

placed a bomb on board, but a nation-wide investigation, costing an estimated \$60-million, has left the crime still unsolved.

According to Soft Target, some senior CSIS officials and one RCMP officer eventually concluded that an Indian intelligence service was probably the real culprit. After all, a number of persons associated with the Indian government had cancelled their reservations on the doomed flight. And why did the Indian consul-general in Toronto have a near-perfect account of what happened so soon after the event?

Moreover, a similar bombing had occurred at the Madras airport in southern India about a year earlier, most probably caused by the Third agency, an Indian intelligence group created in the early eighties to win support for Indira Gandhi's government by encouraging Sikh extremists in Punjab. One group at CSIS concluded from the exclusively circumstantial evidence available that most likely the Third agency ordered the bombing, knowing that suspicion would fall on Sikhs generally and Canadian ones in particular. Another CSIS group inferred that the planting of a bomb was not authorized in New Delhi, but originated solely with local security agents.

Some Canadians became convinced that Talwinder Singh Parmar, head of a tiny extremist Sikh group based in Vancouver, the Babbar Khalsa, was the Air-India murderer. The RCMP, say Kashmeri and McAndrew, eventually decided that Parmar was an agent of the government of India. They query why, among numerous contradictions, a major financial backer of Parmar in Vancouver received a \$2 million loan from the State Bank of India (Canada). By early 1989, Parmar had disappeared, and Joe Clark finally ordered several Indian diplomats to leave. Until then, as detailed carefully in Soft Target, Clark and his officials had accommodated the Indian government repeatedly in ways that seemed to have the effect of poisoning the minds of Canadians against Sikhs.

This controversial book examines some important issues and is largely convincing. All who want Ottawa to do the correct thing for correct reasons in both domestic and foreign policy should read it.

#### IS AMERICORPS WORTH KEEPING?

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I think you will find Susan Molinari's article on AmeriCorps informative:

#### IS AMERICORPS WORTH KEEPING?

(By Susan Molinari)

Volunteerism is a tremendously American tradition. Few of us, however, would characterize a volunteer as someone who is paid (more than minimum wage) receives medical benefits and child care allowances, and gets a \$5,000 education stipend.

Welcome to the AmeriCorps world of volunteerism.

The Clinton administration's year-old AmeriCorps program is riddled with problems, not the least of which is that it's too expensive to administer. That's why the Senate followed the House's lead and voted on Tuesday to completely de-fund AmeriCorps. The government simply must stop making financial commitments it can't keep, especially when we have to rob other needed programs to do so.

#### OTHER PROGRAMS SUFFER

Despite that fact that we were able to fund the 20,000 AmeriCorps "volunteers," we could not, for instance, fully fund either the Pell Grant or the Stafford Loan program, both of which help thousands more.

For every AmeriCorps participant who got education dollars, five students could get Pell Grants. Factor in other, noneducation costs for one volunteer to participate in AmeriCorps, and the number of Pell Grants that could be funded jumps to 18.

Some of AmeriCorps' high costs are directly attributable to the way this "volunteer" program is administered. The non-partisan, independent General Accounting Office estimates that it costs \$27,000 per participant to run the program, and this figure jumps to \$33,000 when the dropout rate is factored in.

AmeriCorps' overhead, including \$2 million in payments to a public relations firm, accounts for some of the more than \$10,000-per-participant cost overruns from the \$17,000 originally estimated. More than half the cost of the program goes to pay for the bureaucrats who administer it.

According to the GAO, the price tag to the federal government for one AmeriCorps volunteer is \$15.30 per hour, including salary, health and child care benefits. This doesn't include the education stipend, training or administrative overhead. When you plug in the money cities, states and private sources kick in, the cost per hour for one volunteer's time jumps to \$19.60, again minus education stipend, training and overhead. Originally, this number was supposed to be \$6.43 per hour.

While government costs soar way over initial projections, private contributions have been much lower than expected. Rather than picking up half the costs, as was promised at the outset, private funds make up only 7% of the cost for each volunteer, the GAO now estimates.

Rather than costly new government bureaucracies, we have a better way to encourage charity and foster community spirit. For decades we have used the tax code to create just such an atmosphere, through deductions for charitable contributions. And we have a better way to fund the education of middle and lower-income students—by fully funding existing programs such as Pell Grants, to the extent resources will allow.

I admire the 20,000 young men and women who have joined AmeriCorps, as I admire the 89.2 million Americans who volunteer—without pay—their 19 billion hours worth of time each year. Trying to encourage volunteerism through a big-government approach, however, does more to encourage bureaucrats than community service.

AmeriCorps participants do worthy work, but the real substance of American-style volunteerism is proven every day by those who are willing to give their time to make others' lives better.

#### MEDICARE REFORM

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today about the subject of Medicare. It is a topic that has been in the headlines and on the news every day now for weeks. It is on the minds of almost every constituent I see. It is among the foremost issues we are addressing here in this body, and definitely, I think it

would be safe to say, is the current major concern of seniors across America.

The GOP has put out a plan to cut Medicare. Based on what is known or perhaps I should say not known in terms of legislative language being unavailable, this plan is one which it seems will have a devastating impact on the most vulnerable of Americans—senior citizens.

In a letter I received from the Families USA Foundation it spoke about how seniors will lose guaranteed health protections that they have today. It spoke about how these individuals will lose out-of-pocket health cost protections at the same time that pending proposals would double Medicare premiums. We're talking about out-of-pocket health costs which already consume more than one-fourth of seniors' incomes.

What this says to me is that something is drastically wrong—that this is not the path to pursue.

Allow me quote from a letter I received this week from a Texas senior:

As a Senior Citizen and drawing Social Security, which I earned, I would like to input my viewpoint on Medicare. I am more fortunate than some of my widow friends in the amount that I get each month, but with the price of living today it is not very much. Out of this Social Security deducts \$46.00 per month and believe me this covers very little, so in order to pay for health care I am forced to take a supplemental policy that costs me \$65.00 per month. If Congress cuts any part of this Medicare care it will force all of us to go on the county medical care for the indigent. Can you imagine what that would do to the whole country if all the people on Medicare had to go that way. Most of us have worked hard all our lives and paid our bills, but what the government has done . . . is unforgivable . . . and NOW they want to put us all on WELFARE.

This is typical of what I am hearing. People are frightened. People are scared. And rightly so.

My party is closely identified with Medicare. Democrats first conceived of Medicare and led the effort to enact the program into law. We have been its champions ever since. This program has been a success, helping to provide health care to millions of Americans who otherwise could not afford it. That is not bad as so many today would have us believe. It is good. If changes need to be made then our goal must be to work together to determine what it is we need to do that is positive and will continue to protect our Nation's seniors. That is what I am wholeheartedly committed to doing.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO INCREASE DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will restore equity and fairness in the tax treatment of the nation's small business entrepreneurs. The Self-Employed Health Fairness Act amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals to 100% of such costs.