

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 31 and Wednesday, November 1, 1995 to hold hearings on Global Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

VA, HUD, INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to take this time to explain some of the votes I cast during consideration of the VA, HUD, independent agencies appropriations bill on September 27, 1995.

Senator BUMPERS offered an amendment to reduce the appropriation for implementing the space station program with the intent of terminating the program. The Bumpers amendment raised the question as to what the United States fundamental goals and needs are in exploring space. While it is clear that the space station has spurred technological and scientific development unrelated to space, I am not convinced that these developments justify the enormous taxpayer expense of the space station. Therefore, at this time, I supported Senator BUMPERS' amendment. Since the amendment failed, however, we will most likely continue to fund the space station for fiscal year 1996, and as we spend more on this program we will come closer to a point at which it would no longer be wise to discontinue funding. I believe we are near that point and will review this budget request again next year to determine whether eliminating funding for the space station would benefit taxpayers.

Senator ROCKEFELLER offered two amendments regarding benefits for veterans. One involved compensation for mentally incompetent service-related disabled veterans and the other would have increased funding for the general veterans medical account. My opposition to these amendments was not based on their content, but rather on the fact that the funding mechanism for both of these amendments involved waiving the Budget Act. More than any veteran-specific funding we can provide, balancing the budget will benefit veterans and their children. Any amendment which increases spending and puts our country further from achieving a balanced budget ought to be rejected. And while I do not doubt that Senator ROCKEFELLER's amendments have merit, his inability to find other spending offsets made them impossible for me to support.

Senator LAUTENBERG also proposed to waive provisions of the Budget Act in order to provide more funding for the Superfund Program. While I share Mr.

LAUTENBERG's concern for the environment, very few Americans familiar with the Superfund Program would disagree that it is in need of reform. We have spent billions of dollars on the Superfund Program already, and the results have been minimal. Superfund has resulted in more lawsuits, more paperwork, extreme cleanup mandates, and few cleanups. This is a classic attempt to throw good tax dollars after bad. Without meaningful reform of the program, I am not convinced that Superfund dollars are being well-spent, making it impossible for me to support this amendment.

Senator MIKULSKI offered an amendment which would have restored \$425 million in funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service. While I applaud her efforts to encourage Americans to provide more service to their communities, this program costs \$26,000 per participant per year—a level which cannot be sustained in the current budget environment.

Furthermore, I could not support funding for this program upon learning that \$14 million out of last year's AmeriCorps funds were used to fund Federal agencies. While the administration claims it is cutting staff, they are actually playing a shell game with taxpayers' dollars by using AmeriCorps workers in the Federal Government. I am confident that the original supporters of this program did not intend for these volunteers to choose Federal employment as their community service.

Forty percent of the dollars currently spent on AmeriCorps is used for administrative purposes by the Federal Government. These funds would be more efficiently and effectively spent on a local rather than a national level.

Another amendment which touched on an important social issue was the Sarbanes amendment to transfer \$360 million from section 8 contract renewals to homeless assistance grants to increase funding for Federal homeless programs. Most Americans share a common concern regarding the plight of the homeless and agree that the Government should play a role in the solution. Nevertheless, I voted against this amendment for two reasons.

First, the underlying bill provides \$760 million for homeless grants, with an additional \$297 million in homeless grants funding available from the earlier rescission bill, which deferred this funding from fiscal year 1995 to fiscal year 1996. In total, homeless programs will have \$1.057 billion to spend in fiscal year 1996. The Sarbanes amendment would not increase this funding by one penny. All the funds he proposes to transfer would not be available until fiscal year 1997. In other words, this amendment would not have helped one homeless person next year.

Second, I was concerned that an unintended consequence of this amendment would be to increase homelessness. The bill provides \$4.35 billion in funding for section 8 contract renewal. Section 8 subsidizes the construction and operation of apartment buildings,

provided the owner agrees to rent a certain percentage of those apartments to low-income people. Currently, 1.5 million units are subsidized in this fashion, and many of these contracts are due to expire. If they are not renewed, many of the tenants will lose their homes.

In order to pay for the increase in homeless funding, Senator SARBANES would have reduced funding for renewing section 8 contracts. By taking away from this account, this amendment threatens to put people currently housed under the section 8 program on the street. The Federal Government has a role to play in helping the homeless, and in this case the underlying bill fills this role by addressing the needs of people already living on the streets as well as ensuring we don't encourage additional families to join them.

Overall I believe we have produced a solid appropriations bill, one which stays within the budget limitations necessary to balance the budget by the year 2002, delegates much of the funding to States in the form of block grants so that spending is more effective, and revises or eliminates programs that simply have not been working. I was proud to support final passage of this legislation.●

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

• Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, on October 20, a letter from four former National Security Advisers was sent to the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations expressing their support for the work of the National Endowment for Democracy [NED]. According to these four distinguished experts, NED "has served our national interest well through its timely support of those who advance the cause of democracy."

As we make the difficult budgetary choices that will help guarantee for us and our children a prosperous future, it is essential that we not discard those programs—particularly those that are cost-effective—which enhance our long-term security. As the following letter from Messrs. Allen, Brzezinski, Carlucci, and Scowcroft points out, the National Endowment for Democracy is such a program.

I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD. The letter follows:

OCTOBER 20, 1995.

Hon. JESSE HELMS,
Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee Washington, DC.

Hon. BENJAMIN GILMAN,
Hon. LEE HAMILTON,
House International Relations Committee, Washington, DC.

As former National Security Advisers to the President, we are familiar with the work of the National Endowment for Democracy (NED). In our assessment, NED, established under President Reagan as an instrument in