone benefits had the program's resources been allocated to their best alternative use. Producing an additional unit of the program's output requires the reallocation of resources away from other productive activity. The opportunity cost of an additional unit of the program's output equals the sacrificed amount of some other productive activity's output occasioned by the resource reallocation. For example, if money used for a federal job-training program were obtained by reallocating funds earmarked for a federal bridge-building program, the opportunity cost of the job-training program would be the value of the services that the new bridges would have provided.

Comparing social benefits with social costs allows policymakers to determine whether the value of the output or services gained from a program is greater than the benefits sacrificed elsewhere when resources are reallocated. When the social benefits of a program exceed the social costs, there is a net gain to society from taking resources from elsewhere in the economy and devoting them to the program.

The comparison of benefits to costs can be expressed as a benefit-cost ratio (that is, social benefits divided by social costs) or as net benefits (that is, social benefits less social costs). The expression of net benefits is more straightforward. When the comparison is expressed as a ratio, decision must be made about costs that can affect the ratio. For example, if building a bridge will result in time saved by commuters or delivery trucks, this can be seen as a benefit—time gained—or as a negative cost—reduced time lost. Whether it is included as a benefit or as a negative cost affects the magnitude of the ratio but not the underlying economic basis for any decision-making process.

Benefit-cost analysis results are typically very sensitive to the underlying assumptions. For example, a small change in the interest rate used to discount a stream of future benefits or costs can have a large impact on the outcome of such an analysis.[4] In addition, including or excluding certain items from either costs or benefits can greatly change the results.

OUR ANALYSIS OF THE KORMENDI GARDNER STUDY

The goal of the benefit-cost study was to calculate the ratio of social benefits, net of nonfederal costs, to federal costs. On the basis of our review of the study and conversations with the authors, we believe the overall approach of the study appears to be consistent with this goal. Rather than dividing gross social benefits by gross social costs, it subtracted all nonfederal costs from the benefits and then calculated the ratio of the resulting net benefits to federal costs. The choice of what costs to subtract from the numerator, instead of adding to the denominator, affects the magnitude of the ratio, but it cannot affect whether the ratio is above or below 1. Given the goal of the study, the costs that are netted with benefits in the numerator do not seem unreasonable.

In addition to decisions about the placement of costs in the numerator or denominator, specific assumptions and other methodological decisions used to calculate components of the ratio affected the results of the study. Further, as the study appropriately recognized, without full program data, comparisons had to be made with historical data for similar programs, and the outcome was influenced by the choice of comparisons.

The study's methodology

The study summed three types of benefits deriving from the AmeriCorps*USA programs: participant benefits, societal benefits, and net donor benefits. Participant benefits included wages, fringe benefits, a ''citizenship'' contribution,[5] an education award,[6] and the value of future education made possible by the award. Societal benefits, as defined in the study, included all benefits that accrued to nonparticipants, such as increased educational attainment or reduced crime and welfare incidence for children who were tutored by AmeriCorps*USA participants. Net donor benefits equaled 0, because donor benefits were assumed to equal donor costs. The study then compared this sum with federal costs. To illustrate, we present these components, along with their values for one of the programs, Project First, in table 1.

Table 1.—Benefits and Costs for Project First

Item	*Value*
Benefits	
Participant benefits	$25,976
Wages and fringe benefits	9,804
Federally paid	8,211
Donor-paid	1,593
Citizenship	8,195
Education award	4,725
Future education	3,252
Net societal benefits	26,330

Footnotes at end of article.

	Value
Net donor benefits	0
Donor benefits	10,350
(Less) donor costs	−10,350
Total benefits	$52,306
Costs	
Federally paid participant costs	$12,396
Federally paid wages and fringe benefits	8,211
Education award (federally paid)	4,725
Federally paid overhead costs	7,789
Total costs	$20,725

To determine the benefit-cost ratio for Project First, the study netted nonfederal costs and benefits in the numerator rather than including gross benefits in the numerator and gross costs in the denominator. For example, the benefits for donors of matching funds were assumed to equal the costs, and they were netted in the numerator.

A more complex example is the participant's ''future education'' component. According to our conversations with the authors, this component was the difference between (1) future earnings the participant will have with the additional education made possible by the education award and (2) future earnings he or she would have had in the absence of the award.[7] The authors also told us they calculated the difference between these earnings streams net of the participant's labor costs during the year in AmeriCorps*USA—that is, the future education benefit component was calculated subtracting out the participant's labor costs for the program year. The difference between the earnings streams did not include the benefits produced during the year; these were included as societal benefits. Because the costs that were subtracted were federal costs, they had to be added back into the numerator to calculate the desired ratio—social benefits, net of nonfederal costs, relative to federal costs. While the logic the authors described to us is understandable, we did not verify the details of all of the computations.

The choice of which costs to net out of benefits, in the numerator, and which to include as costs, in the denominator, is an important one. For example, according to the study, the net value of future education for a Project First participant was $3,252. This was approximately the difference, for the average participant, between a discounted lifetime income of $745,040 with the additional education and $741,790 in the absence of the additional education. One way to measure gross benefits and gross costs would be to include $745,040 as part of the benefit and $741,790 as the lifetime opportunity cost of producing that benefit. This methodology would probably not be an improvement over that of the study; these dollar figures would dominate the ratio relative to other benefits and costs, placing undue importance on this aspect of the entire study.

The valuation of benefits deriving from private donations would be optimistic if these donations were partly offset by federal tax deductions. For private sector donors, if part of the benefit were derived from tax deductions, the lost tax revenue should be counted as a cost if taxpayers ultimately have to make up for it. The authors told us that for the three programs analyzed in the study, this factor was not relevant because private donations came from tax-exempt foundations, but this point should be kept in mind for future analyses.[8] In addition, as with the value of future education discussed above, an alternative calculation could include only donor benefits in the numerator and include donor costs in the denominator, rather than netting them to 0 in the numerator. While this would reduce the measured benefit-cost ratio, it could not make it fall below 1, and the measure of net social benefits would be unaffected.

Other methodological decisions could affect benefit-cost ratios

The study made several other assumptions and methodological choices that affect the benefit-cost ratios. The study failed to recognize the costs associated with raising tax revenues to pay for new government spending programs. We also believe it may have made an optimistic assumption in one case about results of AmeriCorps*USA participants' work. In addition, as the study noted, benefit-cost ratios given in the study did not incorporate certain unquantifiable benefits, which would raise the reported ratios if they could be included.

Loss associated with generating tax revenues

Economists recognize that there are costs associated with raising tax revenues to pay for a new spending program. These costs can arise, for example, as some people change their behavior to avoid paying more taxes. OMB cites an estimated loss of 25 percent due to the process of generating the revenues, and it recommends calculating supplementary benefit-cost ratios including this adjustment to costs. Increasing the programs' cost by 25 percent would diminish the benefit-cost ratio.

Perry project comparison

As an estimate of future gains for preschool students whom AmeriCorps*USA participants tutored, the study used results from the Perry Preschool Project, an intensive intervention in a particular school in the 1960s on which much long-term research has been conducted. The intensity of effort in the Perry Project appeared to be much greater than in the AmeriCorps*USA programs. Comparison with some prior research is necessary, but it may have been optimistic to use the results from the Perry Project. This concern with the study has been raised previously in another assessment.[9]

Benefits that could not be quantified

As the study notes, some benefits of AmeriCorps*USA projects could not be quantified and thus were not accounted for in the benefit-cost ratios. During site visits we conducted as part of our earlier study, we observed benefits that may also apply to the three programs the study analyzed, including strengthening communities and fostering civic responsibility. Inclusion of an estimate for the value of these benefits would raise the reported benefit-cost ratios. One of the limitations of benefit-cost analysis is that intangible benefits such as these cannot easily be incorporated into the analysis.

ASSESSMENT OF STUDY'S CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that programs such as the three AmeriCorps*USA programs it reviewed ''generally can be an important societal investment'' because the benefit-cost ratios exceeded 1 ''by a substantial margin.'' As we pointed out earlier, the magnitude of the ratios depends in part on the assumptions and methodological choices that are made. Even if the three AmeriCorps*USA programs' benefit-cost ratios exceeded 1, in an era of constrained federal budgets, the ratios should be compared with those of other programs performing similar services, such as Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), to see whether AmeriCorps*USA is a more efficient program. As the authors concluded, the three programs they analyzed would appear to be worthwhile federal investments. But until comparisons with other programs are done, decisionmakers will not know whether there are preferable uses of federal funds.

STUDY AUTHORS' COMMENTS

In commenting on a draft of this correspondence, the study's authors told us that they believed we had characterized the study fairly. They thought our breakdown of the benefit and cost components was helpful in illuminating their methodology. They agreed that their results were sensitive to methodological issues such as the choice of comparison groups. They emphasized, however, that a balanced view—which they believed was taken in this correspondence—recognizes that this sensitivity goes in both directions. They said that they stood by their overall conclusions that their results were reasonable and conservative. The authors believe that this type of study should be undertaken for other AmeriCorps*USA programs and for similar federal programs.

We are sending copies of this correspondence to the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service, the authors of the study, appropriate congressional committees, and other interested parties. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this material further, please call me or Cornelia M. Blanchette, Associate Director, at (202) 512–7014 or James R. White, Acting Chief Economist, at (202) 512–6209. Major contributors to this correspondence were Wayne B. Upshaw, Assistant Director; Harold J. Brumm, senior economist; and James W. Spaulding, senior evaluator, (202) 512–7035.

CORNELIA M. BLANCHETTE,
(For Linda G. Morra, Director,
Education and Employment Issues).

FOOTNOTES

[1] *National Service Programs: AmeriCorps*USA—Early Program Resource and Benefit Information* (GAO/HEHS–95–222, Aug. 29, 1995). This figure excludes private in-kind contributions.

[2] George R. Neumann, Roger C. Kormendi, Robert A. Tamura, and Cyrus J. Gardner, *The Benefits and Costs of National Service: Methods for Benefit Assessment With Application to Three AmeriCorps Programs* (Washington, D.C.: Kormendi/Gardner Partners, 1995).

[3] OMB Circular A–94, Revised Transmittal Memorandum 64 (Oct. 29, 1992).

[4] The discount rate is used to compute the present value of future benefits or costs. Even in the absence of inflation, a dollar today is worth more than one receivable in the future. For example, if the appropriate discount rate is 4 percent, then a payment of $1 receivable in 10 years is worth only 68 cents today.

[5] The ''citizenship'' contribution was an estimate of the difference between what AmeriCorps*USA participants received as compensation for their service and the larger amount that they could receive if employed at their market wage. The study counted this as a participant benefit because participants were assumed to derive a benefit in order to be willing to accept the lower compensation level. The study noted that this could be considered a societal benefit instead, because it was in effect a donation from the participant to society.

[6] AmeriCorps*USA participants receive an education award, which can be used to pay future higher education expenses or to repay student loans, upon successful completion of their service. For a full-time participant, the value of the award is $4,725 per year of service, for a maximum of 2 years.

[7] The study assumed only a portion of the participants would actually attain more education because of the award—the results were for the average—and the income streams were discounted back to the current year.

[8] When matching donations come from the public sector, the issues are more complicated. According to the authors, no non-Corporation federal, state, or local government funds were involved for the programs in the study. However, one of the three was a program we sampled for our previous review, and much of the matching funds it reported to us came from local government sources. Our data were gathered more recently than the data the authors had, which may explain the discrepancy.

[9] David W. Murray and Thomas Riley, ''Costs and Benefits of National Service: Unanswered Questions'' (Washington, D.C.: Statistical Assessment Service, 1995). See also George R. Neumann, Roger C. Kormendi, Robert F. Tamura, and Cyrus J. Gardner, ''Response to STATS' Unanswered Questions'' (Washington, D.C.: Kormendi/Gardner Partners, 1995).

Mr. DODD. I am pleased to rise in strong support of the Mikulski amendment to restore funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service and for AmeriCorps.

Mr. President, given all of the attention focused on this issue, it is hard to believe that AmeriCorps is just 2 years old.

However, AmeriCorps has already created a lasting legacy in thousands of American communities. Through the work of over 20,000 full-time energetic and talented volunteers, needy children are receiving tutoring, mentoring and other assistance, our national parks are cleaner, streets are safer and thousand of homes have been rehabilitated for families in need.

The Corporation for National and Community Service has also harnessed the efforts of 500,000 senior volunteers and nearly 350,000 school-age students who are today working in their communities helping to meet critical needs in education, public safety, human service and the environment.

The Corporation's efforts are already making an incredible difference in America's communities. In my State of Connecticut, AmeriCorps sponsors 20 different programs. The largest, leadership, education and athletics in partnership in New Haven, has 164 members working with needy children providing tutoring and mentoring. During the summer months, many of the volunteers live in the community housing projects and work with the children throughout the summer months.

A recent study of the work of just 8 percent of AmeriCorps volunteers found the volunteers were having an extraordinary impact. Nearly 8,000 preschool and elementary students were tutored in basic education; 17,000 needy people were fed, and thousands of school hallways were made safer.

AmeriCorps has also made a significant difference in the lives of volunteers—who not only gain knowledge and satisfaction from their work but who also are able to pursue additional education and training and pay off student loans. After devoting their energies to rebuilding their communities, volunteers received a modest post-service educational benefit of $4,725.

This makes a substantial difference for today's students as student indebtedness rises to alarming levels. More than half of all AmeriCorps members come from families with household incomes between $15,000 and $50,000—the average family income was $33,500 overall—the very families who find the educational award so important in helping to manage the spiraling costs of college.

Mr. President, I know personally what a difference voluntary service can make in a young person's life. Over 30 years ago, hundreds of young Americans answered President Kennedy's call to service in the Peace Corps. I was one of them, and was sent to the Dominican Republic for 2 of the most rewarding years of my life. I would like to think that the maternity hospital I helped construct has made a lasting difference in that community. But I certainly know that the experience made an incredible difference in my life.

Mr. President, the benefits of national and community service may be lost here in Congress, but they are not lost on the American public. The vast majority of Americans support the AmeriCorps Program. A recent Gallop Poll showed that 91 percent of Americans supported national service. A Los Angeles Times poll indicated that 70 percent of Americans like this program—including 60 percent of Republicans and conservatives.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to lose this program to the pitfalls of partisan infighting. I would hope my colleagues would join me in voting for the Mikulski amendment.

Mr. CHAFEE. I want to offer my support for Senator MIKULSKI's amendment. I was a skeptic of this program when it was first proposed. It sounded too expensive, and the concept of stripended service seemed incongruous with voluntarism.

That was before I had a chance to see the positive impact of this program on the ground in my own State of Rhode Island. Young people from all walks of life have gone into a number of communities to help clean up neighborhoods, improve the literacy of inner city school children, and to improve public safety and the environment.

Let me give you an example of what we are finding in Rhode Island. Two years ago, Marilyn Concepcion was a high school dropout. Getting that far was an accmplisment; no one in her family had ever gone beyond the sixth grade. This 19-year-old woman joined Rhode Island City Year, an AmeriCorps program, to earn her GED certificate.

With training from the City Year staff, Concepcion began to tutor and mentor a group of first graders. She taught them to read, taught English as a second language, gave them insight into the value of learing, the importance of an education. Some of these children had never been given the type of encouragement that Marilyn Concepcion provided.

The short-term impact Marilyn Concepcion had on these children's lives has been measurable. They pay attention more in school, their self-esteem has been increased. But the real impact, the most concrete effect on their lives may not be felt for another 10 to 12 years, when these children become members of the work force or go onto college.

Spurred by the positive influence she'd had on her students, Marilyn Concepcion decided she wanted to go to college. She applied to, and was accepted by, Brown University. She became the first recipient of Brown's offer to match the $4,700 AmeriCorps educational award—a challenge grant program just announced by a number of universities and colleges in our State.

If this is the kind of results we are obtaining with only 1 year of experience, I think it is only fair that we let this program continue for some period of time to better evaluate its performance.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Maryland which restores $425 million to AmeriCorps.

Let me begin by saying that if the Senate is interested in engaging in a productive debate on the accomplishments of AmeriCorps—and on real suggestions for improving the program —I would welcome that debate. Very few programs managed by government at any level couldn't be made better, and wouldn't benefit from an ongoing public review. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland both saves AmeriCorps and, in my judgement, improves it.

And AmeriCorps is worth saving, Mr. President. It is worth saving because, as the General Accounting Office stated in its August 1995 report, ''at the grantees' sites we visited, we found that the projects had been designed to strengthen communities, develop civic responsibility, and expand educational opportunities for program participants.''

How do we identify the catalysts for vesting our people in our Nation? How can we encourage our children to feel an obligation and a responsibility to contribute to the strength and security of America throughout their lives?

Military service is one way. And civilian national service is another.

What does America get from a single individual's intense and all encompassing period of service?

Is it possible that those who work for a year to combat illiteracy will be forever committed to a good education for each child in the city or town in which they live?

Is it possible that those who work for a year to fight poverty will remember forever the importance of opportunity?

Is it possible that those who work for a year to hold together a crumbling neighborhood will never forget the responsibility of every man and woman to build and to sustain?

It is my hope that national service will be a catalyst for a lifetime of community service. It is my hope that experiencing the tangible results of strengthening and teaching will convince our people that citizenship has value, that individuals who roll up their sleeves and enter the fray can personally make something richer and stronger.

With every national service slot we fund, Mr. President, we give another American an intense, all encompassing, opportunity to serve. And by investing in them, we gamble that they will then invest in us.

I am willing to take that gamble, Mr. President. I am willing to reach for something to help fight this giant malaise that seems to permeate so many of

our citizens. I am willing to grab a tiny particle of idealism and see how far we can take it.

I am willing to work to make AmeriCorps better, Mr. President. And I am willing to oppose any attempt to eliminate its funding.

Churchill once said, ''We make a living by what we get, we make a life by what we give.'' In national service, Mr. President, we allow our citizens to give. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to commend my friend, Senator SARBANES, for his leadership on this issue, and lend my support to his amendment which would restore funding for homeless assistance.

Mr. President, homelessness is a problem that the American people want solved. The number of homeless Americans has grown steadily over the last three decades and it will continue to grow until we responsibly address the issue of homelessness. Studies put the number of homeless at more than 600,000 people on any given night. It is even more shocking to find that children are now the fastest growing portion of this homeless population. As a caring Nation, we must no longer ignore this growing and often overlooked part of our population. I firmly believe that every citizen deserves not only a place to sleep at night, but a real opportunity to improve their lives. Our national efforts must focus on helping these families.

Senator SARBANES' amendment restores $360 million for homeless assistance funding to the fiscal year 1996 VA–HUD appropriations bill, bringing the funding level back up to fiscal year 1995 levels. These funds will enable local governments, communities, and nonprofits to form comprehensive, flexible and coordinated strategies for ending homelessness. These funds will help local agencies leverage additional money needed to aid homeless people with disabilities, create more housing and provide the services and facilities needed to move people into situations where they can live independently.

Restoring homeless assistance funding to 1995 levels is also an important part of the authorizing committee's effort to reform HUD in general and specifically to reform our delivery of homeless assistance. Last year's Senate Banking Committee bill created a single formula grant program which would replace the seven different categorical grant programs at HUD. This formula grant will allow better coordination of homeless services at the local level and facilitate better planning as funding levels become more predictable. The VA–HUD bill allows for this formula but does not provide adequate funding. The funds restored in this amendment will raise homeless assistance funding to a level that will allow a formula approach to make sense.

Unfortunately, no matter how we restructure HUD, during the transition some people are going to fall through the cracks. The homeless programs are the safety net that catches them.

Mr. President, earlier this year I had a chance to meet with Lucie McKinney and she reminded me of her late husband's tireless efforts and determination to end the cycle of homelessness. We must do all we can to continue Stewart McKinney's work.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the amendment to ensure the survival of AmeriCorps, today's commitment to national service throughout the country and in my State of West Virginia. I was proud to be an original cosponsor of the legislation that created AmeriCorps.

I know something about the importance of public service because of the VISTA program back in 1964. After President Kennedy issued his famous call for serving our country, I went to West Virginia through the VISTA program and to a place called Emmon that changed the course of my life.

AmeriCorps is a wise and meaningful investment in our country's future. Whenever I am home talking to West Virginians of every age, I see heads nod when the idea of national service comes up. West Virginians and our fellow Americans believe in the values of service and responsibility, and AmeriCorps is a very exciting, important way for these values to have meaning. It is incredible to see this appropriations bill include a retreat from one of the most exciting initiatives taken in the recent years. We should be working together to renew and reinvigorate service, especially by our young people, and not retreat from it.

There is a great deal of talk about solving problems at the local level and working in communities. I agree and I believe that AmeriCorps is one Federal program that successfully delivers on this promise. For every Federal dollar invested in AmeriCorps, we reap as much as $2.60 in return.

While it is important to note that AmeriCorps is a cost-effective program, I know it is more compelling to talk about what AmeriCorps has done for communities.

In West Virginia, the AmeriCorps program places workers at seven domestic violence shelters to help battered women and children with a range of issues. I have visited a shelter in West Virginia and was deeply touched by the need to help women and their children caught in violent homes. This is important community work, and AmeriCorps is helping make a difference.

My State also sponsors Project HEALTH—Health Education Associates Learning to Teach Health—which places 20 AmeriCorps members in 15 sites that focus on promoting health care in rural areas. This is a unique partnership program with the Kellogg Foundation, my State, and AmeriCorps. AmeriCorps workers will be promoting child immunizations, working to reduce the prevalence of low birth weight, and promoting healthy behaviors.

AmeriCorps members are also involved in a West Virginia project called Energy Express. This is an innovative summer program for disadvantaged children that combines remedial education and child nutrition. Energy Express also works to promote parental involvement with a child's education which is a goal we all share.

I could go on and on about the extraordinary work by AmeriCorps and the other service programs sponsored in my State. We have more than 20,000 West Virginians participating in public service initiatives thanks to the leadership and encouragement of the Corporation for National and Community Service. There are 189 West Virginians in AmeriCorps, and others are involved in VISTA, RSVP, the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program, and ''Learn and Service'' in the schools. The Corporation for National and Community Service weaves all of these important incentives together.

As we talk about the need to strengthen our communities and to solve problems at the grassroots, we should continue our support for AmeriCorps, which reflects this basic goals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two West Virginia articles be printed in the RECORD. These pieces tell the story of AmeriCorps in West Virginia more eloquently than I can.

There being on objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICORPS COMES UNDER GOP SCRUTINY

(By Cheryl Caswell)

Americorps, President's Clinton's pet project for encouraging community service and education, is one the firing line as Republicans carry out their program to slash government spending.

But his first recruits may be too busy to pay much attention.

In West Virginia, nearly 60 Americorps workers are studying archaeological sites and inoculation records, building shelters, tutoring children, developing leadership clubs and drug prevention programs, housecleaning for the handicapped, studying stream erosion and assisting farmers and domestic violence victims.

''The great value I got in it is that they are not just doing work, but developing an emotional tie to the community,'' said Joan Ambratte, director of the state Commission for National and Community Service.

''They are getting a sense that they are responsible for the future,'' she said. ''And these are the people who are going to take over as leaders in the next 30 years, the ones who will step forward and serve in the legislature and on boards.''

Ambroge's commission came under direct assault by some state Republicans who hoped to end its funding and end Americorps here, but the appropriations passed.

At the national level, many in the Republican party are calling for a $416 million cut to the Americorps program. President Clinton has asked instead for a $300 million increase and hopes to extend the program to another 27,000 recruits.

''There are many critics of this,'' she admitted of the program labeled by Newt Gingrich as ''coerced volunteerism.''

''But few people can devote this much time to community service. * * * the local level, all non-profits are going to need more support. Americorps in the perfect vehicle for that.''

Americorps recruits workers for 1,700 hours—about a year—earning $4.50 or more plus day care and medical benefits. At the end of their term, they get a credit of $4,725 to pay for education or existing college loans.

In Charleston, Sue Sayre, 50, is trading a year of serving battered women for that payback. She intends to return to college next fall.

''The money was an incentive,'' she said. ''But these women needed help. It's a new experience every day for me.''

There were more than 200 applicants for Sayre's position alone.

Hopeful recruits similarly stormed all of the Americorps hiring sites statewide—some federal agencies and some non-profit organizations.

The federal directive for Americorps did catch many of them short. It promised lots of money if they would use the government funded volunteers. The deadlines to submit requests for money and their plans to use it sent the hopefuls scrambling to make it work for them.

''Part of the plan was that they were not to do work that we were already doing with other personnel,'' said Pat Bowman, who works for the national resources conservation service. ''It was like, 'Hey, it would be nice if we could have somebody to do this.' ''

Bowen said his federal office greatly needed someone to travel the state evaluating potential archaeological sites that might be damaged by development, erosion or other means. When he secured funds and volunteers, he recruited a young man with a master's degree in archaeology from the University of Glasgow in Scotland.

In fact, three of his five volunteers have master's degrees, but Bowen doesn't see that as out of line with the Americorps concept.

''If they could come out of school and get a job in their industry, they'd make a lot more pay than we're providing,'' Bowen said. ''But they all have a desire to provide service while they gain experience. It's like a domestic Peace Corps.''

Joetta Wright of Fairmont graduated from West Virginia University with a bachelor's degree in sociology. She began her graduate work and then quit for financial reasons.

Now she works as an AmeriCorps volunteer at a domestic violence shelter in her hometown, answering the hotline and helping victims.

Tommy Adkins, 21, is working with poor Lincoln County residents to establish a barter system with their local businesses. He also spends part of his time in Jackson County, trying to boost the business community there.

In Kanawha County, five AmeriCorps volunteers have helped to review more than 5,000 records of pre-schoolers at the Kanawha-Charleston Health Department in an attempt to catch them up on their inoculations.

Andy Johnston, coordinator of their work for the Regional Family Resource Network, said his agency got 18 volunteers altogether and hopes to see funding increased so they can add more.

''What AmeriCorps can do is be the pickup piece that encourages people to go get more education,'' he said.

Among Johnston's recruits, one had once been homeless. Three currently live in public housing, and two receive public assistance for their own children. Two are college graduates, and one is seeking a master's degree.

''In West Virginia, we're exceeding all our objectives,'' said Ambrose, state director.

''The volunteers have broken the belief that one person can't make a difference,'' she said. ''They are doing real work and dealing with the real challenges of change.''

AMERICORPS MEANS WIN, WIN, WIN

(By Rachel Tompkins)

Eric Stone, 22, thought he would never be able to save enough money to go to college. Many people told him he was bright, clearly college material, but no one in his family had gone, so he had no example of how to do it. Then he read about AmeriCorps.

Today, Eric works as an AmeriCorps member at Chandler School Family Resource Center and the Roger Switzer Community Center in Kanawha County. He's earning the minimum wage and at the end of his year of service, he will have an additional $4,725 in trust to spend on college. One more year of service and he will have enough to pay his tuition and fees at a West Virginia public college.

In the past six months since AmeriCorps began in West Virginia, 30 AmeriCorps members, like Eric, have been working in two community-based organizations: the Regional Family Resource Network in Kanawha County and the Coalition Against Domestic Violence based in Sutton, Braxton County. An additional 30 AmeriCorps members work in West Virginia for various U.S. Department of Agriculture agencies, the Children's Health Fund in Cabell and Wayne counties and the National Multiple Sclerosis Society.

West Virginia AmeriCorps members range in age from 19 to 55. Some have GEDs, or are just out of college, while others have been out of school many years. All are committed to obtaining more education. Some of those working for the Coalition Against Domestic Violence are victims of abuse themselves.

Some examples of AmeriCorps work in West Virginia include:

Reviewing 5,000 immunization records and scheduling 1,000 children for overdue immunizations.

Scheduling two community health clinics in underserved areas.

Expanding the Parents as Teachers program.

Creating two new after-school programs serving 84 children.

Helping 100 families use a common application for a variety of social, health and education services.

Expanding programs about domestic violence awareness in high schools in Southern West Virginia leading to four specific referrals.

Providing multiple assistance to victims of domestic violence on hot lines and in shelters in eight communities.

Unless the national budget cutters prevail, this program will expand in West Virginia during 1995 and serve twice as many AmeriCorps members. As a taxpayer, an educator and the parent of two college-age children, I'm convinced this program ought to be continued and indeed, ought to expand.

AmeriCorps is a win, win, win program. First, local community groups apply for AmeriCorps members to support local projects that need extra help. No one in the state or federal government tells communities what they need. Second, AmeriCorps members who go to work for local groups get things done. The jobs are real work that simply wouldn't get done without the time and talents of AmeriCorps members. AmeriCorps members also get important work experience that will help in future job searches. Finally, each AmeriCorps member puts away $4,725 toward post-secondary education or toward paying off college loans.

During the just concluded legislative session, Gov. Caperton proposed, and the Legislature enacted a bill continuing the West Virginia Commission for National and Community Service to oversee the implementation of AmeriCorps and to promote service and volunteering in West Virginia. Debate on that bill reported in this newspaper suggested that AmeriCorps members were merely overpaid baby sitters. That is simply not it.

I know it is fashionable today to be against government programs and especially fashionable for Republicans to oppose this program so closely identified with President Clinton. But AmeriCorps builds on America's tradition of volunteerism and community service, and adds a new program to the more than 30 years of positive experiences of the Peace Corps, VISTA, the National Senior Corps and Learn and Serve. All of these programs have had strong bipartisan support over the years.

My hope is that West Virginia's elected representatives state and federal, Republican and Democrat will visit these programs, talk with AmeriCorps members, and consider the value of the program to West Virginia citizens and communities. Eric Stone and his colleagues will be happy to share their stories.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of my colleagues from Maryland's amendment that would restore funding to AmeriCorps.

I stand behind this program not from reading the glossy brochures that highlight its achievements. I believe in the work that AmeriCorps does from seeing young adults in my State coming together for a common goal. I have met these students and witnessed their accomplishments, and must tell you that communities throughout my State are praising their work.

From AmeriCorps members providing gang intervention in Olympia schools to rehabilitating damaged watersheds in Lacey to providing emergency assistance to disabled elderly in Pasco to delivering meals to HIV-positive patients in Tacoma, Americorps is working across my State.

Let's put the partisan politics behind us. This is not anyone's program. It is America's program serving our Nation by making our streets safer, our environment cleaner, our children healthier, and our schools better.

Certainly, cries of deficit reduction have wrapped themselves around this debate. However, the return on America's Federal dollar has been proven to be quite substantial in recent studies. A research report conducted last year by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory looked at two Washington State Americorps projects in Hoquiam and Lake Chelan.

For every Federal dollar spent on these two AmeriCorps projects, a $2.40 return can be expected. Even beyond the many direct skills and experiences derived from AmeriCorps participants that cannot be measured in dollars and cents, monetary benefits were still found to substantially exceed costs.

Mr. President, I wonder how my colleagues can look these young people in the eye and tell them that Congress has pulled the plug on an opportunity that shapes their future while improving our communities. I strongly urge

my fellow Members to think critically about what we fund that truly makes a difference in the lives of our next generation. Americorps is the answer that provides a cost-effective solution to meeting many of our Nation's concerns.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, to restore funding to the Corporation for National and Community Service. When the conference report on the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 came before the Senate for final approval, I was proud to cast my vote in favor of this important legislation and I am equally proud to stand before the Senate today to reaffirm my support for the Corporation and its mission.

Signed into law on September 21, 1993, the National Service Act has helped to renew the ethic of civic responsibility and the spirit of community service while also providing critical assistance to needy communities throughout the Nation. The measure has also encouraged and, more importantly, provided the opportunity for thousands of Americans to give of themselves for the greater good while earning money to further their education. In my view, the legislation effectively merges education and service, two critical components of a healthy society.

Now, several of my colleagues in stating their opposition to continued funding for the National Service Corporation have expressed the view that it is not the role of the Federal Government to subsidize community service; that to pay volunteers through a Federal program runs contrary to the spirit of local community-based service. I would urge those who hold this view to look to history. Our society and the unique form of government we enjoy was built on the strength of national service and, in my view, fostering the investment in and providing the leadership for increased opportunity to serve is a responsibility we all share.

Mr. President, Americorps, the centerpiece of the national service program, is not one large Federal program, but a network of locally developed and locally managed service corps which gives thousands of young people the opportunity to serve their country while improving the lives of themselves and their neighbors. Moreover, the initial investment we have made has encouraged increased private sector involvement in community service programs, including Americorps.

I encourage opponents of national service to look carefully at the success of many of the Americorps programs operating in communities across the United States. Information gathered from site visits by the General Accounting Office (GAO) indicate that an overwhelming majority of the programs across the country serve their purpose. In my State of Maryland, the Montgomery County Police Department is operating a Community Assisting Policing program designed to engage volunteers in education and outreach efforts to control and prevent crime and to reduce fear in at-risk communities. The GAO found that participants were involved in such projects as organizing a school Crime Awareness Day, teaching senior citizens how to protect themselves from crime, and analyzing neighborhood crime statistics to identify problem areas.

The GAO also visited MAGIC ME America, a nonprofit organization founded in Baltimore in 1980. The central mission of the MAGIC ME organization, which operated three AmeriCorps programs nationwide, is to motivate and educate teens by involving them in local community service projects. The GAO reported that participants in the MAGIC ME Program in Baltimore found that the program helped them to build their self-esteem and confidence and that all three participants interviewed planned to use their education awards to start or return to college. Additionally, staff members at three of the area facilities served by AmeriCorps volunteers stated that their presence was a key ingredient to the program. With the help of the AmeriCorps Program, MAGIC ME estimates that they have been able to increase the number of people served by over 800 percent in their three AmeriCorps Program sites.

Mr. President, it is my view that national service, and those who participate in national service represent the best of our Nation. In the tradition of the Peace Corps and VISTA, AmeriCorps strengthens the beliefs and values that are at the very root of American citizenship—the tradition of serving others, the value of taking personal responsibility for ourselves and our communities, and the belief that to who much is given, much is expected. Through programs like AmeriCorps we provide our Nation with both an opportunity and an obligation. National service requests a contribution to the community while providing individuals with the opportunity to develop skills which will serve them well throughout their lives.

As I have indicated through examples in my own State, the national service program is effective; it does work. At a time when we as a society are searching for ways in which to strengthen our families and our communities it would be foolhardy to abandon this national service initiative. I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding those who have answered the call to service through AmeriCorps and other national service opportunities. These individuals are taking part in the oldest and best of America's traditions—the spirit of service—and they deserve our support.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to speak?

I note the absence of a quorum, and ask that it be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask the Presiding Officer, how much time does my side have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes, 51 seconds.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I would like to yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts. And I look forward to his discussions, as well as the chart.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Maryland very much.

Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to respond to some of the issues and questions that have been raised about the AmeriCorps and the costs for this program. And I listened, even though I was not on the floor, to both the response by the Senator from Maryland as well as the Senator from Illinois, Senator SIMON, about some of the points that have been raised about AmeriCorps working with governmental agencies and how that issue is addressed in the Senator's amendment.

That has been an issue that had been brought up and examined during the course of the review of the AmeriCorps. And I believe that the amendment that has now been before the Senate responds to that particular issue and question.

Second, I listened to those who have talked about AmeriCorps and the cost of the program, and also how much is expended in costs that are related to the AmeriCorps volunteer. I think it is important that we understand the terms that are being used and the costs that are being allocated to the different projects.

I have a chart here, Mr. President. I understand that this presents a breakdown of the total cost per member by category. I think there is some confusion about what the costs are in terms of the member. And I thought I would review this chart because I think it illustrates by this chart exactly what is being expended for the AmeriCorps and the costs which are related to the service of an AmeriCorps member. We are talking about two different items, and it has been very easy for those who have been opposed to this program to try to somehow lump all of those together and give a distorted view as to actually what is expended on behalf of the AmeriCorps volunteer.

For each AmeriCorps volunteer the Corporation spends $6,200 on the stipend over the course of the year. This represents 33 percent. We have the education award, which is $4,700. We have the health care, which is $1,200. Those all go into the costs. And then we have the AmeriCorps overhead at 7 percent.

I wonder how many of the governmental agencies are able to have an administrative cost at that figure—at

some 7 percent—which is very impressive, and indicates that for every dollar that is actually expended, only a small amount of that dollar is used for program administration.

The State commissions that ensure that the programs are actually going to be a service in the State—really a State function for the AmeriCorps programs—is a small percentage, 2 percent.

Now, the other programs which are related in terms of the general costs are what are considered local program operations. This is the $4,300 over here. These are the tools by which the AmeriCorps volunteer is able to make the voluntary contribution. This is for projects like housing rehabilitation. These are the saws, the hammers, the nails, the equipment the AmeriCorps member is using.

There have been those on the floor of the Senate who have taken this figure, whether in this average figure where it is $4,300, 24 percent—or whether it would be even larger, depending on the particular program and have put it all in overhead to somehow say that the costs of the AmeriCorps Program is far in excess of what was estimated and far out of control.

That kind of confused calculation has been done with regard to the Navy's Seaborne Conservation Corps program. We have heard about the costs per participant being $66,000. I have the excellent response by Congressman GREEN that analyzes those figures to show that at the bottom line, the actual costs were $16,641.

Now, people can come on this floor and use this other figure which represents funding for the organization, so to speak, in which the AmeriCorps members are actually working. They can repeat it and repeat it and repeat it, but it does not make it any more accurate.

I think that it is important that we understand that.

Mr. President, earlier when I spoke about the participation of the private sector, there was a comment made about the contributions that were being made to match the AmeriCorps. I think it is important to have a complete response on that, as well.

We know that the 7 percent, which is actually the figure named in the legislation authorizing AmeriCorps, requiring leveraging of private support was far exceeded. In its first year, AmeriCorps raised $91 million in matching funds, nearly three times the amount required by law; $41 million came from the private sector, more than $32 million legally required from all sources. Over 600 businesses, from local concerns to national corporations like IBM and General Electric, have directly contributed money, uniforms, tools, equipment, and training.

And therefore, again, if you use selective figures to try to downplay the private sector's contribution, you can make a debater's point, but it is not an accurate reflection of reality. The figures I have given show the real participation and contributions that have been made. And I think, Mr. President, an even a greater indication of the value of AmeriCorps is not just what I say about this private-sector participation, but what the leaders of the various voluntary agencies and the other project leaders have said about AmeriCorps. There have been the most commendable and enthusiastic statements, across the board. In a number of instances these statements come from some by those who were skeptical about the whole program and ended up being enthusiastic about what these volunteers really mean.

Mr. President, both those who have supported AmeriCorps and those opposed to it have evaluated the service and the corps. You find out that even by the minimum evaluation, about two and a half times the benefit comes back from the expenditures. This is demonstrated by a cost analysis of the program.

So, Mr. President, I think the points that have been made earlier by the Senator from Maryland in terms of the costs of the program, in terms of the private participation, and responding to the criticisms that are made about involving the AmeriCorps with governmental agencies, all are extremely important issues that should be responded to. And I think we have tried to do that this afternoon.

I just say, finally, we want to keep our eyes on one important point, the $4,700, the educational award, is also eliminated in this appropriations bill. And this is at a time when we are cutting on student loan programs. We reported out of our committee earlier today what is effectively a tax on every college in this country, based upon the amount of the student loan programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Can I have 2 or 3 more minutes?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield the Senator from Massachusetts 2 more minutes to conclude his remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, at a time when we are cutting back on the student loan program, or at least making it much more expensive, this program is out there. These individuals, by and large, are involved because they want to give something back to the community. Their greatest reward is not only their personal satisfaction and service to the community, but an opportunity for education, which is certainly a matter of national interest.

Finally, I will include in the RECORD, Mr. President, the number of colleges that are matching these education awards. Hampshire College in my own State—and I will include in the RECORD a number of the schools and colleges that are matching these education awards two and three times in recognition of the service these young and old people are providing for the community. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-nine minutes, 43 seconds.

Mr. BOND. I am happy to yield the Senator from Arizona 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the Senator from Missouri yielding time.

I appreciate what both he and the Senator from Iowa have done in pointing out some of the problems with this new program that is called AmeriCorps. My position is that at this time of severe budgetary crisis in this country, at a time when we are trying to balance the Federal budget, it is not the time to be starting new Federal programs with substantial expenses which, frankly, are not cost beneficial in terms of the degree of support that it provides to the American people.

As a brand new program, AmeriCorps costs American taxpayers $367 million in 1994, and the GAO estimates that AmeriCorps costs nearly $27,000 for each volunteer. It is not an effective jobs or education program, and I submit, Mr. President, that it is not going to increase voluntarism in this country or in my home State of Arizona.

For example, the Arizona AmeriCorps Program, called the Border Volunteer Corps, was one of the largest programs. It received $2.6 million in the 1994 and 1995 service year. But it will not be federally funded this year through the Corporation for National Service. The reason is because the Arizona-Mexico Commission, the Arizona sponsor, pulled out because of alleged mismanagement of this program.

It seems to me that groups such as the Salvation Army, groups in Arizona like Arizona Clean and Beautiful, Crime Victim Foundation, St. Mary's and Andre House food bank, and others that provide volunteer service in the State commit millions of hours to voluntarism every year.

We know today, Americans 18 and up volunteer 19.5 billion hours of their time, which is a 50-percent increase in the number of hours since 1981. Turning voluntarism into a wide-scale public jobs project, it seems to me, will undermine public philanthropy. We are doing well in volunteering in this country, not paying people to be volunteers.

Moreover, as other speakers have pointed out, AmeriCorps is not based on need. Certainly, today in our effort to prioritize where Federal dollars are going, Federal higher education dollars, if that is what these are targeted to be, should be targeted toward those who are most in need of assistance. AmeriCorps does not promote voluntarism because it is not a volunteer program. Students are paid $7,400 for work and given $4,750 toward education costs for 2 years. In addition, recipients are guaranteed health and child care benefits.

For the average $20,000 to $30,000 cost per year per student in AmeriCorps, eight needy students could receive Pell grants at $2,400 each. Eight needy students—and that is the definition of the qualification for Pell grants—could be served with this same amount of money, in other words, that we pay for one AmeriCorps volunteer.

A $20,000 stipend is worth more than the individual income of nearly 40 million working Americans. That is what we are paying these AmeriCorps so-called volunteers.

Examples of AmeriCorps spending: The National Civilian Community Corps, funded through AmeriCorps, provides 1,000 AmeriCorps volunteers with meals, tuition stipend, health care, child care, and housing at four closed military bases in Maryland, South Carolina, Colorado, and California.

So this volunteer program will cost $26 million for these 1,000 participants. Of course, the taxpayers fit the bill for AmeriCorps and not just for the good work that they do, but also for everything else associated with their work, including their training and a lot of interesting kinds of seminars.

According to John Walters of the New Citizenship Project, AmeriCorps volunteers spend one-fifth of their time in training, education and other nondirect service activities. So the taxpayers pay for nonneedy students to participate in self-esteem and other government classes and seminars.

It is also, I think, a problem here because, Mr. President, at the time we are trying to reduce the Federal bureaucracy, AmeriCorps volunteers are becoming part of a Federal bureaucracy. Over 2,800, in other words, about 20 percent, of the 20,000 AmeriCorps volunteers are assigned to Federal agencies, including Agriculture, Interior, National Endowment for the Arts, and others.

The federally funded Legal Services Corporation, for example, has been awarded funding for 44 AmeriCorps volunteers, costing taxpayers $959,000.

I think the bottom line is that for fiscal reasons, we have to limit AmeriCorps spending, and that is why I support what the Senator from Missouri is trying to do today. It simply costs the American taxpayer too much for the benefits that it provides, and I suggest that it should be eliminated.

We ought to examine the intent and the costs of the program. For example, we should get answers to why the AmeriCorps program costs $42,000 per person per student in Alaska. More than 16 students in that State could participate in the Pell grant program for the same amount of money that is used to sponsor one AmeriCorps volunteer.

Or why $1.7 million of the AmeriCorps budget has been spent on an AmeriCorps advertisement campaign. This year alone, the Government will pay more than $3 billion in interest on our national debt. That is about $1,100 for every man, woman and child in the country, enough to pay a year's tuition for a young woman or young man, for example, to attend Arizona State University.

Reducing funding for AmeriCorps is one small but very important way that we can begin to prioritize how Washington spends the taxpayers' money. That is why, Mr. President, as I said, I support what the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Iowa have been saying today. It is time to cut the AmeriCorps program down to size.

I appreciate the Senator from Missouri yielding me this time. I reserve the remainder of the time.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI, which restores $425 million to the Corporation for National Service.

Two years ago, I was very proud to be a lead Republican sponsor of the National Community Service Trust Act. My support for this endeavor comes from a long-held belief that national and community service is essential in addressing many of our unmet social and educational needs. Community service is the cornerstone of democracy, where those who have much have a responsibility to help those who have little. Providing public service as a means of training individuals, while at the same time supplying benefits to a community, is a win-win initiative.

It is interesting to note that the critics of national service have never criticized the goals of the program. They focus their criticism on the cost of national service activities with figures which are highly debatable, but not the worthiness of the efforts.

I beg to differ with those who say we do not have the dollars for national service activities. We do have the resources to devote to this worthy effort. For example, since 1980, we have downsized our military enrollees by 184,790, representing 54 percent drop. The savings generated from curtailing new recruits by 184,000 is close to $2.7 billion per year, much more than we spend on this program. And yet we have reduced the opportunity to 184,790 individuals each year, who otherwise would get help from the Federal Government to assist them in learning skills and being able to participate in a more meaningful way in our society. All we are doing with this amendment is taking a small proportion of those who now no longer have that opportunity, approximately 20,000, and give them the chance to take part in this program.

Although we are downsizing our military, many young people still have the desire to become involved in public service. We are not providing them an opportunity to contribute if we do away with national service.

National service enables not only young people but schools, community organizations, towns and cities to develop programs that will meet their own unmet needs while giving invaluable education to generations of our future leaders.

I point out that those 184,000 no longer in the military would have had an opportunity to get the same kind of scholarship they could get with national service through the military. Now due to downsizing of our Armed Forces, that opportunity is no longer available to them. So the elimination of national service will effectively remove another avenue for a large number of young people to obtain educational opportunities.

Let us remember that national and community service is not a program that young people engage in because they are free for the summer or because they have nothing better to do. Participation in service requires true commitment. This is a program that demands that youth spend at least 1 year in full service, or 2 years in part-time service in an area of national need.

Although we all support spending cuts, this does not mean we should forsake our responsibility to develop necessary Government programs, especially those that help our young people.

We must commit ourselves to redirecting our priorities to make clear that unless we address the concerns of this Nation, our children will not have a future. National service is a cost-effective program that is meeting many urgent local and national needs not being met through traditional means.

An example of the program's cost-effectiveness is an AmeriCorps project in New York. For each hour that AmeriCorps members update computer equipment, they save the New York City Board of Education $100 in labor costs.

Through a combination of hard work and commitment, National service has surpassed the expectations we all had when this legislation was enacted almost 2 years ago. National service was not designed to result in miracles on a grand scale, but there are many examples of minor miracles occurring daily throughout the United States. Some of these examples include, Youth Conservation Corps participants who have assisted Midwestern families afflicted by this spring's floods, the Teach for America participant who not only taught children in Watts how to read, but also how to love, and the Battleboro, VT, Independent Living project participants who assist the elderly and individuals with disabilities so they can remain in their homes instead of being forced to live in an institutional setting.

National service is a program that has served our Nation well, and therefore I rise today to lend my voice in supporting the Mikulski amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

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

Mr. President, I was struck by the comment of my friend from Vermont that we do have the resources to fund AmeriCorps. I think this amendment, which I have now had an opportunity to study a bit more, reflects just how difficult these funding choices are. I said earlier that when I made my recommendations, I had to weigh AmeriCorps versus community development block grants. I was interested to see what the sponsors of this amendment show as their offsets because we have to keep this amendment budget neutral.

Well, this amendment uses two accounts for offsets, both of them from Housing and Urban Development. The first cuts the annual contributions for assisted housing accounts by an additional $383 million by taking an unspecified reduction. This could affect section 202 housing for the elderly, or the section 8(11) program for the disabled, or even housing for AIDS victims.

Other activities in this account include vouchers for displaced families. Incidentally, when we are looking at family vouchers, for each AmeriCorps volunteer, four low-income families could be given housing for a year. Is this truly our priority? Is it truly our priority to pay one young person what otherwise could go to providing assisted housing for four families needing housing? I do not think so. That is part of the problem I have with AmeriCorps in this budget.

In addition, in the rescissions bill which was adopted by this body and signed by the President earlier this summer, there was already a $1.12 billion reduction in this housing account. And the Department of HUD is telling us of their difficulty in identifying those reductions. To impose a further $383 million cut could impact real programs and real housing assistance for low-income families, the elderly and the disabled. One of the great complaints I have heard about this bill, as it has been submitted by the committee, is that it cuts HUD too much. This amendment would cut HUD further. Frankly, I was not willing to do that. I do not think it is a good idea.

The other offset proposed in this amendment is achieved by increasing the individual limit on mortgages for the FHA-guaranteed program. Now, this is a very controversial provision. Under this amendment, mortgages as large as $175,000 would be eligible for Government guarantees. That is raising from the current limit of about $152,000. These are not and should not be the sector of the housing market that the Government guarantees should cover. Moreover, private mortgage insurance is readily available in those mortgages. This proposal would expand the role and scope of Government. It is something that has been debated in the authorizing committees. I believe it is not wise because it would place the Government in greater competition with the private mortgage insurance market and likely increase FHA's market share in the area at a time when the private market is doing more and more.

President Clinton has talked about reinventing Government and bringing it under control. The Republicans who were elected in 1994 talked about limiting the scope and the role of Government. This amendment goes in the opposite direction from both of those objectives. To make the argument that we should increase the maximum allowable loan amount because it generates more money is to say that the best reason for a Government program is that it makes money. That is not the right approach.

I think the only valid justification for a program is a public purpose that can only be achieved by Government. There is no public purpose served by expanding Government's role into the already served private market. I believe this proposal is corporate welfare for lenders who currently receive servicing fees far higher than market levels for handling loans with no risk. Actually, it is a risk assumed by the taxpayers, not by the lenders.

I think there is real reform needed in the AmeriCorps, National Service Corps. I am very pleased that the sponsors of the amendment—and I congratulate the Senator from Maryland for putting in a proviso that none of the funds available shall be used to administer, reimburse, or support any national service programs run by Federal agencies. We were astounded earlier this year to learn, Mr. President, when we wanted to find out where the money was going at the national level, that AmeriCorps had been funding the Departments of Agriculture, Energy, Interior, Justice, Labor, Transportation, EPA, and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Well, according to the letters that we have received from OMB Director Rivlin and from Mr. Segal, they are not willing to talk about any reforms. I strongly support and commend the Senator from Maryland for agreeing to take out all of these Government agencies. AmeriCorps was funding these governmental agencies, and they were passing over Future Farmers of America, National 4–H Council, Girl Scouts of America, American Red Cross, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, the Boys and Girls Clubs, National Audubon Society, United Negro College Fund, United Way of America, United Cerebral Palsy Association, Goodwill Industries International.

These are the traditional volunteer agencies that most people think of in America when you talk about volunteers. Yet, they were passing over those. They were passing over those, in some instances, to go to Federal Government agencies. I am glad and I congratulate the sponsor of this amendment for knocking out those Federal agencies. But I also want to point out that there was strange scoring done. When you look at the independent assessment made by an outside agency who ranked these applicants, they had to reach way down in the rankings—from an impartial ranking group—to find some of the organizations that were funded. They overlooked Big Brothers/Big Sisters, National Urban League and Student Conservation to provide funding for an ACORN project.

Well, as Senator GRASSLEY has learned—and I believe he may have a statement later on—the ACORN project was involved directly in political activity. They were soliciting votes, actually involved directly in a campaign against a city councilman in Denver.

I think it is time that we had a commitment from this administration for a thorough reform of AmeriCorps before we even consider putting funds that are badly needed in other agencies into that program. I received a letter from PETER HOEKSTRA on the House side, chairman of the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee. He was an original supporter of the Corporation for National Service. He said, at the time, ''I believed that this would be an efficient and effective use of taxpayer dollars. However, after conducting an independent evaluation of how money flows from the Corporation to AmeriCorps programs and how these funds are spent, I have grave concerns about the continuation of this program.''

He states that he has begun a dialog but he finds that it is safe to say that AmeriCorps has been and likely continues to be an avenue for partisanship. ''The recent move by the Corporation to defund ACORN and Cole Coalition only serves to highlight the seriousness of this problem. In the case of ACORN, AmeriCorps' IG has pointed out numerous cases of lobbying, fund raising, and even voter registration carried out by AmeriCorps members.''

Congressman HOEKSTRA goes on to say, ''Finally, our subcommittee is in the process of reviewing CNS' grantmaking procedures. Our preliminary findings reveal a less than comprehensible procedure, whereby grant scoring often has little to do with who receives the final grants.''

I really believe that before we consider trying to take money away from HUD, from assisted housing for those who are in grave need, for the people who are elderly, who are disabled, or the people with AIDS, that the administration at least owes us a good-faith effort to make sure that the dollars that are spent in AmeriCorps are not being spent for political purposes, they are not being wasted on high-cost projects.

I reiterate my point that in these very tight budget times, I do not think that paying money to volunteers in this program is a higher priority than taking care of the needs of those who depend upon HUD for federally assisted

housing. I reserve the balance of my time.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Delaware 3 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, I will be necessarily brief.

There is very little the Federal Government can do about moral values. That is something that is shaped by families and communities and churches. One of the things we can do is the Government can help teach young people that they owe something to their country and to each other and that membership in the community conveys both rights and responsibilities.

The Senator from Georgia is on the floor. He had a national service piece of legislation which I and several others supported over the years. The notion that we are going to instill in our children that they have an obligation to their community and to their country—my own experience, we focus, I believe, too much on just what the benefit to the recipients of this service is.

I suggest one of the greatest benefits of AmeriCorps is what it teaches those who participate in AmeriCorps. My son was in the Jesuit Volunteer Corps. No relationship, no remuneration, but he spent a year in a community service project in a homeless shelter out in Portland, OR. I know he benefited more from that experience, quite frankly, than almost anybody he helped benefit.

That is one of the payoffs of this program. One of the payoffs is a generation of young people who, in fact, are instilled with a sense of obligation and responsibility to the community.

I heard my friend from Arizona stand up and talk about this as if it were need-based. There is nothing need-based about the military; the Peace Corps is not need-based. The point is to pass on these values to children or young people of all economic strata.

We need broad-based support from the next generation in terms of what their responsibility to the communities is. I think that is the most overlooked aspect of this program.

I also add, Mr. President, that I hear some of my friends—not the chairman of the subcommittee, but some of my friends on the floor—talking about the need for other programs. I notice they also cut those programs. I find it somewhat interesting the talk about this could pay for x amount of Pell grants or y amount of this. I notice from their records they do not vote for the Pell grants, they do not vote for the other things.

I find it somewhat interesting that they use as a straw man—I am not speaking about the Senator from Missouri but others who have spoken and talked about this off the floor—they use as a straw man the idea if we just were not spending the money on AmeriCorps, we would be spending it on other worthwhile programs that I note they also vote against and voted to cut.

Mr. President, I must admit that I find this debate—and the opposition to AmeriCorps—somewhat fascinating.

We have been hearing for about a year now—including the last few weeks during debate on the welfare reform bill—that we need to return power to States and local communities. That the Federal bureaucracy needs to get out of the way of local solutions to problems, that we need to make better use of nonprofit community organizations and church groups in addressing the problems this country faces. And that individuals helping each other, not the paternalism of big government, is the ultimate answer to our problems.

Fine and good, Mr. President. And, to an extent, I agree. But, that is exactly what AmeriCorps does.

AmeriCorps says to States and communities, you decide how to meet the needs of your people how to solve the problems you face. AmeriCorps says, private, nonprofit organizations should be the main focus of the program. And, AmeriCorps teaches young people about responsibility, opportunity, and citizenship.

The fact is, President Clinton's national service program is probably the most Republican program ever enacted by a Democratic President.

It is not the Federal bureaucracy trying to solve problems, it is State, local, and private organizations working together to solve problems.

It is not solutions conceived inside the Washington Beltway. It is solutions conceived where the problems are, at the local level.

It is not government taking over the role of charities. It is, as almost all local charities will tell you, a way to make volunteer efforts more useful and effective.

All the Federal Government does is to provide some money and some dedicated young people to help.

Let me tell you about some of those people from my State of Delaware—both those who help and those who are helped.

Tammy is a single parent who used to be on welfare. Today, Tammy is an AmeriCorps member who helps teenage mothers do what she did—move from welfare to work. Tammy says, ''AmeriCorps gave me my voice back.''

Dora is another woman supporting her two children. After leaving the military, she took a job waiting tables. But, this past year, she spent working for AmeriCorps, helping elderly public house residents get preventive health care.

Dora will be using her tuition voucher to go back to school, something she admits she never would have done without AmeriCorps. As she put it, ''AmeriCorps gave me direction.''

Jeff was a Maryland AmeriCorps member, but he did his service by tutoring at-risk elementary school children in the Colonial School District in Delaware. For many of the boys, Jeff was their only male role model.

And, the boys could hardly wait for Jeff to show up each day. After just 1 week, one of the teachers said, ''There's already been a difference.'' Many teachers are now begging the principal to have an AmeriCorps member in their classroom.

And, finally, let me tell you about Camille, who is a homeless teenage mother who dropped out of high school. She met an AmeriCorps member named Chan. And, Chan gave her hope.

Chan got Camille to sign up for an adult education program. He supported her and tutored her. And, Camille will soon graduate from the adult education program and receive her GED.

Mr. President, there is very little the Federal Government can do about moral values. That is something that is shaped by families and churches and communities.

But, what each of the examples I just gave proves is that the Federal Government can do at least a little bit about this country's values. The Federal Government can help teach young people that they owe something to their country and to each other, that membership conveys both rights and responsibilities.

And, what these examples also show is something I have long believed about community service—and I saw it with my own son after he served a year with the Jesuit Volunteer Corps. Those who benefit from community service are not just those who are helped, but also those who do the helping.

AmeriCorps helps instill the values of responsibility and citizenship. It makes a difference in lives of thousands of Americans and makes our problems just a little bit smaller.

There are children who will walk through their neighborhoods today safer because of the AmeriCorps members who are helping the police in community policing.

There are neighborhoods tonight that are safer because AmeriCorps members closed down the crack houses.

There are children in school today because an AmeriCorps tutor gave them hope and they did not drop out of school.

There are families who have homes today because of houses built by AmeriCorps members.

There are senior citizens in nursing homes whose days are just a little bit brighter because of the work of an AmeriCorps member.

Mr. President, AmeriCorps is not the solution to all of our problems. And, it is not the entire answer. But, I dare say, it is making a difference. And, it would be truly regrettable if AmeriCorps was eliminated after just 1 year.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Georgia. I wish to tell the Senate this is one of the founding fathers of national service.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I urge support of the amendment of the Senator

from Maryland, and I commend her for taking this leadership and also commend the Senator from Missouri for pointing out things that need to be corrected in this program.

That is what we ought to be doing. We ought to be correcting the faults, not killing the entire program.

Mr. President, we have heard comparisons of how many Pell grant programs we could fund, how many job training programs we could fund. These criticisms are valid as far as they go but what they forget is a very important point.

That is, we are requiring service, and service is being rendered. A good analogy is our Nation's Armed Forces. We do not maintain Armed Forces in order to provide valuable skill and help develop good character in young men and women. Rather, Armed Forces personnel develop skills and character in the military as they carry out their primary mission for providing for our Nation's security.

The same is true of national service. Would critics have us disregard the benefits to society of national service participants helping flood victims in Montezuma, GA, last year, a town completely overcome by the flood? Should we ignore the benefits of the first-time immunization program of 33,000 children in Fort Worth, TX, in 1 month?

Mr. President, independent studies verified by the GAO found recently that AmeriCorps returns between $1.68 and $2.58 for every $1 invested. I think it is important that we continue this program. National service says to the participants, along with society's opportunities come duties. If you will provide your honest sweat and elbow grease to improve society, we will help you attend college or acquire a skill.

This is a win-win-win situation. The question I have for my colleagues is what other program is aimed at accomplishing these social ends without a handout, without stifling bureaucracy, and with such enormous benefits to our communities?

As my colleagues know, the idea of national service is one in which I have been involved for several years. In 1989, I introduced with Senator ROBB, GLENN, BREAUX, and SASSER introduced legislation to demonstrate the concept of national service in a small number of programs nationwide. President Bush signed that legislation into law in 1990, and the effort yielded a number of highly-successful demonstration programs, including two in my State. In 1993, Congress passed President Clinton's National and Community Service Act to create thousands of young people serving their communities. While the scope of AmeriCorps is much larger than our original demonstration project, the philosophy behind it, supported by Democrats and Republicans, is the same—make plain the essential connection between rights and responsibility by putting Americans to work meeting the unmet needs in their communities.

At present this Congress is involved in a great debate over how to reverse the fraying of our Nation's moral fabric. The question which confronts us is how to stop the rising tide of crime, illegitimacy, falling test scores, and rising despair that plague our communities. I do not pretend that funding national service is the answer to all of these problems. What I can say with great conviction, however, is that national service is one of the few Government enterprises with the potential to inspire large numbers of young people against this tide.

In Georgia, success stories are not hard to find. In my State, AmeriCorps members alone have contributed more than 300,000 hours of service, and served more than 19,000 individuals. In addition to their required service, AmeriCorps members have volunteered 7,500 hours to community-wide philanthropic efforts and traditional volunteer programs. They have also recruited more than 2,500 community volunteers to help in their community service efforts. Members are working with the Macon police department to patrol communities and establish neighborhood watch programs. In Douglas, members are helping to erect road signs to ensure that emergency crews can respond quickly to calls on the newly-installed 911 telephone system. In Atlanta, members mentor and tutor low-achieving students in schools and recruit volunteers for further community service efforts. In Atlanta, the principal of Ralph McGill school in a low-income area of Atlanta informed me on a visit that since AmeriCorps young people started working as teacher's aides discipline problems have declined at his school by 70 percent. This list of accomplishments is mirrored in virtually every State in this Nation.

Critics have tried to attack national service in a number of different ways. With the recent release of the GAO report on the costs of national service we have heard cries of how expensive the program is. I would caution the program's critics to examine the benefits of the program as well as its costs before issuing such casual independent studies. The GAO study often quoted by critics found that AmeriCorps' per-member costs to the Federal Government are in fact lower than the estimates the Corporation set for itself. In addition, the benefits generated by the program, as reported by an independent accounting agency and verified by GAO, have yielded excellent ratings for cost-effectiveness. Most importantly, however, the program receives high marks from the beneficiaries of the service, like the teacher of Ralph McGill school, who is better able to teach his students through AmeriCorps' efforts. In this way AmeriCorps is living up to its slogan, ''Getting Things Done.'' I hope that the program's critics, many of whom were singing the praises of cost-benefit analysis on this floor in a different debate on regulatory reform just a few weeks ago, will practice that preaching for this program as well.

Our Nation's Armed Forces provide another good historical analogy to national service—the GI bill. This program, which began in the mid-1940's as an effort to provide an education to those who fought for our Nation's survival in World War II, has been judged one of the most successful investments of public funds in our history. The program continues today as the Montgomery GI bill. The GI bill gives the participants an education benefit in exchange for their great service to this country. Like the GI bill, national service provides a triple payoff in terms of the service performed, the service experience, and the post-service benefit. Do my colleagues who criticize national service believe that the GI bill was a mistake? Here, Mr. President, is a program that has just as much potential to help our society.

Finally, Mr. President, I would point out that since its initial authorization in 1993, AmeriCorps has had only one full year of operation. As with any newly created enterprise, there are growing pains of varying degrees, and I am the first to express my willingness to search for ways to make the program more effective. The time for such debate and change, however, is during the program's scheduled reauthorization next year. That way we can have a systematic, rational consideration of whether this program has provided sufficient ''bang'' for the Government's buck, and whether structural changes are needed. To kill this program in this appropriations bill would be a costly mistake.

Mr. President, as our distinguished colleague Senator BYRD often points out, one of our primary duties as Senators is to exercise the ''power of the purse'' and be good stewards of the taxpayer's dollar. I have been watching AmeriCorps' work in my State, and I am pleased to inform my colleagues that AmeriCorps is achieving its goals. This is an innovative, nonbureaucratic, decentralized approach to one of our Nation's most important tasks—creating citizens who understand that responsibilities accompany rights and who provide real services to individuals and communities. I urge my colleagues to look at the benefits as well as the costs of this program, and to support the Mikulski amendment.

Mr. President, we are developing leadership and we are also serving communities and individual needs. I urge this program be retained.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, acting on behalf of Senator BOND, I yield Senator SANTORUM 5 minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President, and I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

I rise, and I hesitate to come to the floor to talk about this issue although I have talked about it in the past. I wanted to make a statement because the former Senator from Pennsylvania,

Senator Wofford, is in line to be the next head of the AmeriCorps Program.

I stand as someone who has been a critic of the program. I wanted to make it clear that I am critical of the program—not of Senator Wofford. In fact, I have said to the Senator that I will support him for that position and wish him well.

He has a big job ahead of him because I believe this program is a misguided program, is a program that is on a values level—the Senator from Delaware talked about values. I think it teaches the wrong values. I think it teaches the value of not voluntarism.

My definition from looking in the dictionary, voluntarism is unpaid labor. This is paid labor. That is not voluntarism. You can call it a lot of things, but not voluntarism, any more than me deciding to run for the U.S. Senate and therefore being elected, being a volunteer because that is what I decided I wanted to do.

You are compensated for your work and therefore you are not a volunteer. Call it what it is. It is a Federal paid taxpayers' position that you have, working many places in a government job, or through some government-sanctioned organization, or approved organization.

I do not see anything particularly noble about a job paid for by taxpayers' dollars, that is any more noble than someone who goes out and sells insurance or someone who works on Wall Street or someone who grows cotton.

Those are all noble jobs. They are providing valuable services to this country. To suggest that somehow we instill the value in people, working for the Federal Government for taxpayers' dollars is somehow noble, and that going out and trying to start a business or raise a crop is not noble, that those values are not important.

I think that is really what is fundamental. I think we are missing the point. Yes, there is a lot of good work being done by people, but they are being paid to do it by the Federal Government, and it is the Federal Government's design as to what role they should be filling.

I think that is a very dangerous value to somehow elevate Government service above all other aspects of our lives in our society. I think that is why you see so many people on our side of the aisle come up who feel this is a real hot button issue, because I think it is a distortion of the American value.

I would also add, having just been very actively involved in the welfare debate over the past few weeks, that there are a lot of people who are very strong supporters of AmeriCorps who are not supporters of requiring people on welfare to work. I find that incredible. Here we have people who desperately need work. You talk to employers. What do employers tell you they are looking for an employee? Are they looking for someone who has a lot of skills, someone who is exceptional in a particular area? No. What most employers look for in employees is someone with a good attitude and good work ethic. What people on welfare in most cases do not have as a result of having grown up on welfare—I am talking about the chronic welfare recipient—is instilled a good work ethic.

What we could provide instead of paying volunteers in AmeriCorps is we could be putting the people who are on welfare who need jobs the same things AmeriCorps people are doing. Remember, people on welfare are receiving the money. They are already getting the benefits. It does not cost any addition and gives the people who really need the work, not someone whose daddy is a CEO of some company who signed up for AmeriCorps because he wants to do the good thing and be a volunteer and get $27,000 a year, but someone who actually needs the work experience, needs to learn the skills.

Let us talk about what we can do to take this program and apply it in a sense in the welfare context. That makes a lot of sense. That is really a direction that I think the American public could support.

Mr. President, I want to read a quote from Father Robert A. Sirico, who is president of Action Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty in Grand Rapids, who wrote an article on AmeriCorps and how it falsely teaches people what service is all about. His concluding paragraph is:

> Idealism led me to the priesthood. Another sort of idealism leads people to the business world. Here's some advice for young idealists. If you want to serve others, don't be bought off by a Government program. Try something voluntary that is personally challenging, socially beneficial, and doesn't cost the taxpayers one dime.

I think that sums up the mood of most of us on this side of the aisle. We want people to be challenged. We want young people to be involved in voluntarism. We want people to care about their community. But we want them to do it because they care about their community, not because they are getting paid $30,000 a year by Federal taxpayers.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield Senator ASHCROFT 3½ minutes.

How much time is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A total of 6½ minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. I yield 6½ minutes.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I am pleased to speak on AmeriCorps.

Before I begin, I would like to thank my colleague and my good friend, Senator BOND, for his management of this bill as well as his unending commitment to the taxpayers of Missouri. His opposition to the Corporation for National Service is another example of the fiscal integrity that has marked his career in the Senate, and I am honored to join him here.

Americans constitute a community of service. Last year 90 million Americans of all ages gave their time to civic and religious organizations. They cared for the poor, sick, the broken, and the lonely. They gave their time without regard to benefit or pay. They did it as a matter of personal devotion and out of their regard for each other as part of the way we live our lives as Americans. Their personal sacrifice is, in my opinion, mocked by a Government program with a catchy name like AmeriCorps.

Mr. President, we have for most of this Congress been debating Washington's legitimate role in our daily lives. Some cases are tough, tough debates—debates on welfare, crime, and education. Others are not. This is not a tough case. AmeriCorps is a $27,000 per participant boondoggle for kids trying to find themselves. AmeriCorps is welfare for the well-to-do.

Mr. President, for what AmeriCorps costs annually we could send two poor students to the University of Missouri for 4 years, all expenses paid, for everyone person we send through AmeriCorps. We could give 18 Pell grants to needy students for the annual cost of one AmeriCorps participant.

AmeriCorps is wasteful and bureaucratic. At least $15,000 per AmeriCorps participant goes into overhead and administration here in Washington. Only in Washington could $15,000 a year be paid for paper turning, and as a result that would be considered volunteer service.

Of the AmeriCorps participants, 1,200 serve—volunteer—at the U.S. Department of Agriculture; 525 volunteer at the Interior Department; and 60 serve at the National Endowment for the Arts. This is not in the spirit of volunteering. This is not in the spirit of service that we normally find for American communities.

I rise to oppose this because I believe that a volunteer program should be a volunteer program. It should not be a way to subsidies the Federal bureaucracy and send individuals into the bureaucracy at rates of pay that deprive other needy programs, that displace the ability to meet other needs in our culture.

So I am pleased to support my senior Senator's motion which would defund or otherwise take AmeriCorps out, because I do not believe we should be spending money at this level in an enterprise which masquerades as a volunteer program but is a very expensive program.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

I ask unanimous consent that I be added as an original cosponsor.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Mikulski amendment, and I ask to be added as a cosponsor.

As a former college professor and community organizer, I was proud to be a part of creating and now implementing the National Service Program. I was also proud to bring the vast experience of people and programs in my State to Washington as Congress was considering this original legislation.

People across my State of Minnesota and the rest of the country have worked in National Service programs which has helped our Nation and local communities solve social problems while at the same time strengthen democracy and citizenship.

From all I see, this is a program that works.

Over half of the AmeriCorp members in Minnesota signed up for another year of service.

This is not about paid service at all. Service in Minnesota is about citizenship, to be part of a community, stepping forward to serve. These people are not getting rich by any means. The participants are making $4.50 an hour. This is essentially minimum wage.

If you think today's youth are cynical; if you think they are disengaged and apathetic, you are wrong. I have met them. This program is all about participation and citizenship.

Listen to what some of these young people in Minnesota have said about the program:

David Jacobsma: ''It has meant meeting new people with a wide variety of backgrounds. It has meant money for my education. It has meant new life experiences.''

Holly Sirjord: ''I feel I have contributed to my community. I not only worked with the personal aspects of the community, but I feel in return I have learned a lot by working with the natural aspects as well.''

Katherine Musch: ''AmeriCorps is a wonderful service organization that helps people help themselves build futures. This past year I have learned so much working with people and nature. It was great to feel a part of something so worthwhile. I am proud to be a member and would love to see AmeriCorps continued.''

Aaron Neubert: ''It has given me the opportunity to use my college degree. I am anxious to show future employers that I have experience.''

Kelly Engen: ''Being a member of the AmeriCorps program has meant a great deal to me. It has given me a sense of pride knowing that I am giving something back to the local communities that have given so much to me.''

Tim Reese: ''An opportunity to experience resource management on a watershed scale, frustration, a valuable experience, good training, an understanding of the workings of a Federal agency and a way to help pay for graduate school.''

Russell Boheim: ''AmeriCorps has given me the opportunity to use the knowledge and experience I've gained on a natural resources project benefitting the people in the region, where I was raised.''

Tony Kroska: ''AmeriCorps is, and has been, an excellent opportunity to use and test my skills to further the improvement of a region that I consider to be a valuable resource.''

Shelly Eckblad: ''AmeriCorps—group of Americans forming a body of persons, acting together in a common direction. That direction is to solve problems facing our country—the United States.''

Tracy Guthmiller: ''AmeriCorps to me means opportunity. AmeriCorps has given me the opportunity to assist others while at the same time gain valuable experience for myself.''

Linda Dahl: ''To me AmeriCorps has meant helping those who are willing to work toward improving their stewardship of the land. I believe this will lead to a better informed rural community and a healthier living environment.''

DiAnn Koening: ''Being an AmeriCorps member has given me the opportunity to serve local communities through individual and team efforts, acquire new skills, and become more knowledgeable of the local agencies and what services they provide.''

Melissa Stommes: ''Being an AmeriCorps member has given me a lot of opportunities to test my talents, explore more options, and meet new people.''

Graeme Belcher: ''AmeriCorps has given me the chance to make my community and myself better. The results of my actions will affect the environment so that everyone can live healthier and happier lives.''

Joy Swenson: ''I have learned many things in my AmeriCorps stint, so far. I have been trained in some things that will be a definite help to me in my future career—along with some things that will help out my life in general. Things such as team spirit and working with a range of attitudes and personalities. I cannot really say all I want to in 25 words or less, but I will end with this thought. I believe that being an AmeriCorps member will be an experience that I will always remember.''

Dean Lutz: ''The AmeriCorps program has been beneficial to me in helping me develop and achieve my goals. The NRCS and other surrounding people are fantastic to work along side.''

Jeff York: ''Being a AmeriCorps member has allowed me to return and serve the area I grew up in. As a member, I have enjoyed the responsibility and commitment it takes to serve others. I have also been introduced to a new, diverse group of Americans that, without this experience, I would not have been able to otherwise meet.''

Brian Krzmarzick: ''Being an AmeriCorps member is having a chance to learn new things and meet fun and exciting people while doing something that will help my community and country.''

Michael Aho: ''AmeriCorps has provided a way for me to face the challenges of the future by taking the first of many steps after college.''

I think what some in Washington who are trying to dismantle this program because they are afraid that it makes people think. It makes people who are working with homeless people to ask why is there homelessness. People who are working in the inner city are asking why is there poverty? And those who are working to clean up our environment are asking why is there pollution?

Every program in Minnesota is in a partnership with either a State and/or private partners. All these new partnerships were spurred by this program. It has leveraged a lot of private funds.

Community service programs in Minnesota and across the Nation have offended hundreds of thousands of young people the opportunity to learn while serving their communities. Community service programs have provided important and necessary services to communities all over the country. Programs have empowered students to improve conditions in their own communities by encouraging them to become a part of their community.

Service-learning programs have taught young people about the skills of citizenships, responsibility, and democracy while teaching them math, science, civics, English, history at the same time. Students through these wonderful programs have had their eyes opened to new opportunities and to diversity and multiculturalism in society. They have taught people how to utilize community resources to improve their lives.

In Minnesota, we have combined State funding under the Youth Works Program and the Federal dollars in the AmeriCorps Program to create an excellent program.

People of all ages, but especially our young people, have been encouraged to help their communities and get involved in their communities. We created a program that empowers people to participate, to make changes in their communities, and a program that teaches the skills of citizenship, responsibility and democracy.

I urge my colleagues to support the AmeriCorps Program and service learning and support the Mikulski amendment.

Mr. President, I find the description of this program as kids trying to find out who they are insulting. I do not even recognize the program my colleagues are describing. In Minnesota, AmeriCorps is really an exceptional program. It is quite a wonderful thing to see the work done in a child care center, the work done in the environment, the work done for senior citizens, the work done for communities, combined with a whole lot of young people who are able then to begin to build the resources to attend higher education. Mr. President, I would call this a marriage. It is well worth it. It is the very best in this country.

As to deficit reduction, why do we not cut the subsidies for the oil companies, the coal companies, the tobacco companies and the pharmaceutical companies? Why do not we go after the military contractors, and what do we do when there is a $245 billion tax giveaway mainly to wealthy people? But instead, when it comes to community services, young people and higher education, and that kind of marriage, that is where we want to cut.

That is not a Minnesota standard of fairness, and I am proud to stand on the floor and speak for AmeriCorps.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first I would like to compliment my colleagues and friends from Missouri, Senator BOND and Senator ASHCROFT, for their statements, as well as Senators

SANTORUM and GRASSLEY. I hope our colleagues had a chance to listen to them because they were right on target.

National service is basically paying volunteers. I find that to be a little bit of an oxymoron—paid volunteers. We have thousands, we have millions of volunteers who are doing great work, and they do it without the Federal Government saying, ''Here, we are going to give you a check.''

Many of us stated our opposition to this program at its inception because we said it would cost enormous sums. I looked at my notes, and I was computing, given the figures that we received from the Clinton administration, and estimated this program would cost $22,000. I remember debating Mr. Segal, and he said it would not cost that much; the cost would be something like $17,000 or $18,000. According to GAO, the cost is almost $27,000. I was talking about total cost, the cost to the Federal Government, the cost to State and local governments, and private.

It turns out to be, if you add the total cost, $17,000 from the AmeriCorps; other Federal support, $3,000; State and local contributions, governments, $4,000; and private, $1,800. So the private supports only 7 percent.

They stated that this was going to be largely privately funded. It has not been. It is largely Government funded at a cost of $27,000.

Mr. President, some people said, ''Well, this is good so it will help people be educated.'' The average cost of a Pell grant is $1,300. It is about one-eighteenth the size of this program. And that is a grant. The average cost of a student loan is $416. That compares to this program's average cost of $27,000. There is no comparison.

Mr. President, in my opinion, this program is a failure as an education tool. It is a failure as a tool promoting service or volunteers. We do not need the Federal Government to micromanage a program. We see that all the Federal Departments—the Veterans Department, EPA, Department of Transportation, Labor, Justice, Interior—are receiving assistance and funds to train volunteers. We do not need that.

And then when you find out that Big Brothers and Big Sisters and Red Cross and Girl Scouts have been denied funds, this does not make sense. We cannot afford this program. Let us put the scarce resources that we have in the programs that will help thousands.

Actually, we have millions; we have 9 million students that benefited under the guaranteed student loan program or the Pell grant program. We can help millions in those programs, and we have been doing so. We are wasting millions of dollars under this program. It is a time to defund it, and I hope that this amendment by our friend from Maryland will be defeated. I thank my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Oklahoma and the others who have spoken on this side so eloquently. I think we have had an excellent debate.

Because we have had so many people debating on this measure, we have used up all of the time. I would now ask unanimous consent that there be 3 minutes for the proponent of the amendment and 3 minutes for me as an opponent of the amendment to wrap it up, and then that I be recognized for a tabling motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, we have heard I think some compelling arguments against the AmeriCorps Program. I think in this vote it is important for our colleagues to focus on the fact that everybody agrees this program is vitally in need of reform. This program has to be changed. There have been too many problems with it. Even if you accept the fact that paying for volunteers is a good idea, I think that taking the money from assisted housing or those who badly need assisted housing is unwarranted. I think that raising the FHA mortgage limits is an idea that should be left to the authorizing committees.

Serving on the authorizing committee, I can tell you that there are many good arguments against doing that. I recognize the difficulty that the proponents have had in finding funding for it. This was my problem when I chose to fund CDBG rather than this program.

I urge my colleagues to join with me to table this amendment. We will continue to discuss AmeriCorps in the conference and beyond. We are waiting for a response from the administration.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. We have been through a lot of ups and downs already today, and I would like to thank all the Senators for offering their amendments.

Mr. President, I know I have 3 minutes for summing up. Let me just say this. There is much to be said in favor of national service and much criticism in terms I think of the need for a tighter ship. I think we would agree with the need for a tighter ship.

Let me just say in conclusion, my life has been devoted to creating an opportunity structure. I am absolutely committed to giving help to those who practice self-help. My great grandmother came to this country from Poland for a prearranged marriage with $16 and a feather bed mattress. She came with no guarantees. She came seeking opportunities. And she came because she believed in the United States of America there would be access to something called the American dream. The triad of the American dream was homeownership, access to education, and personal freedom.

The reason that I was one of the leaders in establishing national service was that we would have an opportunity structure for access to the American dream.

There were those who said these are not volunteers because they earn a voucher. They do not get paid. They get a living stipend and a voucher.

We use the term ''volunteer'' to mean that they are not drafted or coerced into it. Perhaps that is not the right language, but it is the right intent.

The important part of this is that we know for most Americans their access to higher education is closing. Student debt is increasing. What this bill essentially does is follow the framework of a principle I believe in, that if you are middle class the role of Government is to try to help you stay there or do better and, if you are not middle class, to be able to get there through hard work, effort, and merit.

That is what national service is all about. That is what its intent is, and that is why we have been advocating this bill.

I know that we are in a very skimpy budget time; that the chairman of this bill and I struggled over this. I know that originally as we looked at this bill the question was, How can we fund it?

The chairman felt we needed money to go into the community development block grant funds, and I could not fault him for that—empowering cities to make local decisions for economic development. Absolutely.

What we face here is not should we or should we not support national service. We have a very skimpy budget allocation. I know that there are those who say, ''Well, we can do Pell grants; we can do four more housing subsidies.'' The fact is, I believe under the skimpy allocations we are now coping with there will not be the money to do these things. I hope we continue the support of national service.

I thank the chairman for the courtesies given to us on this and really the civility of the debate. I hope that my colleagues will vote to continue national service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I have seen the wisdom and I shall not offer a tabling motion. I shall ask my colleagues to vote against this measure.

I could not agree more strongly with the goals and the views expressed by my ranking member about the American dream. But I do not believe it involves AmeriCorps or paid Federal Government volunteer service. I am very much concerned, and I think all my colleagues should be. I hope they would vote against this amendment, even if they support the concept of AmeriCorps, because it takes money from housing assistance, from the elderly, the disabled, those with AIDS, and it raises the FHA mortgage limit.

I do not believe it is the time or the amendment on which we should move forward with AmeriCorps. I ask for the

support of my colleagues in opposing this amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. I ask further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 2781 offered by the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI].

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 464 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Glenn	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nunn
Bradley	Heflin	Pell
Breaux	Inouye	Pryor
Bryan	Jeffords	Reid
Bumpers	Johnston	Robb
Campbell	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kerry	Simon
Conrad	Lautenberg	Snowe
Daschle	Leahy	Specter
Dodd	Levin	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lieberman	

NAYS—52

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Grams	Murkowski
Bond	Grassley	Nickles
Brown	Gregg	Packwood
Burns	Hatch	Pressler
Byrd	Hatfield	Roth
Coats	Helms	Santorum
Cochran	Hollings	Shelby
Coverdell	Hutchison	Simpson
Craig	Inhofe	Smith
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Stevens
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thomas
Dole	Kohl	Thompson
Domenici	Kyl	Thurmond
Exon	Lott	Warner
Faircloth	Lugar	
Feingold	Mack	

NOT VOTING—1

Gramm

So the amendment (No. 2781) was rejected.

Mr. BOND. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, was leader's time reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been.

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent to use leader's time.

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

CONSULTING CONGRESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, yesterday, together with some of my colleagues, I sent a letter to President Clinton urging him to consult with the Congress on the nature of the commitments his administration has made to our NATO allies and the Bosnians with respect to United States involvement in a potential peace enforcement operation in Bosnia. The letter included a number of specific questions about such an operation and the wisdom of the administration's present approach.

Much to my surprise, administration spokesmen protested this letter claiming that there have been numerous consultations on this matter.

Despite White House claims, the fact is that the Clinton administration has not consulted the Congress on sending United States ground forces to Bosnia since 1993—when consultations were held on possible enforcement of the Vance-Owen plan.

What was Congress' reaction then? As part of the fiscal year 1994 Defense Appropriations bill we passed an amendment, 99 to 1. The Mitchell-Dole amendment—which reads as follows, and I quote:

> It is the sense of the Congress that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this act should be available for the purposes of deploying United States Armed Forces to participate in the implementation of a peace settlement in Bosnia-Herzegovina, unless previously authorized by the Congress.

A subsequent provision addressed consultation on U.S. participation in any peacekeeping or peace-enforcement operations and opposed it unless, and I quote:

> The President initiates consultations with the bipartisan leadership of Congress...

This was followed by directions for such consultation, including discussion of the goals of the operation, U.S. interests, the costs, funding strategy, extent of U.S. involvement, and the expected duration and scope of the operation.

Well, it is more than 2 years later—more than 2 years later—and a great deal has changed. The situation on the ground is not what it was and the peace settlement being negotiated is also not what it was. While we are aware that the administration continues to repeat its commitment to send U.S. troops to participate in a settlement force, we in the Congress do not know what that means in concrete terms. And we believe we have a right to know.

About 2½ weeks ago, the administration sent a high level team, led by Deputy Secretary of Defense White, to brief Senators on the NATO air campaign. At that time, questions were raised about administration plans to participate in a peace enforcement operation. Unfortunately, these officials did not answer any of these questions, claiming that the planning process was not finished.

Mr. President, the point of consultations is to have input before there is a finished plan, before the Congress is handed a fait accompli. We do not want to be told after the fact that is a briefing, not a consultation. And we have had plenty of those where we are informed. We are not consulted; we are told. Lists of administration briefings and returned phone calls don't add up to consultation.

Today administration officials and members of the contact group concluded a second round of negotiations with the Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian Foreign Ministers on principles for a peace settlement. There is little doubt in my mind that whether the Bosnian Government continues participating in these talks and finally agrees to sign a settlement will depend significantly on whether or not the United States sends troops to enforce it.

Let us face it, the so-called agreed principles are vague, except in that they partition Bosnia into two entities. As such, the Bosnians are bound to rely on United States guarantees where there are differences with the Serbs, which are inevitable on matters of Bosnia's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Because the administration and allied approach has left the Bosnians without the means to secure their own peace, they will depend on those troops sent to enforce a settlement to defend their sovereignty.

Mr. President, we are still waiting to hear the administration's plan on lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia, a question that remains relevant now, as well as central to any exit strategy for American forces. I cannot conceive of supporting a plan that sends United States troops into Bosnia, while leaving the Bosnians unable to defend against future aggression.

We must know what the administration is telling the Bosnians, the Serbs, and our NATO allies, what promises and what threats, are being made. We also need to know what commitments are being made to the Russians with respect to their participation. In particular what is the administration response to Russian demands to share command with NATO in an enforcement operation? Will U.S. forces be under unified NATO command at all times?

The bottom line is that U.S. credibility depends on the United States keeping its word, meaning what it says. NATO credibility is also on the line. Why has there been no response to Bosnian Serb violations of the NATO no-fly zone reported today and last week?

No doubt about it, there is a lot at stake here—United States and NATO credibility, as well as the future of Bosnia.