

Mr. GRASSLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 243 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. NUNN pertaining to the introduction of S. 244 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BREAU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana, Mr. BREAU, is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

Mr. BREAU. I thank the Chair.

NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

Mr. BREAU. Mr. President and my colleagues, I remember when I was practicing law in Louisiana as a very young lawyer. One of the senior lawyers was explaining to me how we should proceed in a courtroom. His suggestion was,

If you don't have the facts on your side when you are arguing your case, well, you should talk about the law. But if you do not have the law on your side and you are handling a case in court, you should talk about the facts.

He went on to suggest if you do not have either one on your side, you ought to just stand up and shout and walk around the courtroom and act like you know what you are talking about.

Mr. President, I would suggest that some of the Republican rhetoric that I have heard in talking about national service takes the approach if you do not have the facts on your side, just make them up and say whatever you want about a program in order to try to show that it is not a good program.

I think it is very important that we stick to the facts when we talk about programs and things we do in Government. I think the public gets so much

misinformation that it is very important to try to point out when the facts are wrong when we talk about programs.

I start off by making these comments because I was really very surprised by the Senator from Iowa, who was on the floor earlier, his remarks regarding national service that I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I supported the program. It was the type of initiative that the President ran on 2 years ago, the type of program that I think is a good program. When I read the gentleman's statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I was flabbergasted. I said, This cannot be true.

In essence, what the Senator was saying was that the AmeriCorps Program, part of the National Service Program, was costing \$70,000 per student—\$70,000 per student—in order to help kids go to college. I said that is ridiculous; I am not going to spend \$70,000 a year to send kids to college. I found out some serious mistakes, in my opinion, were made about characterizing this program that is costing \$70,000 a student in Pennsylvania, in the city of Philadelphia.

What I found out was that the mistake that was made in using these facts was the fact that they did not take into consideration private law firms that were contributing to this individual's salary; they did not take into consideration the Philadelphia Bar Association's contribution in this particular area. When he added up what the private sector was going to do with up to 11 full-time workers, he came up with the figure of \$70,000, when in truth the Federal Government's contribution and the cost to the taxpayers was only \$4,911. That is a big difference from \$70,000.

The AmeriCorps Program, the National Service Program, is really what I think Republicans have always been talking about. Let us get away from giveaway programs. Let Members terminate programs, and just give money away from Washington to get people to do certain things. The essence of what AmeriCorps is all about—and we have had up to 200,000 young men and women in this country volunteer to participate in the AmeriCorps Program. It is a wonderful concept. It builds on the Peace Corps Program.

By the way, Peace Corps Program volunteers get a stipend; they are paid. Just like the Vista Program has young men and women in this program, that participate in the program and do wonderful things, they get a small salary, as well. The concept of AmeriCorps, and why I think Republicans and Democrats alike should be supportive of it, is because it is a partnership between the Government and the citizens of this country.

It talks about community, responsibility, reciprocity; it talks about saying if the Government is going to help me to go to college, I have an obligation to reciprocate and give something back. What they give back in the AmeriCorps Program is doing commu-

nity work, doing legal work in the communities, working in a law enforcement program, in a drug rehabilitation program, in a nursing program, an environmental cleanup program, as they are doing in my State of Louisiana, as we are doing in Louisiana where we have young AmeriCorps students who are working in the sheriffs department and local law enforcement.

Mr. President, they are giving something back to a Government that has helped them go to college. It is a partnership. It is not a giveaway program. It does not cost \$70,000 for one young student to be able to participate in this program. It is asking the local community to say, do you need these types of students working in your local town? Most of them are saying, Yes, we need some help. We need some help in the environment. We need some help in drug enforcement programs and drug rehabilitation programs.

So the AmeriCorps Program is not a giveaway program; it is a program that encourages young people to participate. We have an all-volunteer army. They get paid, too. They get a salary so they can survive and so they can live. I do not think they detract from an all-volunteer military. The basic fact is we should be encouraging young men and women to give something back to a Government that has helped them get an education.

As President Clinton has said so many times in this country today, what you earn is going to be based on what you learn. The facts are dramatic, that a young person, a young male in this country that graduates from a 4-year college earns about 83 percent more in his lifetime than a person who has not been able to go to college; 83 percent more in a lifetime. That is not just pie in the sky. That is real facts.

That is something that we as a nation should be encouraging. And we do not encourage it under national service by a giveaway program; we encourage it to be a partnership by saying to that young man or young woman that if you would like to go to college and you need some help, we will help you pay for your tuition. But it is not free; it is not free. You have an obligation to try to give something back to your Government—not in India, not in Japan, not in Europe, not in a Third-World country, but right here in America. That is why it is called AmeriCorps. It is not a foreign aid program. We are not sending kids to other nations to help them solve their problems. We are saying that if you accept this challenge, we will let you work in your local community, back where people know you, where you may ultimately end up working as a citizen in a partnership with your local citizens in your local community.

That is why when someone says, well, this program costs \$70,000 a student, it is absolutely not factual. It does not cost \$70,000 for the taxpayers of this

country. What we have in Philadelphia in this instance is a situation where the local bar association and several law firms in the country have helped put up money to pay the salaries for up to 11 AmeriCorps students who will be working in that community as lawyers and as law students, helping people that have problems, helping people understand the Government and this system. The Federal Government is going to put out \$4,900 to allow that student to work in that community. We have helped them get a college education and they are paying back with their services, and getting enough of a stipend from the Federal Government to at least survive and to be able to continue that work and do it full time. We are talking about full-time workers.

This is not a giveaway program. Does it cost anything? Of course, it costs. But how much does it cost to build a prison? We spend \$300 million for a national program to try to get people to have a partnership with their Government, to get a college education, and give something back to the community. We spend billions of dollars, I suggest, building prisons in this country and running prisons in this country, to incarcerate young men and women who have gone by the wayside, maybe because they did not have a National Service Program, because nobody cared. Nobody told them they have a reciprocal obligation to give something back to a Government that has helped them get a college education.

I have heard Speaker GINGRICH in the other body talk, time and time again, about communities, family, and service, and giving something back to the communities. This program is an example of giving something back to the communities, of national service, of saying: I want to help my Government do better. If my Government helps me get a college education, I am pleased, but I also recognize that it is not free. I will give back to my Government in the same ratio that they have given to me.

I think that produces a stronger community. I think that produces stronger families. I think that produces a sense of what America is all about. So I would suggest when we talk about national service, let Members first get our facts straight. Let Senators first understand the real cost.

I suggest, second, let Senators join together if there are problems, and let us improve the program. Let us not, by incorrect factual information, try to kill a program that I suggest is in keeping with what America is all about.

I yield the floor, Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BASE CLOSINGS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, in less than 2 months the Secretary of Defense will forward to the 1995 Base Closure Commission his so-called "hit list" of military base closings. Although it is an excruciating exercise, I think we would all agree that closing obsolete military bases is a painful necessity.

With the end of the cold war, the Pentagon estimated that 30 percent of our domestic military bases must be shut down. Due in large part to the efforts of Senator SAM NUNN, of Georgia, and former Senator Alan Dixon, of Illinois, Congress created a bipartisan Base Closure Commission to help us make the necessary choices of which bases to close.

I believe the base closure process is sound. It serves as a model of how to make difficult and politically sensitive budget-cutting decisions. The Base Closure Commission successfully completed base closure rounds in 1988, 1991, and 1993.

As this chart to my left indicates, these three rounds of base closings eliminated some 70 military bases throughout America. Some areas and some States were hit harder than others.

On March 1, 1995, the Commission will begin its very important deliberations once again, and before the year is through, the Commission will seek congressional and Presidential approval to close dozens of additional bases. We have been told that this list will be longer and painful. In fact, it has been said that this base closure round will possibly be equal in size to the first three rounds combined.

To be certain, base closings hurt. In communities that lose a base, thousands of jobs are terminated, businesses close down, millions of dollars in annual revenue disappear from sight. Mr. President, I am personally aware of that pain caused by base closure announcements. The 1991 Commission closed Eaker Air Force Base, a B-52 base located in Mississippi County, AR. They also took away a majority of the work at Fort Chaffee near Fort Smith, AR.

Most of our colleagues in the Senate have witnessed the departure of the military in at least one community in their State. My colleagues from California lost eight major military bases in 1993 alone, as this map so indicates.

We have seen communities react with anger and frustration to the news of base closings. We have witnessed their fear about surviving such a tremendous economic blow. For most base closure towns, the military was the largest employer, as in the case of Eaker Air Force Base in Blytheville, AR.

Mr. President, I visited this base in 1992, 1 year after the closure announcement, to see how the local townspeople

were coping with the impending loss of the Air Force.

What I found was a community that desperately wanted to beat swords into plowshares. I found also a community that was receiving virtually no help whatsoever from the Federal Government. In fact, this community claimed that Washington was their largest roadblock to a speedy recovery. The citizens of Blytheville needed the Air Force's cooperation and the Federal Government's resources. What they received instead was bureaucratic lip service and endless red tape.

The same was true in other communities across America. The problems were so severe that the former majority leader, Senator George Mitchell, decided to create a special task force to devise a strategy for easing the impact of defense budget reductions and for making a smooth transition to a post-cold war economy.

Senator Mitchell asked me to become the task force chairman. With 24 Democratic Senate colleagues, we began studying what the Federal Government's role should be, if any, to help in our Nation's ongoing transition from swords to plowshares.

Our 1992 task force concluded that the end of the cold war had caught our country by surprise, and that we were late in devising a national strategy for helping our cold war workers, communities and companies find a new direction.

We also found that the United States of America was better prepared to handle a much larger transition in the years following World War II. As early as 1943, 2 years before the war had ended, President Roosevelt made the decision to begin planning for the war's end and the difficult conversion to a peacetime economy. He had created the War Demobilization Office and charged this new entity with devising a national strategy. From this office emerged the GI bill and many other initiatives that helped our country grow and prosper in the years that followed.

In 1992, however, 3 years after the Iron Curtain began to crack, our Government still had no comprehensive strategy for beating swords into plowshares. History, Mr. President, should have taught us better. The lesson learned after World War II, and in other periods of defense downsizing, was that our Government has a duty to provide comprehensive transition assistance to those affected by reductions in our Nation's defense expenditures.

Some might say, Mr. President, that this is not the function nor the role of Government. I would submit, however, that our Government should become a partner in this endeavor and not an obstacle to economic recovery.

To compensate for our slow start and to finally allow our Government to become a partner instead of an obstacle, our 1992 task force recommended sizable increases in defense reinvestment funding and programs. That same year