

here because it could put them at a competitive disadvantage.

So there is some real concern in the private sector, or at least parts of the private sector that compete with the public sector, about either the assumption or the presumption that we will be funding their competitors while we are not funding them.

And so Senator LIEBERMAN and I, and some others, will be offering some amendments later on in this debate to try to address that very significant point that the Senator from Kentucky has made.

Madam President, I am going to yield the floor in just 1 minute. I would just like to, before I yield the floor—and I have many more questions that I would like to pursue with the managers of the bill as to the way in which this process works, but I understand that they wish to make a unanimous-consent request, and I do not want to totally just dominate here. I want to try to clarify this process because it is very important what we are about to undertake.

My question of the manager of the bill, the Senator from Idaho, is this: The first question I asked had to do with when was that mandate effective. What is the effective date of that mandate in my hypothetical? I am wondering whether or not we can have that answer yet.

Mr. GLENN. Might I respond to that first? I did not get in that discussion before. If I might give my view on that, it seems to me you do this a couple of ways. The committee should have some idea of how long it is going to take for a State or local community to get ready for whatever the mandate is. In other words, if it is a water system, a sewer system or whatever it is that we are dealing with, they would have an idea of how long it is going to take in advance of the requirement date, such as the Senator puts down here, the year 2005.

If there was not a time put in, it would be my opinion that you would make an estimate of how many years it would take them to comply, and our sharing of the cost of that would start at whatever that time is. In other words, if the time limit that the Senator used in his example of the year 2005, if it was going to take 3 years in advance of that, the Federal funding portion of this, or whatever we worked out on that, would take the 3 years or 4 years or whatever the estimate was that would help them comply with that, or it would be worked out with the States. You could not wait until the mandate is to go into effect, in the year 2005 in his example, you could not wait until the year 2004½ and then say, "OK, we are now going to help a little bit because their expenditures, if they are going to comply with that mandate, have to be made many times years in advance to allow them to comply."

Mr. LEVIN. That is the reason, if my friend will yield, the reason I requested this information is exactly that. If the law or the bill states that after October

1, 2005, emissions of mercury at an unsafe level will be permitted and delegates the EPA to make the determination of what level is unsafe to human health, my question is: Now you are CBO. Is there any way of knowing what is the first year that any local government will modify its incinerator? Some local governments may start in the year 1998, 2000, 2001. Does it just take a wild stab in the dark as to how many incinerators that are publicly owned will be modified in each of the 5 years up to 2005? How can it possibly make that estimate?

And if—if—the managers of this bill are saying, in that case, the effective date of that mandate is before October 1, 2005, there better be a definition in this bill—there is not now—as to how you arrive at an effective date. It just simply says "the effective date of the mandate." I think anybody reading that mandate that requires reductions of dangerous levels of mercury from incinerator emissions after October 1, 2005, would say the effective date of that is October 1, 2005.

The Senator from Ohio very correctly points out that a lot of the expenditures would have to be made in the years up to then. Absolutely. But we are triggering a point of order. We are triggering a required appropriation in order to avoid a very serious result from occurring.

The Appropriations Committees in each year, up to 2005—if my friend from Ohio is correct, which I think he is—would have to appropriate money to local governments. They have to be told how much to appropriate and they have to be told that 10 years in advance. This estimate of costs to State and local governments must be made in the authorization bill now. Someone has to figure out what is the effective date. This is not just some casual report. This triggers a point of order and a mandatory appropriation downstream in specific amounts, some of which are, again, impossible to estimate. But that is the earlier debate we had, the earlier discussion.

The question here is: If we are going to say the effective date is earlier than October 1, 2005, which is the first date that they must comply with a new mandate, if the effective date is going to be earlier than that, we better define "effective date" in this bill, because there is a lot that hangs on this. There is a point of order and there are appropriations downstream in specific amounts which must meet those estimates if certain things are going to follow.

So, again, we are not just talking about reports here. We are talking about points of order and specific appropriations that are going to be dependent on when this mandate is effective.

I thank the managers of the bill and, again, they have requested that I yield so that they can make a unanimous-consent request, and I am happy to yield the floor, but I do hope that at some point after their request, I will be

able to again seek or obtain recognition so we can pick up our colloquy at that point.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Michigan. It is very apparent that his background in local government has helped him to understand. I think we were trying to communicate together. I think there may be a way that we can resolve this, and it may be something other than what he is recommending and may be something other than what I was recommending. I think we may be able to resolve this.

Mr. President, I am going to put in a quorum call just for the purpose of notifying a Senator who may have an interest in what will be a unanimous-consent request that I will make. I ask unanimous-consent that during the quorum call, I will have the right to retain the floor so that when we lift the quorum call, I will again have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Therefore, 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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that I be allowed to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I am sorry, I cannot see the Senator.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I certainly have no reason to not allow the Senator from Maryland to proceed.

But, again based on my earlier unanimous consent, I would again ask that upon completion of her remarks that I would have the floor?

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

The Senator from Maryland?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, knowing there is important legislative work to be done on the issue of unfunded mandates, I will not take unduly the time of the U.S. Senate. However, I do wish to speak on two items, one, an unsung hero from Maryland who has just passed away and the other on the issue of national service.

SISTER MARY ADELAIDE SCHMIDT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, when we think of the word "hero," we usually think of brave men who have gone

to war, who have served their country, and indeed as in the wonderful men who fought at the Battle of the Bulge and saved western civilization. But I wish to speak about another hero, a hero by the name of Sister Mary Adelaide Schmidt, school Sister of Notre Dame who taught me in Catholic elementary school. Sister passed away in the last few days at age of 97. She was born in 1898, when we did not even have the right to vote, but she certainly knew how to empower women, empower us with the message of the gospel, empower us with the skills that we needed to make it in the world, and to know how to claim our womanly virtue and at the same time make a difference.

Sister Adelaide played a special role in my life. This booming voice that you hear on the Senate floor today was a voice that was shy about speaking up when I was in the sixth grade. The same kind of voice, low pitched, husky, that can be heard throughout the Senate Chamber, could be heard throughout the sixth grade at Sacred Heart of Jesus Elementary School. As a result, I was shy about speaking up because my voice was lower than the other girls' in the classroom, when boys voices were changing.

Sister Adelaide asked me to stay after school, brought this out in her kindly way, to have me share that with her. And then for the next couple of weeks she said, let us make sure you know how you sound and how good it is going to make you feel. She had me read poetry, she had me read passages of the Psalms, she had me read out loud from both the Bible and contemporary works of literature. By the time I finished that stretch of time I knew how to speak up; I was comfortable in doing it. Two years later I ran for class president in the eighth grade and, as Paul Harvey says, "You know the rest of the story."

So today I would like to pay tribute to Sister Mary Adelaide and the enormous sacrifice that she made with her life that made a difference in so many others', like my own. And for all of the wonderful men and women who are teachers, and teach in religious day schools: Know that you have made a difference. I believe that they are unsung heroes.

So, Mr. President, I wanted to salute Sister Mary Adelaide.

#### NATIONAL SERVICE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wanted to speak on the issue of national service. The new issue of Newsweek quotes the new Speaker of the House as unequivocally opposing national service because it is, in his words, "coerced voluntarism."

I believe the new Speaker does not understand national service or the grounding that went on behind it.

As one of the founding godmothers of this initiative, I rise this afternoon to express my dismay at yet another at-

tempt by Republican leaders to distort a bold approach to solving our country's problems.

It appears from these recent comments and others made earlier on the floor today, that some in this Congress will try to lump national service in with every other program headed for the chopping block as part of our institution's budget cutting fever.

Well, I am here today to say that national service is not a Government-run social program. And that is the point that the Speaker and some of national service's critics misunderstand.

It is not a program but a new social invention created to provide access to the American dream of higher education and to help create the ethic of service and civic obligation in today's young people.

Under national service, young Americans receive a reduction in their student debt, or a voucher for higher education, in exchange for full- or part-time community service. Service projects are driven by the choices of local nonprofits organized around one of four broad themes—public health, the environment, public safety, or education.

National service began as a concept with the Democratic Leadership Council and other Democrats like myself in the 1980's. But its purpose was not born of political gamesmanship or partisan advantage. It was designed to address two of the most pressing needs that our country faces. One, how can students pay off their student debt; and how can we create a sense of voluntarism.

The first is the issue of student indebtedness and access to higher education. Most college graduates today face their first mortgage the day they leave college—it is called their student loans. That debt often forces them to make career choices oriented strictly to getting them financially fit for duty.

Worse yet, for many the high cost of higher education simply denies them access to college at all.

By providing a post-service benefit, national service members can ease their student debt, or accrue savings that will help them go to school. It is not an entitlement, and it is not a hand out.

Educational benefits are linked to work service. Participants are eligible only when they have finished their work service commitment.

The second problem national service is designed to address is more idealistic. It is how to instill in young Americans what de Tocqueville called the habits of the heart. To address the sharp drop over the last two decades in the number of Americans who volunteer in their own communities, a fact representative of Americans disinvesting in those social institutions which helped build our country.

Bob Putnam, a Professor at Harvard, has written an article called "Bowling Alone." He says more people bowl today than a decade ago but few belong

to bowling leagues. So, Senator MIKULSKI, what does that have to do with national service?

The point is bowling alone is a metaphor for the way Americans have come to view civic involvement and citizenship. There has been an absolute decline in developing community involvement. People have less time available because many households have two wage earners instead of one. They are more mobile. We have a society that is more influenced by TV. And they are also less committed. There is a serious lack of a sense of civic obligation.

Fewer people attend PTA, groups like Red Cross and the Boy Scouts have fewer volunteers.

My point in saying this is that national service is an idea that promotes exactly the values that the Republican leader wishes to instill. The fact that we should not rely on Government, that there should be a role for non-profit organizations, that there should be for every opportunity, an obligation; for every right, a responsibility. And that is what national service is about. It is not coercive. Nobody is forced to get into the national service program. But I will tell you what they do. Their lives are significantly changed by it and their communities are significantly changed by it.

Young American men no longer have the shared experience of military service that served for the men of my generation as a rite of passage into adulthood. Where they learned that there was more to being a good citizen than just staying out of trouble. That instead, civic responsibility meant uniting with people of all different walks of life for a common purpose to help people help themselves; to be part of an American effort bigger than themselves.

National service is the latest in a long series of social inventions we have created to help provide access to higher education. We created night schools to teach immigrants English. We created the GI bill for returning veterans, and we invented community colleges to bring higher education close to home at a modest cost.

The argument that national service is coerced voluntarism is a knee-jerk statement that belies the facts. I chaired the Appropriations Subcommittee which has funded national service in the past. In the first 2 years of the Clinton administration, no one coerced anyone to participate. Instead, people were knocking down the doors to join.

Two facts make this point. First of all, there are more people who want to participate than there are opportunities.

In national service's first 2 years, about 1,500 organizations applied for funds. Only 300 were selected because of lack of funds. That is a selection rate of just 20 percent—a lower selection rate than peer-reviewed research grants at either the National Science