

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Cabinet Affairs

Series/Staff Member: LeeAnn Inadomi

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 7257

FolderID:

Folder Title:
National Service

Stack:

S

Row:

24

Section:

1

Shelf:

5

Position:

2

January 11, 1996

To: Harris Wofford
LeeAnn Inadomi

From: Susan Stroud

Re: Office of Federal Partnerships and Special Programs

I want to provide you with a briefing memo about the functions of the Office of Federal Partnerships and Special Programs to provide some background for our discussion today.

Primary Focus:

The Office of Federal Partnerships serves as a liaison with other federal agencies. OFP currently works with 15 federal agencies on a regular basis. We draw the resources from federal agencies to support national service programs. Liaison efforts include:

- 1) partnership development with federal agencies
- 2) serving as the liaison for the Corporation with the White House policy offices (Domestic Policy Council, National Economic Council and the Vice President's office) and Cabinet
- 3) providing a link to the federal agencies and departments for public affairs and public liaison activities
- 4) representing the Corporation on Interagency Task Forces
- 5) serving as a liaison for international requests for information, hosting foreign delegations and developing international collaborations
- 6) developing special projects like affinity groups and the speakers series

The OFP team manages the following partnerships:

- Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities
- COPS (Community Oriented Policing Services), Department of Justice.
- VAWA (Violence Against Women Act), Department of Justice.
- CII (Childhood Immunization Initiative), Department of Health and Human Services.
- SHP (Supportive Housing Program), Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- US/South Africa Binational Commission
- Mentoring efforts
- Teen Pregnancy and Welfare Reform White House initiatives

The OFP team works with federal agencies in response to media inquiries, Congressional testimony, public affairs events, cabinet and White House events. The team monitors Congressional activity relating to national service.

The Office of Federal Partnerships represents the Corporation on the White House Domestic Policy Council and works with staff at the National Economic Council on domestic policy initiatives.

In addition to staffing White House policy group, OFP represents the Corporation on a number of interagency groups.

These groups include:

- President's Council on Economic Sustainability.
- President's Crime Prevention Council.
- Attorney General's Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council.
- Interagency Group on Veterans.
- Interagency Council on Homelessness.
- White House Group on Welfare Reform.
- White House Group on Historically Black Colleges and Universities.
- White House Group on Urban Policy.
- White House Working Group on Youth Development.
- White House Group on Environmental Justice.
- White House Group on Urban Policy.
- Community Empowerment Board.
- US/South Africa Binational Commission.
- President's Council on Hispanic Excellence in Education.
- Interagency Group on Native American Affairs.
- Interagency Group on HIV/AIDS.

In 1996 the OFP team will focus on developing federal agency partnerships. These partnerships will pull together resources from the federal agencies as well as the support from the private sector. We will develop partnerships that will be managed by national non-profits and will draw on the technical assistance and expertise of federal agencies. For example, we will identify a national non-profit, such as the Red Cross, which could manage immunization programs that receive federal funds from HHS. In addition, we will recruit private sector partners such as Rotary International and the Junior League. We will continue the development of partnerships on the Childhood Immunization Initiative, Violence Against Women, Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities, Supportive Housing, Community Policing and Mentoring.

Upon review and approval by senior staff, the OFP team will develop a limited number of partnerships that will involve federal agency participation in addition to private sector and foundation support. These new partnerships may include a teen pregnancy prevention and welfare reform partnership with HHS and Education; a partnership on literacy with the Department of Education; a partnership with USDA, Interior and EPA on natural resources; a partnership on EZ/EC's with USDA and HUD; a partnership with Defense on base closure and environmental restoration; and, a partnership on youth violence prevention with the Department of Justice.

In addition to developing these partnerships with federal agencies, the OFP staff will continue to work on special projects that benefit the Corporation as a whole. These programs include the speaker's series, affinity groups on the Corporation's issue areas, issue forums and policy seminars.

Staff will continue to make contact with foreign governments and private organizations that wish to develop national service programs. Delegations from two dozen countries have met with Corporation staff in the past year. Information and correspondence are exchanged with nations that have either implemented a national service program, or are in the planning stage. On-going relationships have been formed with Canada, South Africa, Italy and the European Union.

The Office of Federal Partnerships is interested in broadening our reach beyond federal agencies. The OFP team will develop closer relationships across the Corporation's

programs, especially to develop partnerships with Learn and Serve and the Senior Corps. Many of our partnerships already utilize AmeriCorps*VISTA resources. The Supportive Housing Program will access AmeriCorps*VISTAs, the Childhood Immunization Initiative uses AmeriCorps*VISTAs, as will the COPS and VAWA programs.

In the next year, the OFP team will work more closely with the Senior Corps to develop program utilizing senior service participants. Foster Grandparents and RSVPs could be used in many of our federal partnerships.

11 Fed Agencies give out \$ for AmeriCorps Programs.
Partnership agreements

BusinessWeek

Government

COMMUNITY SERVICE

A SOCIAL PROGRAM CEOs WANT TO SAVE

AmeriCorps has the passionate support of even GOP execs

It's not like Erie Chapman to defend a federal do-gooder program. After all, he's a CEO, a loyal Republican, and a fundraiser for House Budget Committee Chairman John Kasich (R-Ohio), leader of the GOP budget-cutting effort. Yet the head of Columbus-based U.S. Health Corp. says Kasich is wrong to target President Clinton's national service program, AmeriCorps, for extinction.

U.S. Health has pledged \$150,000 over three years to City Year, a nonprofit that sends AmeriCorps members to work at community projects in Columbus and five other cities nationwide. Chapman argues that AmeriCorps will recoup more than its \$376 million cost this year by giving youths skills to become productive adults. He has even protested the planned cuts at a Washington press conference and congressional hearing. "It's tragic to cut these programs," he says. "Why shoot a bunch of innocent kids just to get at the President?"

CALLS AND LETTERS. Chapman has plenty of company among execs lobbying their Republican pals to save Clinton's pet program. Since AmeriCorps' creation by Congress in 1993, corporations have ponied up cash, equipment, and employee volunteers to help 20,000 young adults aged 18 to 25 perform services that range from rehabbing low-income housing to cleaning up rivers. A list of donors reads like a who's who of Corpo-



TUTORING IN NEWLAND: Atlanta's Home Depot is giving \$125,000

rate America: BellSouth, Microsoft, NationsBank, Procter & Gamble, and American Express—to name a few.

It's no accident that execs find the project appealing. Unlike most bureaucratic social programs, AmeriCorps tries to operate like a business. It's run by a nonprofit company—the Corporation for National Service—rather than a federal agency. Moreover, the process of choosing the 350 service programs that are assigned to AmeriCorps participants is competitive. Thousands of local groups

submit proposals—with goals and concrete ways to measure success—and state boards pick the winners.

Besides, business is already intimately involved in the program. By law, non-government sources—usually businesses—must pay at least 25% of operational costs and 15% of the \$7,200 stipend each AmeriCorps member gets for a year of service. Participants also get a \$4,725 education grant at the end of service. Says Eli J. Segal, the former exec who heads AmeriCorps: "This translates into the kind of business buy-in that other

federal programs have not had."

MORE BANG. CEOs particularly like the way AmeriCorps' pool of full-time, community-service workers allows them to leverage their own charitable efforts. Timberland Co., for example, says AmeriCorps participation was key to its five-year pledge of \$5 million in cash and equipment to City Year, whose youths nationwide are dressed in Timberland outfits. "As the program gets bigger, our investment goes further," explains Ken Freitas, vice-presi-

dent for community enterprise.

To save AmeriCorps from the GOP budget scalpel, corporate chiefs ranging from Shell Oil's Philip J. Carroll to Anheuser-Busch's August A. Busch III have written letters to Capitol Hill lawmakers. Tenneco Gas's Steve Chesebro not only sent letters to his two Republican senators—Texans Phil Gramm and Kay Bailey Hutchison—but lobbied other Houston CEOs to kick in money for the local AmeriCorps program. "We didn't say that we liked big government

or that government should take care of this through handouts," he says. "We have seen that this is productive and proven."

Home Depot CEO Bernard Marcus has written to two dozen lawmakers, including House Speaker Newt Gingrich, who represents a district in the company's home state of Georgia. One of Home Depot's favorite programs is Hands-On

AMERICORPS' CORPORATE FRIENDS

Corporate America has been a big backer of programs using AmeriCorps members. Among the supporters:

GENERAL ELECTRIC Contributed \$250,000 to 11 United Way chapters for projects, including literacy training and food pantries.

TENNECO GAS Has given \$35,000, plus printing and accounting services, to Serve Houston Youth Corps, an AmeriCorps affiliate.

NIKE Promised \$150,000 for programs in six cities to set up fitness-oriented projects, such as sports leagues and renovating playgrounds.

FANNIE MAE Gave \$100,000 to three housing groups to train AmeriCorps members to counsel low-income renters on homeownership.

DATA: AMERICORPS

Atlanta, a clearinghouse for volunteers. The company had already given \$10,000 a year to the group, but with AmeriCorps involvement, Home Depot has expanded its support by \$125,000 over three years. Now, 65 AmeriCorps members are aides in three urban schools—a program not possible with the nonprofit group's part-time volunteers. Why is Home Depot so interested? "We need people to hire," says Suzanne Apple, director of community affairs. "This program will help build self-sufficiency, self-esteem, and the leaders of tomorrow."

One of those future leaders may be 27-year-old Paul P. Promadhat, a computer aide in a Harlem elementary school. As part of his AmeriCorps-backed training, he works at Project First, a program designed by IBM and the nonprofit Public Education Fund Network. Big Blue gives \$100,000 in computers and cash and provides retirees to train aides. When his AmeriCorps stint ends in July, Promadhat hopes the school system will hire him full time as a computer troubleshooter. "This gave me an opportunity to do something I believe in," he says.

OUT FOR BLOOD? So far, such testimonials haven't moved Republicans, who seem bent on destroying the Clinton program. There may be more than money at stake: Killing AmeriCorps would yield under 1% of the more than \$1 trillion in savings the GOP needs to balance the budget by 2002, but it would be a big slap at the President. Budget Chairman Kasich denies that the GOP attacks are aimed at Clinton. "It's a matter of policy, not politics," he says. "The AmeriCorps program is expensive, inefficient, and top-heavy with bureaucracy."

AmeriCorps' opponents argue that young people should volunteer for community service without getting stipends and that the program's per-member cost is an inefficient \$30,000. "When we're cutting basic welfare to the poor, Medicare, and Head Start, you can't sustain the argument for funding AmeriCorps," says John P. Walters, president of the New Citizenship Project, a conservative policy group.

AmeriCorps officials say the program costs closer to \$18,000 per member—about 33,000 youths are expected to take part next year at a federal cost of \$575 million. And a new study by professors at the universities of Michigan and Iowa finds that each dollar spent on the program reaps \$2.60 in reduced welfare costs, increased earnings, and other benefits. With returns like that, many CEOs aren't ready to throw in the towel. So this may yet be one do-gooder program the Republicans spare.

By Susan B. Garland in Washington, with Mary Beth Regan

September 7, 1995

**SENATE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCE COMMITTEE
CONFIRMATION HEARING**

Opening Statement by Harris Wofford

Nominee as Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National Service

It's good to be back -- although not the way I intended.

It's obvious I wasn't one of your colleagues to leave the Senate of his own volition. Nor one to depart on notes of pessimism and pent-up frustration. Serving with you was the high point of my life -- so far. In this respect I want to associate myself with the moving statement on Tuesday by Senator Pell. Someone said I didn't stay in the Senate long enough to be disillusioned. You can't say that about Claiborne Pell.

I left the Senate with respect for the institution, for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and especially for the work of this Committee. I enjoyed our work together -- the many times we found common ground and produced constructive legislation, and even the times we had to take our disagreements to the floor.

That said, many of you will agree with me that we often make too much of our disagreements, and that in American politics generally -- not just in Washington -- we get caught up in a spirit of partisanship that makes it hard to use common sense to find the common ground for the common good.

War was said to be the extension of politics by other means. American politics is in danger of becoming the perpetual extension of political warfare by any means.

One of the possible victims of this over-partisanship is the Corporation for National Service. At a time of peril to the promise it represents, I am honored to be nominated by the President to be the Corporation's second Chief Executive Officer. I want to give you some reasons I hope you will recommend my confirmation -- and, more importantly, reasons for us to work together to see that we do not make the tragic mistake of throwing away the very seed corn this nation most needs.

The Chairman and those of you who were here as this Committee carefully worked out the provisions of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 know how deeply I am committed to the idea embodied in that bill -- and in its predecessor bill, the first National and Community Service Act, of 1990, signed into law by President Bush.

You've heard me tell how President Kennedy on the White House lawn in 1961 -- after sending off one of the first batches of Peace Corps volunteers -- turned to several of us who were helping Sargent Shriver and said: "The logic of this idea is that someday we will bring it home to America."

Thanks in good part to the work of this Committee, that day has come. But it has not come in the form Kennedy would have imagined.

One reason the national service legislation of 1990 and 1993 stands out in this Committee's long record of bipartisan achievement is that it does not go back to the Sixties and do it as we probably would have done then.

The Corporation for National Service is not a centralized domestic Peace Corps. It is a decentralized, diversified, market-driven, public-private partnership, based in the independent sector. To be sure, it draws on the spirit of the Peace Corps and of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s and the G.I. Bill of the 1940s. But it is an innovation true to the best insights of the 1990s. It goes beyond reinventing government because it primarily goes beyond government to release the power of people.

If key aspects of the Welfare State are to be dismantled and the career bureaucracy of federal, state and local governments greatly reduced, the problems of education, neighborhood safety, health, and the environment will all remain. The challenge will be to find alternative and more effective ways to deal with these problems.

So to those who are disillusioned with government at all levels and want to galvanize citizens to do what urgently needs doing, decentralized national service is the most promising way of getting things done. Through effective citizen service on an expanding scale I believe we can crack the atom of civic indifference. That must be our aim: to split the atom of citizens' cynicism -- and release the constructive power of people to work together to solve some of our communities' most pressing problems.

And to those who are rightly concerned that at the root of so many of our problems in America is a matter of values -- a lack of self-discipline and loss of civic responsibility, especially among young people -- national service offers a proven, strong response.

If you had been with me on recent visits to see service in action in four states, you would see how this challenge is being met by the 20,000 AmeriCorps members, including about 4,000 VISTAs and some 800 members of the new National Civilian Community Corps -- and by the hundreds of thousands of members of the National Senior Service Corps and the Learn and Serve school-based student service programs.

In San Diego at the Navy Training Center and outside Denver at the Lowry Air Force Base, I listened to the first graduates of the National Civilian Community Corps (AmeriCorps*NCCC) proudly tell what they had accomplished, and how it had changed their lives. I could see why Roosevelt considered the CCC of old as the best thing he had done, and why so many Americans consider it the best investment this country made in the Great Depression.

In Philadelphia I saw how full-time AmeriCorps members assigned to Habitat for Humanity and living in the community in North Philadelphia had turned that program from primarily a weekend project by volunteers coming in from the suburbs into an all-week effort enlisting students in the nearby schools and adult volunteers from the neighborhood -- and increasing the number of homes renovated.

So you see I'm committed. Let me assure you that simultaneously I'll be critical -- and that I will welcome your help in looking critically at the progress made in year one as well as at the challenges and difficulties encountered.

All of us should salute Eli Segal and the Corporation staff for accomplishing so much so quickly, and so well. They will be the first to tell you where improvements can be made. Indeed, the Corporation may be the most self-critical entity I've ever been a part of -- and it needs to remain that way as an impetus for continuously improved quality.

The key to understanding and appraising the Corporation is the extraordinary decentralization mandated by Congress. Look at its diverse scope: the Learn and Serve America program for K-12 school-based service goes through 50 state education agencies; the assistance to student service in higher education goes through hundreds of colleges and universities; the Senior Service Corps operates through three long-established agencies, the Retired Senior Volunteer Corps, Foster Grandparents and Senior Companions; AmeriCorps*USA has two-thirds of its assignments in some 400 programs going through Governor-appointed bi-partisan commissions in all the states; and there are 700 locations for the Volunteers in Service to America -- AmeriCorps*VISTA; and scores of local projects of the 800-strong National Civilian Community Corps -- AmeriCorps*NCCC -- based in four centers.

In any large venture like this, in the public as in the private sector, mistakes and disappointments will be inevitable. In the necessary process of trial and error, we must be especially alert to discover what isn't working -- or working well enough -- and respond rapidly. But we should also discover the successes because they need to be spread and made contagious. As both President Bush and President Clinton like to say, somewhere in America there is a solution to every problem. Pilot programs that work need to perform the function of a pilot -- to ignite the whole furnace. Points of light need to become communities of light.

I hope you will help us with this crucial function of evaluation and reporting. In the Peace Corps, overseas programs were faraway and seldom under first-hand Congressional scrutiny. We had to hire investigative journalists to go and do in-depth visits. That's how Charlie Peters of the Washington Monthly got his big start -- and helped the Peace Corps get off to a good start.

We will ask you and your state staffs to help us locate the things that need fixing and help us highlight programs that work with distinction. I hope you will develop ways yourselves to recognize the successful examples of national and community service in your states, perhaps with your own Senatorial awards.

As you move into hearings and discussions on reauthorization later this year or early in 1996 I look forward to working with you and with your colleagues in the House, so that we build on the strengths, overcome the weaknesses, and make any necessary mid-course corrections.

Let me note three of the critical questions that are on my list of priorities:

First, how do we get national service established in the public mind as a non-partisan institution in which the American people can all take pride? How do we prevent it from becoming a casualty of the coming presidential campaign?

The Peace Corps initially faced many of the criticisms now made of the Corporation. It was viewed as Kennedy's prized baby. It was ridiculed and attacked by both President Eisenhower and candidate Nixon, but by the time Nixon became President, the Peace Corps had proved itself and stood on a solid non-partisan base. It's interesting to note that over the years, in the House unlike the Senate, the majority of members who were Peace Corps Volunteers have been Republican, including one of the foremost champions of national service now, Representative Chris Shays of Connecticut.

The Chairman knows that at age ten I became a Democrat and wouldn't ride to school in my Republican family's car because it carried an Alf Landon Kansas sunflower 1936 campaign sticker. She says her father would have enjoyed that story. Remembering the non-partisan spirit in which Alf Landon dealt with many of our controversial issues in his later years, I want the Chairman and all my Republican colleagues to know that my party partisanship has ended for the duration of my responsibilities in the Corporation for National Service.

After Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt said that until then he had been known as Dr. New Deal but that from December 7, 1941 until victory he would be, heart and soul, Dr. Win-the-War. In this job my heart and soul will be focused on securing the non-partisan standing that national service requires.

President Clinton has called this a defining idea for our era. But it isn't the property of any one President or party. A number of national service supporters in the House of Representatives have written that this is essentially a Republican and conservative idea. But this isn't a Democratic or Republican, a conservative or liberal idea. One of the books most eloquently advocating national service, in his own strong way, is Bill Buckley's Gratitude: Reflections on the Debt We Owe Our Country. And it is George Bush, whose Points of Light initiative is an important part of the national service effort, who keeps urging us to make service part of the definition of a successful life in America.

Some years ago, in his first Presidential campaign, Senator Dole advanced the idea of national service, and in 1992 when Senator Boren and I initiated the proposal for a National Community Civilian Corps Senator Dole helped us persuade President Bush to sign it. That bill was supported by Senators Warner, Domenici, McCain and Nunn, as well as Senators Kennedy, Mikulski and Simon of this Committee. One of the most persuasive letters supporting the 1993 National Service Act came from Elizabeth Dole on behalf of the American Red Cross. I greatly appreciated the co-sponsorship of the 1993 Act by my senior Republican colleague, Senator Specter -- along with Senators Jeffords and Durenberger of this Committee -- and the further support from other Senators of both parties. And some of the strongest statements of support for AmeriCorps programs have come from Republican governors, who now are responsible for the Commissions on National Service in a majority of the states.

We must build on this bi-partisan -- indeed, non-partisan -- beginning.

A second critical concern is the relationship between the new AmeriCorps and the various other parts of the Corporation for National Service -- VISTA, the NCCC, the Learn and Serve K-12 and the college and university student volunteer programs, and the three senior programs.

With the recent birth of a new grandchild I've just seen what happens with the older brothers and sisters when a new baby arrives. The other siblings tend to be neglected -- or to feel neglected. The organization of AmeriCorps was a consuming task-- in just one year reaching a scale the Peace Corps never reached (it took the Peace Corps about four years to field 15,000 volunteers). While accomplishing that feat, the Corporation was also working to bring the whole family of service together in a common cause, but more needs to be done to achieve that goal.

If confirmed, I will give more emphasis to these other parts of the Corporation, and especially to the school-based service learning programs and the senior programs, not so much because of their feelings but because of their great potential.

If we want service to be the common expectation and common experience of all citizens, as Governor Robert Casey put it in creating his Office of Citizen Service which I chaired, the place to

begin is in school. It takes time and skill and dedication by teachers and administrators to incorporate service in the curriculum or develop volunteer service as a vital extracurricular activity. Students do not need to be paid for part-time volunteering after school and on weekends. But school-by-school, and college-by-college, their service must be well-organized. That is a challenge which needs to be presented more directly and effectively to hundreds of thousands of educators so that millions of students can become engaged.

Similarly, if we want to move toward the goal of making service the expectation and experience of every retired person, the Retired Senior Volunteer Program, Foster Grandparents and Senior Companions need to be supported and strengthened. Together with the independent organizations representing these programs, we must take new steps to mobilize the untapped potential for service of millions of older citizens -- and by the year 2000 to reach the goal set by the White House Conference on Aging of at least one million regular senior volunteers. One's later years, like the earlier period after high school or college before undertaking a full-time career, is a period when people can dedicate a large part of their time to service. And seniors bring to service what no other age group can boast: a lifetime of practical experience and community connection.

The links between these programs of the young and the old are themselves full of potential. Working in or with schools, AmeriCorps members can become key organizers of student after-school or weekend volunteering. Intergenerational programs have proved themselves when seniors mentor or tutor the young, and the young help seniors to live independent or happier lives. We should aim for a pincers movement between young and old volunteers, closing in on some of our hardest problems.

A third special challenge is the relationship between all of the Corporation's programs and the much larger family of non-profit charitable and service organizations and volunteer programs who may not yet have any direct connection with the Corporation.

In accepting the Republican nomination for President in 1980, Ronald Reagan said, "Let us pledge to restore, in our time, the American spirit of voluntary service, of cooperation, of private and community initiative; a spirit that flows like a deep and mighty river through the history of our nation."

Above all, we should expect the Corporation for National Service to play a vital part in deepening and making far more mighty that river. Some contend that there's a contradiction between the part-time volunteer service of the customary unpaid kind in the vast range of non-profit agencies and stipended service by full-time AmeriCorps members. That makes no sense. Full-time and part-time service complement each other.

Leaders of many non-profit volunteer organizations and charities, from Habitat for

Humanity to the Multiple Sclerosis Society, from the YMCA and YWCA to the Junior League and the American Red Cross have raised their voices in support of the great value of the service of full-time corps members. They see the sustained daily leadership of AmeriCorps members as a multiplier for the enlistment and effective utilization of part-time, unpaid volunteers. And they see the intensity of the full-time experience as instilling "habits of the heart" that will lead to an increase in the lifetime volunteering of many citizens.

Already a substantial portion of AmeriCorps assignments are directly geared to enlisting and organizing the volunteer service of others. In future planning I think the Corporation should give a higher priority to AmeriCorps assignments that focus on expanding the service of such unpaid part-time community volunteers.

Finally, there's a question I want to put to leaders of major corporations, foundations, and educational and non-profit organizations. Shouldn't we aim, over time, to become less of a government corporation and more of a trust of the American people, chartered by Congress, like the American Red Cross, but not controlled by the government?

To what extent can the private and independent institutions, including colleges and universities, and also units of state and local government such as schools and police forces contribute more of the resources and assume even more of the responsibility?

Those are questions on which I would like your thoughts as well as the guidance of an in-depth study by some of the leaders of our private, independent, educational and civic sectors.

There is one person missing here, whom I expected to be at my side and to be a key partner in the next stage of the Corporation -- George Romney. When word got out about my nomination, the first call came from George Romney, whose last 25 years since he left the politics of politics was devoted to a politics of service. He asked to come and see me, to discuss the future strategy for national service, the Corporation and the Points of Light Foundation which he helped lead. I would have gladly gone to Michigan to see him, but we had a good, long first meeting here, followed by two more.

He then offered to make once-a-week visits to Congress for as long as it took, to assure the Corporation enough of a budget to continue without cutbacks, to help keep national service from becoming a political football in the Presidential campaign, and to work together with open minds in a successful process of reauthorization.

I can say that we were in accord on all of the points I've presented today.

I know George talked with the Chairman about some of his thoughts on reauthorization and he may have spoken to others of you. His last mission was to see Senator Hatch. Afterwards, Bob Goodwin, the new President of the Points of Light Foundation, and I went over some memoranda

George had written on how to get national service on a solid non-partisan footing, how to make AmeriCorps service more of an integral, multiplying factor in the whole independent volunteer sector, and how to engage the Points of Light Foundation, with George Bush as its new honorary chairman, as a key partner in reaching out to the world of community volunteering. In the reauthorization George hoped the name of the Act would be changed to the National Service and Community Volunteering Act.

As we walked out of Senator Hatch's office, we invited George to share a cab. No, he said, not in a city with good public transportation -- he took the Metro when he could. That's how far he had strayed from American Motors. At 88, on just about the hottest afternoon of the summer, he was going to walk over to Union Station for a Metro to the Airport. Bob and I went with him as far as Metro Center. The next Monday, en route to a national service meeting in Crystal City I naturally took the Metro -- in George Romney's honor. Two days later he died while doing his morning exercises.

At his funeral his son Mitt said that as a boy his father never succumbed to the childhood diseases of mumps, measles and chicken pox; and that as a man George Romney never succumbed to the adult diseases of indifference, inertia and cynicism.

His wife Lenore wanted me to know that George had been "thrilled" by our new partnership and by the prospects ahead. "He told me he wrote down on paper all the things you should do." She asked pointedly, "Do you have that list and are you going to do it all?"

I have George's papers, and I'm going to try to the best of my ability to carry on his legacy. I tell this story not just to indicate how much his loss meant, but to say that what national service needs -- what I will certainly need if confirmed as the CEO of the Corporation -- is partners like George Romney. I look forward to that kind of partnership with this Committee.

Governors' Excerpts on National Service

"Governors of both parties that I've spoken with have shared my enthusiasm for getting behind President Clinton and Eli Segal on National Service programs like City Year. City Year is the classic N.G.A. program—regardless of party, it's something we can call a good thing."

*—Remarks by Governor William Weld (Massachusetts) (R)
National Governor's Association
July 17, 1994*

"Today is a great day for service in Michigan—the kick-off for Michigan's AmeriCorps. Soon members of Michigan's AmeriCorps will be getting things done to meet the important needs of our communities, demonstrating that our greatest resource remains our people. AmeriCorps captures the promise found in all citizens, young and old, who see problems in their communities and work together to solve them. . . . You have come together, as have others in communities across the country, in the true spirit of service. Today, we celebrate the beginning of AmeriCorps and reaffirm traditions that we hold so dearly in Michigan—community, volunteerism, and service to others."

*—Remarks by Governor John Engler (Michigan) (R)
to Michigan's AmeriCorps Members
September 12, 1994*

"AmeriCorps USA, California's new national service program, is another significant part of the state's service movement. In California alone there are over 2500 AmeriCorps members, engaged in service,—who will be doing a wide range of work, from reducing juvenile crime, and providing service participants valuable skills and experience to encouraging adult and youth role models to mentor and tutor students at risk of dropping out of school or academic failure and encouraging preventive approaches to meeting unmet human needs."

*—Letter from Governor Pete Wilson (California) (R)
to Attendees at California Conference on Service
and Volunteerism
January 26, 1995*

"While balancing the budgets, fighting unfunded mandates, and streamlining government, I am committed to this community service program for Montana communities and citizens. If we can be as creative and constructive with other federal dollars in Montana as we are with our community service efforts, Montanans will inevitably win."

*—Letter from Governor Marc Racicot (Montana) (P)
to State Rep. Dick Green
February 24, 1995*

"North Carolina is proud to host a wide range of national service programs in more than three fourths of our 100 counties. Already, AmeriCorps programs are having a tremendous impact on communities across our state because they provide service at the local level, where real change can happen."

"Our AmeriCorps members are tutoring children, creating new after-school enrichment programs, teaching adults to read, caring for the elderly, constructing affordable housing and working in day care centers. They have brought volunteers who would not otherwise be involved to work in AmeriCorps programs."

"The success of AmeriCorps in North Carolina has relied on the input and commitment of citizens who have worked together at the local level to create programs that address our state's most pressing needs. Community organizations, schools, civic groups, volunteers, government agencies and business leaders are involved in developing solutions that really work. Citizens and elected officials across the political spectrum have shown support for national service as an ideal way to get things done in the state."

*—Letter from Governor James Hunt (North Carolina) (D)
to Eli J. Segal
March 21, 1995*

"During these tight budgetary times, we must carefully consider the total impact of each dollar we spend. The AmeriCorps program represents an investment in our young people and in our communities that not only provides immediate benefits but will also pay huge dividends in the future. It harnesses old-fashioned citizen power and focuses on the roots of fundamental societal problems. AmeriCorps has made a tremendous difference in Kentucky in a very short time. It is one of the most creative, innovative and successful federally funded programs operating today."

*—Statement from Governor Brereton Jones (Kentucky) (D)
March 23, 1995*

"I continue to be extremely pleased with the way our State Commission for National and Community Service has been able to support and expand AmeriCorps projects. . . . I also believe we are off to an excellent start in this new federal-state partnership where local decision making can have an impact. The President is to be commended for providing the vision for National Service which permits Governors through the State Commission the ability to design programs which address critical state needs."

*—Letter from Governor Mike Lowry (Washington) (D)
to Eli J. Segal
April 27, 1995*

"I am enthusiastic and impressed with the work of the AmeriCorps programs in Arizona. . . . AmeriCorps is not government as usual, but rather an investment in local programs — building public/private partnerships and delivering measurable, tangible results."

*—Letter from Governor Fife Symington (Arizona) (R)
to Mr. Richard H. Carter, Executive Director
Border Volunteer Corps
May 9, 1995*

"Growing out of federal legislation initiated in the Bush Administration, today's national service programs are a truly non-partisan effort that has had a demonstrable effect on the quality of life in Rhode Island. We are proud of our AmeriCorps programs—City Year, Children's Crusade and Community Partnership—and their committed members of all ages who are working every day in community service programs to assist their fellow citizens."

*—Statement from Governor Lincoln Almond (R)
(Rhode Island)
June 6, 1995*

"The new national service effort — AmeriCorps — has only existed a short time, but we believe it can be a valued partner with communities and volunteers working to meet local needs in Chicago and across Illinois. It, along with another Corporation for National Service initiative — Learn and Serve America — is a needed and potentially valuable member of our community service network. . . . Our Commission on Community Service will do all it can to make sure the Corporation for National Service programs are effective as they continue to work to enhance the structure of service throughout Illinois. We welcome your participation and leadership as all Americans are challenged to take an active role in strengthening their communities from the grass roots upward."

*—Letter from Governor Jim Edgar (Illinois) (R)
to Eli J. Segal
June 2, 1995*

"The National Service program has been a great success in the State of New Hampshire and I anticipate it will continue to be in the future. The growth and prosperity of the AmeriCorps program in New Hampshire is directly related to the outstanding commitment of our volunteers, as well as our State Commission on National Service. These motivated individuals make AmeriCorps work for New Hampshire and I am pleased to be a partner in this process."

*—Letter from Governor Stephen Merrill (R)
(New Hampshire)
to Eli J. Segal
July 10, 1995*

*** NAYS (21) *****
DEMOCRATS (1)
Kerrey B (NE)

INDEPENDENTS (0)

REPUBLICANS (20)

Armstrong W (CO)	Helms J (NC)	Nickles D (OK)
Boschwitz R (MN)	Humphrey G (NH)	Roth W (DE)
Coats D (IN)	Kassebaum N (KS)	Rudman W (NH)
Garn J (UT)	Lott T (MS)	Symms S (ID)
Gorton S (WA)	Mack C (FL)	Thurmond S (SC)
Gramm P (TX)	McCain J (AZ)	Wallop M (WY)
Grassley C (IA)	McClure J (ID)	

*** NOT VOTING (4) *****
DEMOCRATS (2)
Exon J (NE) ? Kerry J (MA) +

INDEPENDENTS (0)

REPUBLICANS (2)
Hatfield M (OR) + Stevens T (AK) ?

KEY -- Special Categories of Not Voting

# Paired For	X Paired Against
+ Announced For	- Announced Against
P Voted Present	C Voted Present to avoid possible conflict of interest.

S Speaker exercised discretion not to vote
? Did not vote or make position known

H2J

13 of 13 items CQ's WASHINGTON ALERT 10/25/94

0m ** 1990 CQ HOUSE VOTE 512 ** 7mS14300m. National and Community Service Act - Conference Report. Adoption of the conference report (thus clearing the measure for the president) on the bill to authorize grants to states and localities to encourage community service; create or expand Youth Service Corps; authorize demonstration national service programs offering post-service vouchers for education and housing; and authorize a Points of Light Foundation to coordinate and foster volunteerism. Adopted 235-186: R 22-145; D 213-41 (ND 159-14, SD 54-27), Oct. 24, 1990. A "nay" was a vote supporting the president's position. (Story, 1990 Weekly Report p. 3614)

0m Item Key: 6468

*** YEAS (235) *****

DEMOCRATS (213)

Ackerman G (NY)	Frost M (TX)	Oberstar J (MN)
Alexander B (AR)	Gaydos J (PA)	Obey D (WI)
Anderson G (CA)	Gejdenson S (CT)	Ortiz S (TX)
Andrews M (TX)	Gephardt R (MO)	Owens M (NY)
Annunzio F (IL)	Gibbons S (FL)	Owens W (UT)
Anthony B (AR)	Gonzalez H (TX)	Pallone F (NJ)
Applegate D (OH)	Gordon B (TN)	Panetta L (CA)
Aspin L (WI)	Gray W (PA)	Payne D (NJ)
Atkins C (MA)	Hall T (OH)	Pease D (OH)
AuCoin L (OR)	Hamilton L (IN)	Pelosi N (CA)
Bates J (CA)	Harris C (AL)	Perkins C (KY)
Beilenson A (CA)	Hawkins A (CA)	Pickett O (VA)
Berman H (CA)	Hayes C (IL)	Pickle J (TX)
Bevill T (AL)	Hefner W (NC)	Poshard G (IL)
Bilbray J (NV)	Hertel D (MI)	Price D (NC)
Boggs L (LA)	Hoagland P (NE)	Rahall N (WV)
Bonior D (MI)	Hochbrueckner G (NY)	Rangel C (NY)
Borski R (PA)	Hoyer S (MD)	Richardson B (NM)
Bosco D (CA)	Jacobs A (IN)	Roe R (NJ)
Boucher R (VA)	Johnson T (SD)	Rose C (NC)
Boxer B (CA)	Johnston H (FL)	Rostenkowski D (IL)
Brennan J (ME)	Jones W (NC)	Rowland J (GA)
Brooks J (TX)	Jontz J (IN)	Roybal E (CA)
Browder G (AL)	Kastenmeier R (WI)	Russo M (IL)
Brown G (CA)	Kennedy J (MA)	Sabo M (MN)
Bruce T (IL)	Kennelly B (CT)	Sangmeister G (IL)
Bryant J (TX)	Kildee D (MI)	Savage G (IL)
Bustamante A (TX)	Kleczka G (WI)	Sawyer T (OH)
Campbell B (CO)	Kolter J (PA)	Scheuer J (NY)
Cardin B (MD)	LaFalce J (NY)	Schroeder P (CO)
Carper T (DE)	Lancaster H (NC)	Schumer C (NY)
Carr B (MI)	Lantos T (CA)	Serrano J (NY)
Chapman J (TX)	Lehman R (CA)	Sharp P (IN)
Clarke J (NC)	Lehman W (FL)	Sikorski G (MN)
Clay W (MO)	Levin S (MI)	Sisisky N (VA)
Coleman R (TX)	Levine M (CA)	Skaggs D (CO)
Collins C (IL)	Lewis J (GA)	Skelton I (MO)
Condit G (CA)	Lipinski W (IL)	Slaughter L (NY)
Conyers J (MI)	Lloyd M (TN)	Smith L (FL)
Cooper J (TN)	Long J (IN)	Smith N (IA)
Costello J (IL)	Lowey N (NY)	Solarz S (NY)
Coyne W (PA)	Luken T (OH)	Spratt J (SC)
Crockett G (MI)	Manton T (NY)	Staggers H (WV)
Darden G (GA)	Markey E (MA)	Stark P (CA)
de la Garza E (TX)	Martinez M (CA)	Stokes L (OH)
DeFazio P (OR)	Matsui R (CA)	Studds G (MA)
Dellums R (CA)	Mavroules N (MA)	Swift A (WA)
Derrick B (SC)	Mazzoli R (KY)	Synar M (OK)
Dicks N (WA)	McCloskey F (IN)	Tallon R (SC)
Dingell J (MI)	McCurdy D (OK)	Tanner J (TN)
Dixon J (CA)	McDermott J (WA)	Thomas L (GA)
Donnelly B (MA)	McHugh M (NY)	Torres E (CA)
Downey T (NY)	McMillen T (MD)	Torricelli R (NJ)
Durbin R (IL)	McNulty M (NY)	Towns E (NY)
Dwyer B (NJ)	Mfume K (MD)	Traficant J (OH)
Dymally M (CA)	Mineta N (CA)	Traxler B (MI)

Barton J (TX)
Bateman H (VA)
Bentley H (MD)
Bilirakis M (FL)
Bliley T (VA)
Broomfield W (MI)
Brown H (CO)
Buechner J (MO)
Bunning J (KY)
Burton D (IN)
Callahan S (AL)
Campbell T (CA)
Chandler R (WA)
Clinger W (PA)
Coble H (NC)
Coleman E (MO)
Combest L (TX)
Coughlin L (PA)
Courter J (NJ)
Cox C (CA)
Craig L (ID)
Crane P (IL)
Dannemeyer W (CA)
DeLay T (TX)
DeWine M (OH)
Dickinson B (AL)
Dornan R (CA)
Douglas C (NH)
Dreier D (CA)
Duncan J (TN)
Emerson B (MO)
Fawell H (IL)
Fields J (TX)
Frenzel B (MN)
Gallegly E (CA)
Gallo D (NJ)
Gekas G (PA)
Gingrich N (GA)
Goss P (FL)
Gradison B (OH)
Grandy F (IA)
Grant B (FL)
Green B (NY)
Gunderson S (WI)

Henry P (MI)
Herger W (CA)
Hiler J (IN)
Holloway C (LA)
Hopkins L (KY)
Houghton A (NY)
Hunter D (CA)
Hyde H (IL)
Inhofe J (OK)
Ireland A (FL)
James C (FL)
Johnson N (CT)
Kasich J (OH)
Kolbe J (AZ)
Kyl J (AZ)
Lagomarsino R (CA)
Lewis J (CA)
Lewis T (FL)
Lightfoot J (IA)
Livingston B (LA)
Lowery B (CA)
Madigan E (IL)
Marlenee R (MT)
Martin D (NY)
McCandless A (CA)
McCollum B (FL)
McDade J (PA)
McEwen B (OH)
McMillan A (NC)
Meyers J (KS)
Michel R (IL)
Miller C (OH)
Miller J (WA)
Moorhead C (CA)
Myers J (IN)
Nielson H (UT)
Oxley M (OH)
Packard R (CA)
Parris S (VA)
Pashayan C (CA)
Paxon B (NY)
Petri T (WI)
Porter J (IL)

Ritter D (PA)
Roberts P (KS)
Robinson T (AR)
Rogers H (KY)
Rohrabacher D (CA)
Ros-Lehtinen I (FL)
Roth T (WI)
Roukema M (NJ)
Saxton H (NJ)
Schaefer D (CO)
Schuette B (MI)
Sensenbrenner F (WI)
Shaw E (FL)
Shuster B (PA)
Skeen J (NM)
Slaughter D (VA)
Smith B (OR)
Smith C (NJ)
Smith D (OR)
Smith L (TX)
Smith R (NH)
Smith V (NE)
Snowe O (ME)
Solomon G (NY)
Spence F (SC)
Stangeland A (MN)
Stearns C (FL)
Stump B (AZ)
Sundquist D (TN)
Tauke T (IA)
Thomas B (CA)
Thomas C (WY)
Upton F (MI)
Vander Jagt G (MI)
Vucanovich B (NV)
Walker R (PA)
Walsh J (NY)
Weber V (MN)
Weldon C (PA)
Whittaker B (KS)
Wolf F (VA)
Young C (FL)
Young D (AK)

*** NOT VOTING (13) *****

DEMOCRATS (4)

Foley T (WA) S
Ford H (TN) ?

Kaptur M (OH) ?

Ray R (GA) ?

INDEPENDENTS (0)

REPUBLICANS (9)

Edwards M (OK) ?
Lukens D (OH) ?

McCrery J (LA) ?
Rowland J (CT) ?

Schulze R (PA) ?
Stumway N (CA) ?

Dyson R (MD)
Early J (MA)
Eckart D (OH)
Edwards D (CA)
Engel E (NY)
Erdreich B (AL)
Espy M (MS)
Evans L (IL)
Fascell D (FL)
Fazio V (CA)
Feighan E (OH)
Flake F (NY)
Foglietta T (PA)
Ford W (MI)
Frank B (MA)

Mink P (HI)
Moakley J (MA)
Mollohan A (WV)
Moody J (WI)
Morrison B (CT)
Mrazek R (NY)
Murphy A (PA)
Murtha J (PA)
Nagle D (IA)
Natcher W (KY)
Neal R (MA)
Neal S (NC)
Nelson B (FL)
Nowak H (NY)
Oakar M (OH)

Udall M (AZ)
Unsoeld J (WA)
Vento B (MN)
Visclosky P (IN)
Walgren D (PA)
Washington C (TX)
Watkins W (OK)
Waxman H (CA)
Weiss T (NY)
Wheat A (MO)
Whitten J (MS)
Williams P (MT)
Wise B (WV)
Wolpe H (MI)
Wyden R (OR)

INDEPENDENTS (0)

REPUBLICANS (22)

Bereuter D (NE)
Boehlert S (NY)
Conte S (MA)
Davis R (MI)
Fish H (NY)
Gillmor P (OH)
Gilman B (NY)
Goodling B (PA)

Horton F (NY)
Leach J (IA)
Lent N (NY)
Machtley R (RI)
McGrath R (NY)
Molinari S (NY)
Morella C (MD)

Morrison S (WA)
Quillen J (TN)
Regula R (OH)
Schiff S (NM)
Schneider C (RI)
Shays C (CT)
Wyllie C (OH)

*** NAYS (186) *****

DEMOCRATS (41)

Barnard D (GA)
Bennett C (FL)
Byron B (MD)
Clement B (TN)
Dorgan B (ND)
English G (OK)
Flippo R (AL)
Geren P (TX)
Glickman D (KS)
Guarini F (NJ)
Hall R (TX)
Hatcher C (GA)
Hayes J (LA)
Hubbard C (KY)

Huckaby J (LA)
Hughes W (NJ)
Hutto E (FL)
Jenkins E (GA)
Jones B (GA)
Kanjorski P (PA)
Kostmayer P (PA)
Laughlin G (TX)
Leath M (TX)
Miller G (CA)
Montgomery G (MS)
Olin J (VA)
Parker M (MS)
Patterson L (SC)

Payne L (VA)
Penny T (MN)
Sarpalius B (TX)
Slattery J (KS)
Stallings R (ID)
Stenholm C (TX)
Tauzin W (LA)
Taylor G (MS)
Valentine T (NC)
Volkmer H (MO)
Wilson C (TX)
Yates S (IL)
Yatron G (PA)

INDEPENDENTS (0)

REPUBLICANS (145)

Archer B (TX)
Armey D (TX)
Baker R (LA)
Ballenger C (NC)
Bartlett S (TX)

Hammerschmidt J (AR)
Hancock M (MO)
Hansen J (UT)
Hastert D (IL)
Hefley J (CO)

Pursell C (MI)
Ravenel A (SC)
Rhodes J (AZ)
Ridge T (PA)
Rinaldo M (NJ)

REPUBLICAN SUPPORTERS

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993

HOUSE

BEREUTER (NE)
BLUTE (MA)
DEAL (GA)*
DIAZ-BALART (FL)
DICKY (AR)
GILCHREST (MD)
GILLMOR (OH)
GILMAN (NY)
GUNDERSON (WI)
HOBSON (OH)
HOEKSTRA (MI)
HORN (CA)
HOUGHTON (NY)

JOHNSON (CT)
KLUG (WI)
LAUGHLIN (TX)*
LAZIO (NY)
LEACH (IA)
MORELLA (MD)
QUINN (NY)
ROGERS (KY)
ROS-LEHTINEN (FL)
SHAYS (CT)
TORKILDSSEN (MA)
UPTON (MI)
WALSH (NY)

SENATE

CAMPBELL (CO)**
CHAFEE (RI)
HATFIELD (OR)
HUTCHISON (TX)
JEFFORDS (VT)

SHELBY (AL)**
SNOWE (ME)***
SPECTER (PA)
STEVENS (AK)

**Voted for the authorizing bill as a Democratic Member of the House in 1993.*

***Voted for the authorizing bill as a Democratic Member of the Senate in 1993.*

****Voted for the authorizing bill as a Member of the House in 1993.*