

America's litigation explosion forces nonprofit organizations to spend an ever-increasing amount of time and resources preparing for and avoiding lawsuits. The American Society of Association Executives testified before Congress last year that the association's liability insurance premiums increased an average of 155 percent; one in eight nonprofit organizations reported an increase of insurance premiums of 300 percent alone. This has put some of our most revered nonprofit organizations at risk.

For example, Dr. Creighton Hale of Little League Baseball reports that the liability rate for a league increased from \$75 to \$795, in the last 5 years. Because most leagues cannot afford such an expense, many operate without insurance. Some have, unfortunately, been disbanded altogether. The bill before us protects volunteers from liability unless they cause harm through reckless or criminal conduct.

This common-sense approach legislation would put an end to tragic liability cases such as a 1990 negligence case in which a Chicago jury awarded \$12 million to a boy who was injured in a car crash. Who was the negligent party? According to the jury, it was the estate of the volunteer—the estate of the volunteer, who gave his life attempting to save that boy.

Here are just a few other examples of recent outrageous litigation which threatens voluntarism.

In Oregon, a boy on a Boy Scout outing suffered a serious injury while playing tag football. The court dismissed the original lawsuit filed against the Boy Scouts, due to an insufficient nexus between the Boy Scouts and the youth's injury. The injured boy then decided to sue the volunteers who supervised the game. In one of the largest monetary verdicts in Oregon history, the jury found the two volunteers liable for \$7 million.

When a 10-year-old boy in New Jersey lost a fly ball in the Sun during Little League practice, the ball dropped and hit the boy in the eye. The boy's coaches were sued for negligence.

In Oklahoma City, a member of an amateur softball league was so angered when he was ejected from a game that he drove away in a fit of rage and crashed his car. So what does the ejected player do? He files a suit against the umpire.

According to William J. Cople, a Washington lawyer who is pro bono counsel for the Boy Scouts of America, "Volunteers have simply been swept away in the hysteria of litigation. . . . Suits are brought for almost anything, under any circumstances." What good comes from these suits? Well, about all you can say is that they keep a lot of lawyers in business.

Mr. President, the bill we are debating will help put an end to such unwarranted litigation. This bill creates a system in which plaintiffs sue only for good reason and sue only those who are responsible for the damage. Such com-

mon-sense reforms will create an atmosphere which will nurture voluntarism. This legislation will foster the spirit of voluntarism, not just speak about it at a photo op.

For centuries, volunteers in America have fed our hungry, sheltered our homeless, instilled values in our youth. Volunteers are vital, as we know, to our survival as a moral nation. It is time we gave volunteers something in return, and that something is this legislation that will protect them from frivolous and outrageous legal attacks that are the result of a judicial system in desperate need of reform.

Finally, there is something else I believe we should do to encourage the volunteer spirit in America. This is to allow volunteers to get a more realistic tax deduction for their travel costs associated with charitable activities. Later today, I, along with Senator COCHRAN, will be introducing the Charitable Equity Mileage Act of 1997. This bill will increase the standard mileage rate of deduction for charitable use of an automobile from 12 cents a mile to 18 cents a mile. I think this bill should be unanimously supported by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Further, many of our citizens who volunteer for charitable activities do incur expenses for which they are not reimbursed. For example, when an individual uses his or her automobile to deliver a meal to a home-bound elderly individual or to transport children to Scouting activities, the volunteer usually pays the transportation costs out of his or her own pocket with no expectations of reimbursement. I believe the costs associated with charitable transportation services ought to be deductible at a rate which fairly represents the individual's actual costs. This is especially important for volunteers living in rural communities who have to travel long distances to provide community services.

Congress, in 1984, set the standard mileage exemption deduction rate of 12 cents per mile for individuals who use their automobiles in connection with charitable activities. At the time the standard mileage rate for business use of an automobile was 20.5 cents per mile. In the intervening 13 years, the business mileage rate has increased to 30.5 cents per mile, but the charitable rate has remained unchanged at 12 cents per mile because the Treasury Department does not have the authority to adjust the rate. By raising the charitable rate to 18 cents a mile, my legislation, I think, restores the relationship that existed in 1984 between the charitable mileage rate and the business mileage rate. In addition, the legislation authorizes the Secretary of Treasury to increase the charitable mileage rate in the same manner as is currently allowed for business mileage expenses.

All of us agree that, with the changing role of the Federal Government, we need to do more to encourage voluntarism in our country. The Volunteer

Protection Act will do that, and so will the legislation that I am introducing. Volunteers who provide transport services should be allowed to deduct such costs at a rate which fairly reflects their true out-of-pocket costs, and this is precisely what the bill does.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in sponsoring this important legislation.

Mr. President, I have a letter of support for my bill from the American Legion. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE AMERICAN LEGION,  
Washington, DC, April 24, 1997.

Hon. FRANK MURKOWSKI,  
Member, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: The American Legion fully supports the "Charitable Travel Equity Act of 1997," to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the standard mileage rate deduction for charitable use of passenger automobiles.

Not only does The American Legion applaud the increase in the mileage rate deduction, but more importantly this measure fixes the problem that has not allowed for incremental increases without an act of Congress action. The standard mileage rate deduction for business use of passenger automobiles has increased significantly while no adjustments were made in the charitable use rate. Granting the Secretary the authority to make prescribed adjustments will provide fairness and promote additional volunteerism.

Thank you for your continuous leadership on behalf of America's veterans and their dependents.

Sincerely,

STEVE ROBERTSON,  
Director,  
National Legislative Commission.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized as in morning business.

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

#### BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, we have been in the midst of a filibuster where our President and many of our notable leaders around the country have gone to Philadelphia and called for an expansion in voluntarism, something that we all believe in, something that America was built on.

We have a bill on the floor of the Senate now to try to protect volunteers from frivolous lawsuits which threaten the whole process, and we are in the midst, basically, of a stall and a filibuster by our Democratic colleagues in opposition to this bill.

In this lull, I wanted to take the opportunity to come to the floor of the Senate and, for the first time, publicly make a comment on the emerging budget agreement.

Mr. President, I believe that the budget agreement that is now emerging is a good political deal, but it is a

bad budget. It is a good political deal because, in a sense, it gives both parties in the negotiation what they want.

The President in this budget negotiation gets what he wants. He gets an ironclad guarantee that the era of big Government is alive and well and guaranteed in Washington, DC. He gets new entitlement programs. He gets the re-establishment of entitlements that we eliminated in welfare reform. He gets more social spending than President Carter and nearly twice as much as in the 1960's under Lyndon Johnson. The President, in this emerging budget agreement, gets the one thing that he cares most about, and that is a guarantee that Government is going to continue to grow and that its presence in the American economy and American society is going to continue to be dominant.

In a sense, Republican Members of Congress get what they want. We get to claim a tax cut. We get to claim that we have delivered on a campaign promise we made to let people keep more of what they earn. There are still negotiations underway as to how big that tax cut is going to be. But the problem is that by politically manipulating the Consumer Price Index, something I will talk more about in a moment, what is happening is that while on one hand we are going to be guaranteeing a cut in taxes in the short run, by manipulating the measure of inflation upon which the Tax Code is built, we are guaranteeing increases in tax rates that will, over time, offset the cut in taxes that we will claim from this budget agreement as a victory.

The President gets what he wants: more Government and a lot of it. Republicans get what they want, and that is a claim of a short-term tax cut. But let me say the American people do not get what they want. The American people get no fiscal restraint. In the end, the American people will not get a balanced budget. In the end, the American people are not going to get a stronger economy from this budget. In the end, the American people are not going to get any lasting tax relief from this budget.

This budget is a great deal for Washington, but it is a bad deal for America. This is the kind of budget that comes about when the two great political parties stop debating ideas and start conspiring against the public, conspiring to promote their interest but not working either together or in contention to promote the public interest.

Let me say a little bit about the Consumer Price Index and about politicizing it.

America is a country where statistics matter. Facts are persistent things. Facts have an impact on what happens in our country, and the measure of inflation affects everything from how much you get in Social Security benefits to how much veterans receive in retirement benefits to how much we pay in taxes to how contracts are negotiated. We have set up an agency

which, historically, has acted independently, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, to try to come up with a measure of what inflation is, what consumer prices are.

Obviously, no statistic is perfect. In fact, we have had a debate in economics for 40 years about whether the Consumer Price Index is a good measure of the cost of living. To listen to politicians talk about it in the last 4 or 5 years, there is this unanimous opinion among professional economists that the Consumer Price Index overstates inflation. Let me say that there are only two economists in the Congress, DICK ARMEY and myself, and we both oppose the change in the Consumer Price Index. In fact, economists are split on this subject.

No less an authority than Milton Friedman, Nobel Prize winning economist, perhaps the best known economist on the planet and probably the most able, has concluded that the CPI may well overstate the rise in private prices, but it almost certainly understates the cost of living, which is the measure that we are using it for.

And why does the CPI understate the cost of living? Because it leaves out the No. 1 cost of living for the average working family in America. In fact, it leaves out an involuntary expenditure that is bigger than health care, housing, nutrition, and transportation combined. The Consumer Price Index does not include the cost of Government, does not include taxes and, therefore, through that exclusion, Milton Friedman argues it understates the true cost of living, even though it might understate the rise in the cost of goods and services in the private sector. But whether CPI overstates or understates the Consumer Price Index, we should not have political decisions being made about economic statistics, and I would have to say, obviously, it was inevitable in the Clinton administration that the process of setting statistics was going to become politicized.

We are looking in this negotiation underway at mandating, through an assumption that it will happen in the future, a change in the Consumer Price Index that will raise taxes over a decade by over \$100 billion, and it will raise taxes by changing the inflation rate and, therefore, pushing working families more quickly into higher tax brackets and lowering the value of the personal exemption and the dependent exemption, which are critical factors in calculating the taxes of working families.

So the bottom line is, by deciding on a political basis where Members of Congress and the President have decided that we are going to manipulate the Consumer Price Index, we are going through that process to cut Social Security and other benefits over a decade by about \$180 billion, and we are going to raise taxes by about \$120 billion.

What are we going to do with that money? We are going to spend every penny of it. So Social Security is 15

years away from insolvency, we are going to manipulate the Consumer Price Index and reduce benefits, but we are not going to put those benefits back in to saving the Social Security trust fund.

We have the highest tax rates in American history. No American has ever lived a day where the aggregate tax rate, where you are looking at taxes at all levels of Government, was as high as it is today. Never; not a day. But what we are doing by manipulating our statistics is we are raising taxes on working families, and we are all doing it sort of quasi under the table.

I will offer, when we debate the budget, an amendment which I think is a pretty important amendment. In fact, I am going to call it the CPI Social Security and Tax Equity Improvement Act. What this amendment is going to say very simply is this: That rather than having a bunch of politicians manipulate the Consumer Price Index to try to cut Social Security benefits and raise taxes so we can spend the money, we ought to go ahead, since this has now reached such a political fever pitch to seize this money and squander it will not go away, we should leave it to the experts but dedicate the savings to specific purposes.

So what I am going to propose is two things. In the budget, I am going to say whatever we do to change the Consumer Price Index, that every penny that comes from raising taxes on working families ought to go back to those working families to raise the dependent exemption and the standard deduction first back to the level that existed in 1950 in real dollars. Today, the standard deduction is about \$2,550. In current-day inflation adjusted dollars, in 1950, it was \$3,800.

So the first thing we would do with these savings that come with increases in taxes from changing the CPI, if Congress does it in the budget, is we would take that money rather than letting Congress spend it, the part that comes from raising taxes we use first to raise the standard deduction up to \$3,800 a year, and then we would use it to reduce marginal tax rates. And those parts of savings that come from cutting Social Security benefits, we would put back in the Social Security trust funds, but we would set up real trust funds with it. It would be outside the Treasury Department. It would not count as the internal debt of the Federal Government, because it is the debt of the Federal Government to Social Security beneficiaries. When we pay interest on that debt, it would count as an outlay of the Federal Government. Today, it does not even count as an outlay of the Federal Government when Social Security earns interest. Finally, we would set up a procedure where we could look at having a real trust fund, including real investments.

I also will introduce a bill that will establish an independent commission made up of all living American Nobel Prize winners in economics and have

them, in conjunction with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, review for 6 months the Consumer Price Index and make a recommendation to the Commissioner of Labor Statistics. If she decides, based on their recommendations, which will be made public, to change the Consumer Price Index, then under the bill I will introduce, the part of savings that come from raising taxes will go back to families to raise the standard deduction and cut marginal tax rates. The part of savings that come from the Social Security trust fund will go back into it, but into a real trust fund that will be set up outside the Treasury, and it would be capable for the first time in American history of making real investments.

I am not here to criticize our leader or to criticize Senator DOMENICI for their work on these negotiations. We all have to do the best job we can do. We all have to try to achieve what we believe in, and I am sure that if the negotiations are completed along the lines that they have negotiated them, that they will believe they have gotten the best agreement they can get. But I cannot and do not support an agreement where the President gets what he wants, a guarantee of big Government in perpetuity, new entitlement spending, social spending the likes of which we have not seen since the 1960's; Congress gets what it wants, the ability to claim a tax cut, even though by manipulating the measure of inflation, we raise taxes and, over time, offset that tax cut.

The problem is the President gets what he wants politically, Congress gets what Congress wants politically, but the American people do not get what they want politically. They want a real budget; they want fiscal restraint. Nobody can claim that this budget exercises fiscal restraint. Nobody—Democrat, Republican—no one can look at this budget and say that a tough decision has been made, that spending has been controlled. There is no fiscal restraint in this budget.

While we will be able to claim a short-term tax cut, the reality is there is no permanent tax cut when you factor in the change in consumer prices in this budget. We do not guarantee in this budget a balanced budget. In fact, this budget begins by assuming a balanced budget, for all practical purposes. By changing the underlying assumptions in this budget, if we simply went with a spending level set out in discretionary spending in current law, which is \$4 billion for next year below what we are spending now—that is the law of the land—and we did nothing else under the assumptions of this budget, for all practical purposes, we would have a balanced budget.

So a balanced budget is not achieved by this budget; it is assumed by this budget. In the end, this budget gives both political parties what they need politically, but it does not give the American people what they need and, as a result, I am not for it. This is a

bad deal in the making. It is a deal that is a political deal with political ends. It is a deal that comes about when we move away from the traditional function of our great political parties, which is to contest, which is to present competing ideas and then ultimately allow the superior ideas to prevail. This budget really represents what I am sure will be portrayed in the media as great bipartisanship, but in reality it is the two parties working together to claim political victories for each party without achieving the objective that the American people seek.

So I do not doubt that there will be great support for this budget. When you claim you are balancing the budget, when you can demonstrate that we are creating new entitlements and the largest social spending that we have ever seen since the 1960's, you are going to have a lot of Democrats who are going to support this budget. When you can claim, no matter how temporary it may be—with the procedures in this budget, we will over time raise income taxes—but when you can claim that we are cutting taxes, even for a short period of time, there are going to be some Republicans who find this agreement to their liking.

Finally, there is pressure on us all, and there should be, to find a compromise to balance the budget, to work with the President. But I do not see an effort here to work with the President to solve the problem. I do not see an effort here to work with the President to gain control of spending. Both parties campaigned in the last election on controlling spending. There is no effort here to control spending. In fact, there is a conspiracy here, a bipartisan one, to increase spending. I do not see an effort here to guarantee and lock in a balanced budget. I see an effort here to assume a balanced budget, so I see bipartisanship all right, but it is bipartisanship basically to achieve a political goal for each political party. I do not see bipartisanship to achieve a goal for America.

Let me touch on two final points and then I will yield the floor.

We are going to bring up next week a supplemental appropriations bill. That supplemental appropriations bill, for all practical purposes, raises the deficit \$8.4 billion, though there are some offsets in the defense area.

I remember when we had 43 Members of the Senate who were Republicans, and the Democrats tried to bring up a \$17 billion so-called economic stimulus package, and we blocked it. We now have 55 Republicans, and yet next week we are going to bring up an \$8.4 billion spending bill where virtually every penny of it is going to raise the deficit. We are already spending \$22 billion above what we said in our 1996 budget we would be spending on discretionary spending this year.

I intend to offer an amendment next week. That amendment is going to do two things. No. 1, it is going to say every penny we spend this year on

emergencies—and I am in favor of disaster relief—but I think it is very instructive that if you look at the number of States we have had floods in, and then you look at the fact that we are giving disaster assistance to 23 States, this disaster is taking on manmade implications made in Washington, and the disaster is not just flooding houses in North and South Dakota and Minnesota, but it is increasingly runaway Government spending at the expense of the taxpayer and at the expense of the deficit.

What I will propose is the amount of money we are going to spend for an emergency this year, spend it, but do an across-the-board cut in other programs to pay for it. Then whatever we spend next year, make it count as part of the budget for next year; in other words, for next year that it be offset against other programs that we might have spent it on.

I know we will have colleagues here who will jump up and say, well, we have people who have been flooded out of their homes. And we do. And we should help them. But shouldn't we pay for it?

What family would not like to say, when Johnny falls down the steps and breaks his arm, "Well, look. We don't have any money. We have planned to go on vacation this year" or "we were going to buy a new refrigerator this year. So we are just going to have to assume that Johnny's arm gets fixed, and it would be nice if somebody would come in from Heaven and just give us the money." But that does not happen in American families. What they have to do is they have to go back and they have to not buy that new refrigerator or they have to not go on vacation.

What I am saying is, help people who have been the victims of natural disaster, but do not create a financial disaster by simply adding it to the deficit. Let us provide disaster assistance, but let us cut other programs that now, with these disasters, we cannot afford.

Let me also note that this is not unexpected. We have had a disaster every year that President Clinton has been in office and we have not had the money to pay for it because we did not write it into our budget. It has averaged about \$7 billion a year. There is nothing unexpected. Every year in America we have floods or hurricanes or tornadoes or earthquakes. We know it is going to happen. When we do not write the money in our budget to pay for it, all we are doing is saying, let us borrow the money and just keep spending. My answer is, let us pay for it by cutting other Government programs.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that amendment is going to be adopted. There is no constituency that I can determine in the Congress for controlling spending. But we are going to vote on it. We are going to know where people stand on this issue.

The final point I want to mention is on the so-called CR. We all know that when the Government shut down, people were dislocated. I would have to say

that I think the President did an exceptional job politically of exploiting it. I admire him for it. I think we did an inept job of explaining that in fact the President vetoed the bill and shut the Government down.

But in an unusual effort to have good Government, what Republicans are saying on this appropriations bill we are going to vote on next week is, look, before we get into any disputes with the President, let us just agree that if at any point during the year we cannot agree on how much money to spend to keep the Government open, that we will keep it open temporarily at 98 percent of the spending we spent last year, which, by the way, is substantially above the budget that we adopted last year.

Our Democratic colleagues are saying, "Well, no, we can't do that. We can't set out that if we can't reach an agreement we will simply spend 98 percent of last year's level." They are saying that somehow we are trying to impose priorities on the President. What we are trying to do is to guarantee that we do not have a shutdown in Government. I think our proposal is eminently reasonable. And I intend to support it. I do not intend to vote for this supplemental appropriations bill if we do not have this provision to prevent a fiscal disaster written into it.

I think it is time for us to understand that we have an obligation, No. 1, to pay for these bills, and, No. 2, to try to set out some way of gaining control of runaway Federal spending. The problem in Washington is still spending. We are still not controlling it. That is what this debate is about.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as some of my colleagues know, I was considering introducing, as a substitute to the bill by the distinguished Senator from Georgia and others, the bill of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PORTER, as introduced in the other body. I am withholding that because staff from my office and staff of the distinguished Senator from Georgia and others have been talking about some additional amendments to the pending legislation that, if acceptable to all sides, would improve a number of the concerns that the Senator from Vermont has with the pending legislation, concerns I will not go into again here because the Senator from Vermont has discussed them on a number of occasions on the floor.

While I was waiting to make that announcement, though, I could not but hear some comments of the Senator from Texas regarding the budget.

Frankly, I will say to my friend from Texas or anybody else, if they are not happy with the recommendations being made by the White House or Democratic Senators or anything else, the Republican Party has a majority of the

Members in the House of Representatives, the Republican Party has a majority of the Members in the Senate of the United States. All they have to do, if they have a budget they prefer to anything the President has, is bring it forward and pass it. They have enough votes to pass it. And the President cannot even veto it; it is a budget resolution. So it is a little bit disingenuous to suggest that somehow the President or anybody else is winning on this.

The Republican Party has the majority of votes in the House and the Senate. A budget resolution cannot be vetoed. All they have to do is pass it. In fact, the law requires that they pass it by April 15—I mean, April 15 of this year, not next year. The law also requires that you and I, Mr. President, file our income taxes by April 15. If we do not, we get a knock on the door from the IRS. Apparently nobody is going to knock on the door when the Congress did not pass a budget resolution by April 15.

But I suggest, before anybody goes tearing too hard after the President or anybody else that may have been negotiating a budget, with all due respect to my friends on the other side of the aisle, if they do not like it, just pass their own. They could have followed the law and passed one by April 15. They did not. I will not chastise them for not obeying the law, even though they want the rest of us to. But just pass it, if you like. You can do it. I will also say, as far as passing an automatic continuing resolution, whoa Nellie, that has nothing to do with cutting budgets. I am perfectly happy to vote for budget cuts. I voted for more successful budget cuts than an awful lot of people in this body, I mean those that actually passed in the Appropriations Committee and elsewhere.

But this idea of some kind of an automatic continuing resolution is just a law that says we do not have to do our work. Now, by the end of September we have to pass 13 appropriations bills. If we all just go off and take another vacation, do not pass them, then this law proposed by the Senator from Texas and others would kick in, and nobody would even know if we were out of town.

I prefer we do our work. Maybe some of the same people, some of the same people who were unable to come up with a budget by April 15, who refused to follow the law to come up with a budget by April 15, want this new wrinkle, this unprecedented wrinkle of basically passing appropriations bills in advance, because if you pass this law, this continuing resolution, we can just go home. Maybe the American people would like that, but I do not think we are meeting our responsibilities. So I think we should stop the gimmicks in the appropriations bills. And this is just one more. It is not an issue of whether you want to cut budgets or not. It is an issue of whether we do our work.

We have had several vacations this year and we confirmed two Federal

judges and we are now in the fifth month. There are 100 vacancies. We have had several vacations this year and we are now in May, even though the budget resolution is supposed to be here April 15. I think before we pass any more laws that allow us to escape the responsibility for carrying out our actions in this body, we ought to do what we are supposed to do.

(The remarks of Mr. LEAHY pertaining to the introduction of S. 678 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### VOLUNTEER PROTECTION ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, going back to the matter at hand, all of us support the concept of volunteers working to help. In fact, this country could not make it without volunteers. I think of those volunteers in the recent disastrous floods in the Dakotas who worked 16- and 20-hour days to pack sandbags, sometimes to protect homes and property and businesses of people they did not know and probably never would know. They just showed up, volunteered, and did it.

I think what happens, sometimes we will get hit with a vicious storm in my part of the world, power lines will come down, electricity will be out, and people gather to volunteer and help. I think of some people I have seen in times when I have had the opportunity to volunteer in what we call our Cleanup Day. Cleanup Day in Vermont was begun by a dear friend and former Governor of Vermont, Dean Davis. This is where thousands of Vermonters all over the State go out at this time of year—the snows are gone, we hope—and we will pick up trash all over the State, beautify our roads, our streams.

In fact, I recall when my daughter was the State director, and I went with her and some others. We saw a little piece of metal sticking up in a stream and we decided to pull it, and more of us pulled, and pulled and pulled, and we got a car hooked up and pulled and pulled, and out came a sink—a whole sink. Somebody had tossed it in there. We cleaned it up. I hope that stream was better as a result.

I think of the men and women who work with children in my State, the volunteers who work with the 4-H Club, for example. During my 8 years as a prosecutor in Vermont, I went back through the records of all those who came in our juvenile courts in the county where I was the States attorney or district attorney. We had about a quarter of the population. During 8 years in that juvenile court, we never had a person in there who had been active in 4-H or active in Scouting. Those people worked so hard at it and learned good basic values, but they had a lot of adults who volunteered to help in those operations.