

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: National Service

Series/Staff Member: Rick Allen

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 1292

FolderID:

Folder Title:

National Service - Volume 1 - Congressional Record, September 13, 1990, House [binder]

Stack:

S

Row:

66

Section:

2

Shelf:

6

Position:

3

Clinton Presidential Records Digital Records Marker

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

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

Cong. Rec. 9/13/90 H.

Divider Title: _____

Vol. 136

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1990

No. 112

Congressional Record



United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 101st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

United States
Government
Printing Office
SUPERINTENDENT
OF DOCUMENTS
Washington, DC 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for private use, \$300

SECOND CLASS NEWSPAPER

Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Government Printing Office
(USPS 087-390)

the greatest needs are, and it is essential to allow them the flexibility and leadership necessary to effectively and cost-efficiently serve the intended beneficiaries of Perkins' programs. I remain concerned about the limited resources many States are facing and their ability to effectively implement quality vocational programs for special populations in light of budget deficits. However, I do believe the conference report is a step toward recognizing the need for State-level flexibility and leadership in the education and job training arenas, and I believe it is a positive change for vocational education in the United States.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Amendments of 1990. I also ask that we continue to work to coordinate the academic, vocational, and employment training programs available to needy individuals in our Nation, and to ensure these programs are producing competent, educated, and employable individuals who will be able to live meaningful and fulfilling lives within our communities.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 7, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act. As I do so, I wish to congratulate the chairman and ranking member for their leadership in shaping a bill that responds to America's vocational education needs in the 1990's. I also want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] for their leadership and cooperation on the Indian vocational education measures in the bill.

GENERATING WORKFARE

I am particularly pleased that the Indian titles in the bill address the unique educational and economic problems evident in Indian country. The key need on reservations is generating durable businesses and productive jobs.

Staggering unemployment and the attendant poverty are the roots of so many other reservation maladies, such as the alarming rates of alcoholism, diabetes, and child abuse. Even as we tackle these as discrete problems with sufficient resources and creative programs, we must engender support for workfare and curb dependence on welfare. Otherwise we will only see a further repetition of the endless cycle of joblessness, poverty, and social problems.

Creating jobs, however, assumes that Indian communities have developed a trained pool of workers and managers. On too many reservations that is not now the case. This bill responds to that problem by reaffirming basic Indian programs and by establishing new programs in Indian postsecondary vocational education.

SUPPORTING INDIAN POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

The latter programs in the bill reflect legislation which I introduced with my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON]. I am reassured from discussions with committee staff that our focus on support for the United Tribes Technical College, the Crown Point Institute, and Tribally Controlled Community Colleges is manifested in title III, part H, and title IV.

It is clear from the language in title III, that United Tribes and Crown Point will be eligible to continue their leadership in Indian vocational education by tapping grants available to

postsecondary institutions. United Tribes Technical College in Bismarck, ND, has placed some 80 percent of its graduates in paying jobs, a remarkable achievement given reservation unemployment rates of equal magnitude. It's all the more remarkable when you consider that 70 percent of United Tribes' graduates once received welfare. Surely this is one needed route to self-sufficiency.

Indian tribal colleges are recognized in the bill, as well, for their special role in promoting economic development on Indian reservations. The bill will enable the colleges to improve their vocational education programs, to assist with economic development planning, and to train tribal leaders, among other tasks.

The bill reinforces support for these Indian postsecondary institutions because it does not diminish eligibility for other Federal programs. That's a critical feature of this legislation.

In conclusion, matching trained workers with vibrant enterprises is precisely the right prescription for Indian country today. Tribal leaders and tribal members alike have striven to achieve that goal and I am pleased that this bill will make it more achievable. It's also the approach we need to stop the waste of tax dollars on welfare and to ensure instead that invested tax dollars flow back to the Treasury. These titles in the bill, then, will not only benefit native Americans but all Americans.

Mr. HAWKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAWKINS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the conference report on H.R. 7 just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SERVICE ACT OF 1990

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 463 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 463

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4330) to establish school-based and higher education community service programs, to establish youth service programs, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the

bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and which shall not exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, said substitute shall be considered by titles instead of by sections and each title shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of section 303(a)(4) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, and with clause 7 of rule XVI are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois). The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes for purposes of debate only to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 463 is the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990. This is an open rule, providing for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as original text for purposes of amendment, and it provides that the substitute shall be considered by titles instead of sections, with each title considered as having been read.

The rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI, which prohibits nongermane amendments, against the substitute. This waiver is needed because the Education and Labor Committee added a third title, the Good Samaritan Food Donation Act, which was nongermane to the bill as introduced.

The rule also waives section 303(a)(4) of the Congressional Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of new entitlement authority prior to the adoption of the budget resolution, against the substitute. This waiver is necessary because the provisions of H.R. 4330 which permit the deferral or partial cancellation of student loan payments for certain volunteers are

considered new entitlement authority. The cost of those provisions is minimal, only \$500,000 annually. Since H.R. 4330 is an authorization bill, all of its other provisions are subject to appropriations.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4330, the bill for which the Rules Committee has recommended this rule, would expand and improve opportunities for civilian service, particularly for young Americans. Such opportunities are extremely important both for the people who will benefit from volunteer services and for the volunteers themselves. At a time when there are so many unmet needs in society, and when it is obvious that we are not doing enough to foster in young Americans an ethic of community service and commitment to others, this legislation is urgently needed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 463, so that the House can proceed to consideration of H.R. 4330.

□ 1210

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. TELENSON] has explained the provisions of the rule, and I will not repeat those provisions. Mr. Speaker, I would like also to commend the ranking Republican member of the Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] for the fine job they have done in putting this legislation together and bringing it to the floor of the House.

We are going to miss the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS]. In his last days in the House since he has announced his retirement, I want to tell the Members how much I have enjoyed working with the gentleman. He certainly is a true gentleman in the best sense of the word. He has earned the respect of the Members of this body and his service has been noteworthy throughout this Nation of ours. I salute the gentleman from California especially for his dedication and his loyalty to the betterment of education and of labor.

This bill is one that the gentleman appeared on before the Rules Committee. There was no controversy at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and ask for a yes vote on the rule so that we can get down to the business of discussing the measure as a whole. If there is controversy on it, the Members of the body will have an opportunity to discuss the issues involved under this open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this bill obviously concerns volunteers. It depends upon volunteers and their willingness to come forward and to offer their services in many different areas and in many different ways. That willingness depends increasingly in America, upon their perception of what it is they are undertaking, and I refer, Mr. Speaker, to liability concerns.

Unfortunately, increasingly in our country people worry that if they are going to volunteer—either in a direct service capacity or to serve on the board of an organization—that somehow they may end up in a court of law defending their assets, their homes, their farms, against a lawsuit. This has been documented in study after study taken across this country, and the chilling effect—the worry about ending up as a defendant in a court of law, at risk—is preventing many people who would otherwise be willing to come forward, from coming forward and offering their services.

Organizations like the Red Cross, the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, the PTA, the AAUW, and hundreds of others like them, have found, very increasingly, great difficulty in getting volunteers to come forward and offer the services needed to make their programs succeed.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago I offered to the Congress H.R. 911, a bill that would encourage States to amend State law—because this is essentially, primarily a matter of State law—to encourage State laws to be amended to give volunteers the immunity that they ought to have in order to encourage people to keep coming forward. In other words, people who are willing to volunteer their time and give their efforts to organizations that help others ought to be able to do so without ending up in a court of law as a defendant. Their organization ought to be the one that ends up as the defendant if somebody is injured or hurt as a result of their activities within the scope of their volunteer duties. The organization ought to end up as the defendant, not the individual. The individuals ought to be given immunity where they are acting within the scope of their volunteer duties and not in a wilful or wanton manner. The organization should be made to be the defendant if any problem occurs. That was the essence of H.R. 911.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that 254 Members of the House signed on as cosponsors to that legislation in the last Congress. Unfortunately, the committee of jurisdiction did not even give it a hearing.

In this Congress, the legislation has been reintroduced as H.R. 911. It has

over half the House as cosponsors. It has, in this Congress, not received a hearing, either.

Mr. Speaker, this is essential legislation to getting people to come forward and volunteer. Two hundred fifty national organizations of the type I have just described ascribe to this legislation and support it and believe it is necessary to keep volunteerism alive in our country.

I would like to offer, and I hope to offer, the essence of this volunteer protection legislation as applied to the bill that we will consider under this rule. What it would do would, in respect to one of these programs, is make the organizations liable, but give direct service volunteers and board members a clear conscience, that they can come forward without any problem that will find them in court, unless they are acting outside the scope of their volunteer mandate or acting in a wilful and wanton manner.

I would hope that the Members who are cosponsors would be alerted to the essentiality of this amendment. I would hope that others who may not be familiar with it would consider that liability concerns are increasingly a problem in our country. They are affecting many, many areas of American life—from the production of American products and their competitiveness overseas, to how our doctors and other health care providers treat patients—and what a waste it is for so much defensive medicine to be practiced in this country when those resources could be put forward to help people—to as simple a case as whether an individual will come forward and volunteer for something that needs to be done for others who are perhaps less fortunate than they.

I would hope that the Members would be alerted to the need for this kind of approach to be applied to this legislation, and I hope to offer that amendment when we consider the bill.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why we are going to have this bill on the floor today is because we are seeking to have legislation brought to the floor that would not interfere with what is happening out at the Andrews Air Force Base in the budget summit.

□ 1220

The DOD bill had to be pulled off the floor because they could not proceed until they got firm figures from the people who are engaged in the budget summit.

The people engaged in the budget summit have a real problem. They are trying to find ways to save enough money to get this Nation's economic situation back in order. One of the

things where they are trying to find money is in the entitlement programs.

What does this rule do? Well, this rule brings the waiver of entitlements so that we can create a brandnew entitlement while they are out wrestling with exactly that problem at Andrews.

That does not make any sense. What in the world are we doing here? We are struggling to try to find ways to save money, and this bill would authorize \$212 million of spending for brandnew programs, including new entitlement authority.

It just makes no sense at all. We ought to turn down the rule, based upon the fact that it has that waiver in it. We ought to be very cautious of this bill. This bill is not a noncontroversial bill.

The administration has a strong veto message on this bill. I will read to you from it. It says: "The administration strongly opposes H.R. 4330 because it is incompatible with the President's concept of voluntary service. If H.R. 4330 were presented to the President in its current form, his senior advisors would recommend a veto." They then go on to point out about five different places where this bill has major problems and ought to give us real concern about its passage.

So I would suggest to the House and I would advise the House that this is a bill that, in its current form, will be vetoed. It is a bill that creates brandnew entitlement authority. It is a bill that creates \$212 million in brandnew spending. It is a bill which gets in the way of all of what we have believed about voluntarism in America that is locally based. It is a bill that has major problems.

I would ask the House to reject the rule and to reject the bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, yes, there is some opposition to the bill. As the gentleman would say closing, the administration at the moment is not in favor of the bill. Some of those problems can be worked out in the immediate future. I would ask Members, however, not to be concerned about the waiver nor to be frightened away by the statements of our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. As this gentleman stated earlier, the waiver is necessary because the provisions permit the deferral of partial cancellation of student loan payments for certain volunteers. That is considered new entitlement authority. That in fact is true, it is a new entitlement authority. But the cost, as the gentleman has told the Members earlier, is minimal.

The gentleman said earlier, \$500,000 annually. In fact, CBO [Congressional Budget Office], says it is less than \$500,000 per year. That is a very small amount of money. The gentleman would suggest to Members that that is not an adequate reason for turning down the rule.

It is an open rule. All of these matters will be before the Members later today, this afternoon, and this gentleman urges people's support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER) there were—ayes 7, noes 3.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 463 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4330.

□ 1225

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4330) to establish school-based and higher education community service programs, to establish youth service programs, and for other purposes, with Mr. OBER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HAWKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, national service means Americans giving their time and effort to enhance the national good.

This bill is intended to promote national service by incorporating service learning into elementary and secondary school curricula, offering incentives to colleges and universities and college students to do service, especially in our Nation's schools, and creating American Conservation and Youth Service Corps to enable youth to carry out a variety of projects addressing unmet environmental and social needs. H.R. 4330 gives Americans, particularly disadvantaged youth the opportunity to serve their communities, their country, and themselves.

This bill, which reflects the contributions of many members on and off the Education and Labor Committee, is intended to build upon existing worthwhile community service efforts

and enhance their potential for addressing unmet social needs. H.R. 4330 responds to the same concerns that the President noted when he proposed his points of light initiative in his inaugural address. This bill is an attempt to make the concept of service more central to American's life and work.

I want to make several points:

First, according to the organization Independent Sector, less than half of Americans are active volunteers. The typical volunteer is a white female between 35 to 44, married with no children and employed with an income of between \$20,000 and \$40,000. This legislation targets the young, the poor, and others presently not asked to serve. Further, it promotes opportunities for senior citizens through a blend of new and existing programs.

Second, it does not create cumbersome bureaucratic structures but rather uses existing administrative systems.

Third, this bill is fiscally responsible. For less than \$200 million, it will generate hundreds of thousands of hours of community service.

Fourth, this bill is intended to expose more people to community service. It emphasizes exposing youth to these opportunities because studies show that young people who have served continue to do so throughout their adult lives.

Fifth, service learning also appears to be an effective technique in keeping students involved with school. It is consistent with the Congress' focus on programs to fight school dropouts.

Finally, this bill is faithful to a set of principles which emerged from hearings conducted by the Education and Labor Committee. First, it categorically rejects any linkage between service and student financial assistance. Second, it contains adequate and realistic protections regarding job displacement. Third, the programs authorized include appropriate compensatory education and job training, where necessary. Finally, it recognizes the large number of service efforts underway in virtually every American community and therefore intends to build upon, not smother, these efforts.

Similar legislation passed the Senate overwhelmingly with strong bipartisan support. I urge Members to pass this bill so that we can go to conference to produce a bill that achieves the widely shared goal of enhancing civic mindedness and good citizenship at a time when many Americans, particularly youth, are alienated from the system.

□ 1230

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I wish the honeymoon and the love-in

that we had on the previous bill could continue on this bill. Unfortunately, it will not.

I am pleased that the Committee on Rules gave us an open rule. The only problem is that I, as the ranking member, only found out that the bill was coming to the floor at 9:15 this morning, meaning other members of the committee found it out even later. It is pretty difficult to get amendments prepared and ready as well as change schedules in order to present them. So, the open rule, unfortunately, does not help us to clean up the bill. I am pleased, however, that they did give us that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable interest in this issue. Dozens of bills have been introduced in this Congress, the President addressed it in his State of the Union Message, and the Committee on Education and Labor has held over five full committee hearings on the issue.

The bill before us provides grants to colleges, elementary and secondary schools, and State and local conservation corps to establish or expand community service programs. The major focus of these programs is our youth, but it also provides for the participation of senior citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I have some concerns about the bill, and the administration has indicated its opposition to the bill, and I probably should read that opposition into the RECORD at this particular time.

The President strongly supports the concept of community service. He has challenged all individuals and institutions to make service central to their lives and work.

The administration, however, strongly opposes H.R. 4330 because it is incompatible with the President's concept of voluntary service. If H.R. 4330 were presented to the President in its current form, his senior advisers would recommend a veto.

H.R. 4330 would: Provide unnecessary financial incentives for service. It includes unjustified deterrent and cancellation of certain student loan payments for full-time professional staff in drug counseling, prevention and treatment programs, and full-time volunteers. These costly provisions extend the concept of volunteer far beyond reasonable bounds. Attempt to direct community service efforts from the Federal level rather than from the community. Emphasize short-term volunteer participation and financial rewards, concepts inconsistent with a sustained commitment to voluntarism. The reward for voluntary service should never be seen as financial.

Mr. Chairman, there are other reasons why he would veto the legislation. Hopefully we will have an amendment or two that will clean it up so that it perhaps will not be as objectionable to the President or to many of us.

I have some concerns about the bill, as I indicated. First, the inclusion of

loan cancellation provisions is troublesome as there is no reliable evidence that it would enable individuals to choose a public service career who otherwise would not. We also do not know what the fiscal impact of such a provision would be. First of all, it is a very discriminatory approach in my estimation. We are saying to people who receive Perkins loans that it is important to volunteer. Now to those who do not receive Perkins loans, I suppose it is not as important. The argument will be made that we know the purpose is to allow those people who ordinarily would not be able to afford to volunteer to volunteer. I have a little trouble following that line of thinking. With respect to the cost I would like to ask a question. Since the Perkins loan is a revolving fund to the college or the university, if we forgive that loan for the student and then the money does not come back to the revolving fund, do we then say to the college, "You don't have a revolving fund," or do we ask for additional money and additional revenue in order to continue the revolving fund? One or the other has to be done because there is no way to keep it going if these loans are canceled.

I had to laugh at CBO's comments on this provision because they said it probably would only cost \$500,000 a year when fully implemented. That is because, they go on to say, "It is available only for young persons with a major commitment to service and who make a major sacrifice to perform the service." CBO goes on to say that very few young people are willing to make this kind of sacrifice.

Again, I would hope that before we finish consideration of this bill we can offer the amendments, or at least in the conference report that will make it an acceptable bill to the administration. Notwithstanding these concerns I have, I cannot discount the value of community service, both to the participants and recipients of such service. In my State of Pennsylvania they have a very active service corps, PennServe, and a public-private partnership called the Pennsylvania Citizens Service Project. Each of these programs could be enhanced by this bill. However, we must be careful that we do not discourage true voluntarism by offering financial guarantees.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to listen carefully to the debate on the bill, and the issues raised by this bill and to the amendments that will be offered today. I believe that we all can support the concept of volunteer service and its value to our communities whether or not we believe that the bill in this form is the appropriate vehicle to encourage such support. Probably the bill represents a basis from which we can develop a national service policy, but in its present form it does not give us that opportunity. Perhaps it would be better dealt with in amendments to JTPA, and certainly a part of it should be considered

in our higher education reauthorization.

Again, I am pleased for the open rule. I am only sorry that we do not have time to really make the open rule count, time to really develop the amendments that are needed in order to make this a bill that will be signed and a bill that will best serve voluntarism in the United States.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990. I have been a long-time supporter of this type of measure and am happy that this measure has been brought to the floor today. A large number of people have worked to pull this bill together, from Capitol Hill to city and town halls and in thousands of schools and volunteer service organizations. I want to particularly thank Chairman HAWKINS, Congressman FORD, Senator KENNEDY, and all the sponsors of this measure for their efforts in behalf of volunteer programs. This is a good, solid measure and it will provide volunteer opportunities for thousands of students across this country.

As mayor of the city of Springfield, MA for 5 years I had the opportunity to help establish a community service learning program in that city. It has been a tremendous success. This program has become a catalyst for a renewed spirit of volunteerism in my home city and I believe a national program will do the same for America. This bill provides the seed money for a school- and college-based community service program. If the Springfield experience is repeated nationwide, the schools will benefit, the communities will benefit and—most importantly—the students will benefit.

Just today I received some comments on the Springfield community service learning program from Carol Kinsley, who is the director of the program. She has put together reports from the teachers and principals who make it work in Springfield. For the past 3 years, hundreds of Springfield students have gotten involved in various volunteer program through this program. I would like to quote from remarks prepared by Carolyn Price, who is the principal of Lincoln School—kindergarten through fourth grade—in Springfield. She writes, "our test scores are higher. I would like to think that as community service becomes a part of school restructuring, C-S-L is one more component that adds to the success of the child. C-S-L builds more successful . . ." That kind of praise is common for the Springfield school volunteer program. Over and over, the teachers say that a school-based volunteer program helps

students learn to care for themselves and for others. Volunteering is a great learning experience, it is a great life experience.

Mr. Chairman, the other major benefit from a national service program is, of course, the work provided by the volunteers. In Springfield, many people and institutions have been enhanced by student volunteers. The elderly in nursing homes, in particular, have greatly enjoyed entertainment and reading programs that student volunteers have provided. Handicapped citizens and patients at area hospitals have also had their lives brightened by volunteers providing services.

It is my belief that good citizenship can, and should, be taught in our schools. The success of the Springfield program backs up that belief. Practical volunteer work, combined with course work, provides a much more realistic look at the world and better prepares students for adult life. Our young people are our greatest resource and a community service learning program improves both the students and the community.

This bill provides funds for grants to the States for them to implement school-based service learning programs. At least 80 percent of the funds will be passed through to the localities. Additional funds are provided for grants to institutions of higher learning to establish similar programs for college students. This is a much needed plan that will repay this modest cost a 100 times over. The National Service Act will benefit every community in this country and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this measure.

□ 1240

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

(Mr. GUNDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, this is not much fun. I do not know of anybody in this Congress who does not believe in volunteerism. I do not know of anybody in this Congress who did not get here without one heck of a lot of volunteers in our campaigns and in our political activities. And now we are here debating not the goal of volunteerism, because I believe everybody in America that I know of believes in the merits and the worthiness of volunteerism, but what we are debating today is apparently a major philosophical gulf between those who believe the only way we can have volunteerism is to pay for it and have Government set it up and those who think it can come from the hearts and the minds of people in the communities and schools and churches and families and clubs and organizations of America.

I thought probably it would be helpful as we begin this debate to call on

our good friends who make up the dictionary—this is Webster's—and so I looked up "volunteer." It says that a volunteer is one who enters into or offers for a service of his own free will—that is not through government organization, not through incentives, not through compensation, not through grants to local governmental agencies or anything of the sort; it is doing it on their own because they know it is right and they know it is good.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that we are meeting here and talking about setting up a new Government program, a new Government authorization, at the very time that the leadership of this Congress and the administration is meeting at Andrews trying to figure out how we are ever going to bring the deficit down.

We ask, who is the problem? We are the problem. We are the problem when we say the only way we can get volunteerism in America is to pass an act and set up a bureaucracy and set up all kinds of grants and programs through different departments.

We just finished passing the conference report on vocational education. Do you know what? Every Member on both sides of the aisle stood up and talked about how good that bill was. Yet today we fund 56 percent of the authorization for vocational education because we do not have any more money. Today we fund 50 percent of the authorization for chapter 1 to disadvantaged children because we do not have any more money.

Today, for every poor college student in this country who is eligible for a Pell grant, they are authorized under Federal law to get \$2,900 a year, and we give them only \$2,200. That is \$700 less than the authorization, because we do not have any money.

Let us talk about Head Start. Today in Head Start we have an authorization or a need for approximately \$8 billion. We provide \$1.4 billion. Twenty percent of the projected need for Head Start is all we can provide. Why? Because we do not have any money.

We have the Job Training Partnership Act which we are going to modify yet in this session in a program that looks upon the committee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], for his leadership in creating that program. But do you know what? We only fund 5 percent because we do not have any money.

Then we look at education for the handicapped. We at the Federal level said we are going to provide 40 percent of the cost of education for every handicapped child in America. We only provide 7 percent of the cost. Do you know why? Because we do not have any more money.

But here we are today in the midst of deficit reduction saying, "Let's pass a new bill, let's set up a new authorization. It doesn't cost much."

But not this year. Is there any Member in this Chamber who thinks that if we pass this bill to pay for a centralized bureaucracy for volunteerism in the midst of the deficit reduction summit, we are not going to be back here next year expanding the authorization? Come on. This is not any fun. I do not like to be against volunteers. I am for them as much as anybody else. But do we need a Government bureaucracy?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman understand that if we take this action today, that we will be able to provide more volunteers as a result of the passage of this bill?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I would hope so.

Mr. WALKER. That was my understanding when I looked through the committee report and saw the premise of the bill. But has the gentleman heard any figure as to how many additional volunteers we are going to get out of it?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Actually I have read the committee report pretty closely, and the best I can tell is that there is no projected figure.

Mr. WALKER. I wonder, can any Member on the other side tell us? Maybe the gentleman could yield to some Member on the other side who will tell us how many additional volunteers we are going to get for \$212 million. Is there any Member in the House who knows that figure?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I would be happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I note there is a deafening silence. We have no idea, after we spend \$212 million, how many additional volunteers we are going to get. Yet the whole premise of the bill is that we are going to get additional volunteers for the amount of money we spend. I think it is absolutely ludicrous that we would come to the floor and suggest that we have this bill that is going to do all these good things, but we do not have any idea how many additional volunteers it is going to produce.

What I do know is that under the present system we have been producing more and more volunteerism every year, that volunteerism in this country has gone up tremendously during the last 10 years, and that in communities across this country they have found more volunteerism, not less. We are about to get in the way of all that by adding a new Federal regulation and a new Federal bureaucracy over and above what is presently in place. Yet nobody can tell us how many volunteers it is going to produce.

□ 1250

It could in fact reduce the number of volunteers, if you put too much of a federal overload on this.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would cite the example earlier that I offered of the Springfield program, in which we expended a salary of about \$37,000 for a director. In the school system alone we came up with probably 10,000 to 15,000 from kindergarten through the senior high schools in the city of volunteers that participated broadly across the entire community.

I would also thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GUNDERSON) for quoting from a dictionary that is produced in my home city as well.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Neal). I would ask the gentleman, did he have any funds for that project he set up?

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we used local and State money. But I think it is a wonderful model. Public money was used.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do, too. The tragedy of the debate we are going to have this afternoon is it is going to come off as some of us being against voluntarism. For gosh sakes, I hope no one in this body is against voluntarism. The question is do we need a Federal bureaucracy and appropriation to get voluntarism?

Mr. Chairman, I think my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Neal) has clearly articulated we do not. Springfield did it with local funds.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, and State money.

Mr. GUNDERSON. And State money.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one point, and that is that I just did some rough calculations here. In order to fund the \$212 million, we are going to have to take every dime of taxes of 40,000 American families in order to pay for the cost of next year's program. Forty thousand American families are going to have to contribute every dime of their taxes, based upon just the average tax bill, in order to fund this program.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we ought to have some idea as to how many volunteers we are going to get for that level of sacrifice.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me go on. I think we are going to believe that this legislation, because it says the Nation-

al Service Act, is all committed to just providing grants to local governments to set up volunteers. I would just like to call the attention of Members in the remaining time I have to section 224 of this legislation, which deals with the youth conservation and Youth Corps.

We can legitimately debate whether that kind of corps is or is not something that should be part of this bill, and whether you believe it is or is not going to be productive in the concept of education and training like the Job Training Partnership Act and vocational education, and so on. But I want all Members to understand what is included in this bill in section 224, where it says the following:

Assistance under this title shall not be suspended for failure to comply with the applicable terms and conditions of this title.

(b) goes on.

Assistance under this title shall not be terminated for failure to comply with the terms and conditions of this title.

Do Members know what I just said? I just said that under this act, under the language in front of us, once a grant is given, if that local agency does not comply, so what? We cannot suspend and we cannot terminate the program, unless we go through a long administrative hearing process.

If one thinks the administrator of a volunteer program at the Federal level should have to go through a long hearing process before they can suspend it during the hearing, or terminate it for just cause, then you begin to realize that this is not a Voluntarism Act, this is not a National Service Act, this is the new Bureaucracy Act of 1990.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. McCurdy), who has presented to the body several of the bills that were considered by the committee, and whom I wish to applaud for his leadership in this particular field. I think the gentleman inspired and really moved us to action. For that we are deeply thankful.

(Mr. McCurdy asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCurdy. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. Hawkins).

Mr. Chairman, I am a strong advocate and proponent of voluntary national service. I have traveled this country, as many have, and observed the number of programs in the States and communities. I have been on college campuses advocating national service. I have publicly debated the issues with notable opponents like Milton Friedman. I am a strong supporter.

Mr. Chairman, I believe America supports a real national service program, and as an advocate of this approach, I wish I could rise in strong support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot rise in strong support. I will vote for it in

order for it to go to conference, in order that we have a possibility and potential to include one of the Senate provisions currently in that legislation which was advanced by Senator Nunn and myself for a demonstration program of earned benefits for young people who provide service in return for some increased educational benefits.

I firmly believe national service can be a truly progressive solution, a fresh approach, to a number of social problems facing our Nation today.

Voluntary national service promotes citizenship. It expands opportunities for Americans to secure educational benefits. Furthermore, participants gain by working to address many of the ills that face this country today, whether it is illiteracy, homelessness, or the problems that are faced by many urban areas and communities across this great country.

Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree with incentives to promote voluntarism. However, I believe that a real national service program goes beyond this particular legislation, and I would urge, respectfully, the leadership of this committee to consider the demonstration program contained in the Senate bill.

I would love to come back and urge my colleagues to support a strong bill for a new, fresh approach for national service that can stand the scrutiny of the American people, that addresses the concerns they have, and answers the desire that they have to promote citizenship, and at the same time increase opportunities for our young people, and furthermore, to address many of the social ills that we do not have money for in this country today.

Mr. Chairman, we do not at the Federal level have the money, but I believe a real national service program can put people on the ground in America to deal with those issues.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. The essence of voluntarism is that people do it on their own. They don't have to be told to do it. They don't have to be encouraged to do it. They don't have to be paid to do it. They volunteer on their own without expecting to be compensated because they see things that need to be done and they want to help. That's what voluntarism means.

And people are doing it all over America right now, as they always have—young and old alike. Today's youth, in particular, are no less public spirited, I am sure, than we were when we were younger. And when we were younger, I'm sure there were a lot of older people who looked down on us and thought we were self centered and wanted to tell us what to do with our lives. That's just the way it always is.

There are always some older people who think the younger generation is

worthless and has to be told what to do. But that doesn't mean we should succumb to that temptation as a government. I firmly believe that today's younger generation is equally as capable as its predecessors of making its own decisions about how best to serve our country.

Mr. Chairman, we should defeat this bill in the first place because it is unnecessary. The volunteer spirit is alive and well and just does not need government messing around with it. But we should defeat this bill also because it is counterproductive. A big new government program will hurt voluntarism in our country, not help it. It will divert effort and resources into meeting bureaucratic standards and into efforts to obtain ever increasing levels of Federal funding.

But in addition, when some so-called volunteers are paid to do what others have previously done without compensation, those who are paid will gradually supplant the true volunteers. There will be an increase in the sentiment that "I won't do it unless I'm paid." The true spirit of voluntarism will decline. The effect will be the exact opposite of what is intended.

Beyond that, this bill would increase the potential for waste of taxpayers' funds in the Federal student loan programs. It provides various kinds of deferment and loan cancellation to volunteers. But it is non-Federal entities running volunteer programs that get to decide who is a volunteer and therefore who qualifies for these benefits. This invites favoritism and abuse.

The cost of loan forgiveness or deferment is entirely borne by the Federal taxpayers while the eligibility is determined by the managers of thousands of private organizations, and the beneficiaries may be their sons or daughters or their neighbors' sons or daughters. In addition these benefits are highly inequitable, since the value varies greatly from person to person, and their tax status is unspecified.

The student loan provisions are reason enough to reject this bill. They invite abuse, they are unfair, and they represent large payments for what are supposed to be voluntary services. But beyond that, the entire concept of the bill is wrong. We don't need it, and government intrusion in this area will be harmful. I urge all my colleagues to vote against the bill.

□ 1300

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

(Mr. MARTINEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the youth service bill, H.R. 4330.

It has been mentioned here by several Members here that voluntarism is people coming forth wanting to provide service. The thing that is overlooked by them when they say that, is

that in most cases when especially young people want to volunteer for a particular service, and they come forward, they say, "I want to help. Where can I help? Where can I go, what do I do," and there has to be an organization in place that will direct them into that voluntary service. That being the case, that organization must be structured and paid for by someone, and in many cases it is paid for on a voluntary basis by private individuals or corporations. In many cases it is provided for by local public funds, the same as the public funds we are talking about in this bill.

There will always be those who will find a way to volunteer on their own, and for no compensation, but there are also those who need to be inspired, convinced or cajoled into some kind of voluntarism, because it is terribly needed.

Let me read something that is a fact, and it is that the typical volunteer is a white female between the ages of 35 and 44, married, with no children, and employed with an income of between \$20,000 and \$40,000. That is not the kind of volunteer we are trying to attract by these programs. This legislation targets the young, the poor, and others who have not been asked to serve further, and it promotes opportunities for senior citizens through a blend of new and existing programs.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when our communities have eroded from drastic budget cutbacks and at a time when news accounts proliferate with crimes committed by youth, we have a wonderful opportunity and solution at hand I believe: The National Service Act of 1990.

Mr. Chairman, President Bush recognized the need for national youth service when he called upon all Americans to volunteer their services to our communities. At a time when we face both internal and external threats to our democracy, we must reestablish the moral foundations that made this such a great nation. One is that we must all help each other to find and bring out the best in our citizenship.

This national service bill will do that. It will allow our Nation's youth to provide services to their communities, to help their elders, to help their peers, and to help their juniors, to improve their communities and environments. In turn, the communities will receive help for performing needed services that no longer can be afforded by our State and local governments. Everybody comes out a winner.

For over 10 years we have debated national youth service and crafted legislation based upon successful programs that have already been implemented in over 60 States and local communities. This year with the strong endorsement of the administration for youth service programs, we hope to see this dream come into full and concrete fruition.

As I indicated at the onset, this bill establishing a national youth service

will create a new set of moral and working values for our Nation to build upon for the future. I urge my colleagues to make this a lasting hope and reality for the future of our Nation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

[Mr. BALLENGER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, my Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education held several hearings on this legislation and worked to establish the language in several of the sections of the bill. We conducted filed hearings, hearings here in Washington, and had several on-site visits with students and volunteers throughout the country.

When this legislation was brought to us by the President and was first considered, and when the issue was first raised, I was struck by the attention that national service volunteerism in America was receiving. It was treated as though it were something new.

This is not a new issue. There have been a thousand points of light blinking brightly across the American landscape for more than 200 years. The organized concept of national service, especially service among the poor and middle-income people, stretches back to at least the 1800's with the creation of the YMCA and the YWCA, the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts, all agencies, by the way, which spend a considerable amount of money on administration.

In this century to help us out of the Great Depression the Federal Government, the public of the United States created the old Civilian Conservation Corps, and the National Youth Administration. They were wildly successful and popular agencies of Government. And by the way, the same objections that are being expressed by Republicans on the floor today to the cost in this bill were expressed by Republicans back in the 1930's against the cost of the CCC and the NYA. They were wrong then and they continue to be wrong a full half a century later.

In the 1960's under the inspired leadership of President Kennedy and President Johnson, the United States created the Peace Corps, the Teacher Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, the National Student Volunteer Program, the Foster Grandparent Program, the Retired Senior Volunteer Program, and VISTA.

□ 1310

There is a current agency downtown which administers most of those pro-

called ACTION, and so, my colleagues, there is nothing new about national service, nor is there anything new with the cost of administering national service in the United States, whether that cost is being borne by the private sector as it is with the YMCA and the YWCA, or borne by the public as it is under the Job Corps.

I expect that throughout my lifetime Republicans in this Chamber will rise in opposition to the extraordinary cost of these programs, but despite their objection, the American people continue to support these efforts.

President Bush, of course, understood that in his campaign when he called for a national service effort, volunteerism, a thousand points of light, but neither he nor his Republican colleagues in this Chamber want to provide any batteries for those thousand points of light. We need batteries. Yes, the batteries will cost some money.

Speaking of money, I just noted a new article that has come across the ticker tape outside this Chamber that last year, of the \$300 billion that was spent on the Pentagon, \$170 billion of it was spent to defend Japan, Korea, and Southeast Asia. We are talking here about the tiniest percentage of that kind of cost.

I would suggest that as our budget conferees meet not far from Capitol Hill out at Andrews Air Force Base, they respect the compass for America's priorities, putting more, not less, money into such efforts as being envisioned here today, and that we find the money by telling the Koreans and the Japanese and the others that if they want their country defended, they must either defend it themselves or pay someone else to do it for them, but that the American people want to turn our precious resources back to be spent, to be used, to be reinvested in this Nation, and that is what this national service legislation envisions us to do.

I am pleased to support it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds, just to rise to say that before the gentleman from Montana became totally politically partisan, he indicated for 200 years the system worked beautifully without the Federal Government providing any batteries, and I appreciate that statement from him.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

[Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.]

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, while this national service bill has come a long way since the original versions introduced last year, I must oppose it. It is dirty work, but someone has to do it. What has this Nation come to when Congress feels that it is necessary to authorize over \$200 million for voluntary service?

When I was a teacher, schools organized and carried out community serv-

ice voluntarily and without financial incentives from the Federal Government. If we want to encourage civic-mindedness, clearly paying schools to participate is contradictory to that goal.

Aside from the sheer contradiction indeed its an oxymoron this bill represents, we have no business being here today creating yet another Federal program while currently existing worthwhile, tested programs go starving for funds. After this committee passes this legislation, student financial aid, vocational education, education of the handicapped, and the WIC programs will still be funded inadequately.

Even the administration which has espoused and promoted the worthiness of national service is opposed to this legislation. Why not allow the administration to carry out its volunteerism initiatives with the support they require from Congress? National service is not a "problem" requiring the infusion of Federal dollars. The lack of national service and civic mindedness is a problem that can only be addressed by changing the way our youth and adults think about what they owe their communities, their schools and their country. This cannot be accomplished by spending money.

In addition to the foregoing reasons, I must oppose this bill because of the student loan cancellation provisions. While I can agree that those performing volunteer service should be allowed to defer payment of their student loan obligations, I cannot agree with cancellation of loans. This sets a dangerous precedent and opens a Pandora's box. I had offered an amendment during the committee markup of this bill to delete the loan cancellation provision at least until a GAO study could be done to determine the cost impact of loan cancellations. This I believe to be an eminently sane way to go about legislating such an important issue which has profound, wide ranging policy implications.

Let me explain why I oppose the cancellation of student loans in return for volunteer service:

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle stated during our last debate on this point that this provision will not cost that much money. I do not oppose this section simply because my colleagues could not answer the question "How much will this cost?" I oppose it because it violates the very essence of the idea of voluntarism and service.

What precedent do we set by saying that it is important to serve others—for a price? Will people only volunteer as long as it is profitable? Have we come here again today to talk about the virtues of national volunteer service to our fellow citizens while lining the pockets of those that serve? Can we not persuade and encourage our citizenry to give of their time freely and willingly and without pay? Is authorizing in excess of \$200 million the only way to accomplish that task?

If this is so—if we cannot enlist volunteers without these dollar incentives, then is it any wonder that we have raised a generation of young people with the attitude of "I don't know, and I don't care?" The "me" generation.

My colleagues across the aisle argue that this loan cancellation provision will not cost a lot of money—that it will not apply to very many people. I can not understand if that is an argument for the section or against it. If not many people will be using this loan cancellation provision, then why do we have it in the bill? Unless, of course, we have special interests at work here.

Beyond the costs of loan forgiveness and how many will take advantage of this provision, there is this question:

If we can cancel loans for these volunteers, why do we not cancel loans for your and my favorite group of people? Let us cancel loans for volunteer fireman, volunteer ambulance crews, people who were Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, the list goes on and on.

If your argument is that these full-time volunteers are only earning the minimum wage or less, well why do we not cancel every student loan of every person who earns the minimum wage or less? Let us cancel students loans for everyone working at McDonalds. While we are at it, why do we not cancel the student loan obligations of women that choose to stay at home and raise a family?

I think we need to excise this section of the bill and consider it further. Better yet, since, this deals with the Higher Education Act, should not we be putting it off until next year when we reauthorize that legislation? After all, that is what I have been told we should do with the much more serious problem of student loan defaults which I have been trying to get this committee to address for the past 7 years!

I urge my colleagues to resist the temptation to approve this feel good legislation and vote for fiscal responsibility and common sense. Let us find other ways to help encourage the ideals of national service by recognizing purely voluntary community leadership and service.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

[Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.]

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990.

In meeting and talking with young people around my district, I can testify to a new idealism and an eagerness to serve others. This bill represents a number of proposals to expand their opportunities to do that, and to encourage them to take advantage of those service opportunities.

For example, I have heard from students from all over my district and around the country who are interested in my proposal, incorporated in H.R. 4330, to create a Peace Corps training program. This program would provide 2-year scholarships to qualified students who agree to serve 3 years in the Peace Corps.

I decided to introduce legislation creating a Peace Corps training program following a September 1986 memorial service honoring Peace Corps volunteers who had died in service. Speaking at that ceremony, Father Theodore Hesburgh, then-president of Notre Dame University, suggested that students should have the opportunity to train for peace as they do for war. Father Hesburgh proceeded to propose a new challenge to our Nation's college students, taking as a model the Reserve Officer Training Corps. (ROTC).

I believe that the Peace Corps Volunteer Education Demonstration Program Act incorporated in H.R. 4330 is an important addition and complement to the national service youth plans included in the bill under consideration today. My proposal addresses the principal benefits which Father Hesburgh asserted would result from this proposal: First it would help "to institutionalize the Peace Corps and set it firmly into American life." Second, it would produce Peace Corps volunteers who are much better trained than present volunteers, who only have about 3 months to prepare for service. Third, it would reinvigorate the once fruitful relationship between the universities and the Peace Corps. Fourth, it would "suddenly address . . . one great lack so often voiced about universities and American students today: the provincialism of students, the lack of international concerns, the dearth of Americans who can speak both the main and the esoteric languages of the world."

This program is intended to give special emphasis to the recruitment of minority students, who have been historically underrepresented in the Peace Corps, and preference will be given to students enrolled in technological and scientific fields. In addition to their regular academic curriculum, these Peace Corps candidates will also be required to study the languages, customs, history, and politics of those countries or regions in which they will serve. During their summer breaks, they will receive practical experience in public service in either their own communities or in the communities where they attend college.

For many students, and particularly for minority students, entering the work force as quickly as possible after graduation is a practical economic necessity. Repaying the often enormous loans that have financed their educations must be a top priority for them and their families. This Peace Corps program would help to remove that financial barrier, easing the burden for

many students, as well as encouraging international service.

At a meeting at Stanford University 3 years ago, college presidents, including representatives from historically black colleges, met with Peace Corps officials to renew old ties between the academic community and the Peace Corps, and to consider ways to attract new volunteers, especially from minority groups. It was noted that although the idea of public service is an essential thread in the fabric of black American life, it is particularly difficult for students who may be the first in their families to attend college to surrender their first few years of earning power.

There is no question that the Peace Corps is committed to reflecting the diversity of the American people in its own ranks of goodwill ambassadors to the world. Yet it has indeed had trouble attracting minorities. By way of example, although the population of the United States is about 12 percent black, blacks constitute only about 2 percent of Peace Corps volunteers.

The college presidents suggested that the incentives included in the Peace Corps language of H.R. 4330 are certain to be of particularly great value in attracting blacks and other minorities into the Corps. An increase in the number of minorities serving in the Peace Corps would have a ripple effect, helping to augment the number of minorities among foreign service officers and personnel of the Agency for International Development, both of whom the Peace Corps is a noted supplier.

Many in this body may recall that the Congress and President Reagan strongly supported the 1986 resolution setting a target of 10,000 Peace Corps volunteers by 1992. This legislation would help achieve that goal by addressing the decline in the number of volunteers, which has dropped from a high of around 15,000 in the mid-1960's to just over 6,000 today.

The Peace Corps language in H.R. 4330 would also help the Corps recruit students with an expertise in such scarce skill areas as forestry, crop extension, animal husbandry, and irrigation—all of them skills which are much in demand in Peace Corps countries and in short supply on American campuses. It is well known that the Peace Corps today had a surplus of applicants with generalist degrees in fields such as history and political science. It is less well known that the Peace Corps does not come close to satisfying host countries' request for volunteers with those scarce skills which I previously mentioned.

Peace Corps volunteers have been called our best exports. Especially in this post cold war era, they have been called on to help spread and install the principles of democracy in Eastern Europe and around the world. They return for their service overseas as our best imports, serving our people as teachers, public interest advocates,

social workers, and other community service careers, including legislators.

In his inauguration address, President Bush called on us to "make gentler the face of the world." It is time that a new generation of American students and we as a nation took up that challenge. I firmly believe that the national service legislation which we are debating is necessary to provide our youth with the opportunities to confront that challenge. I urge my colleagues to join me in strong support of H.R. 4330.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

(Mrs. Unsoeld asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, the National Service Act is an exciting call to our young people to serve their communities. My family served overseas with the Peace Corps, and those Peace Corps volunteers changed lives forever.

□ 1320

Their own and everyone with whom they came in contact. It would have been a drastically different service organization had those Peace Corps volunteers had to pick up all of their own expenses themselves with no Government umbrella.

Some of the various organizations that are identified as those that are examples of the voluntarism and therefore, no need for this program, are themselves advocates of our National Service Act. For example, the National Collaboration for Youth, National Council on the Aging, National Crime Prevention Council, National Network of Runaway and Youth Services, United Way, Big Brothers and Sisters, Girl Scouts, Red Cross, and the Child Welfare League of America.

The National Service Act is a brilliant plan. It delivers a double benefit. Volunteers benefit from the experience, and their own personal growth, while communities benefit from their help. National service projects offer a special advantage for at-risk youth. It allows them to obtain job skills and work experience which can lead to permanent employment. The Washington Service Corps, in my State, is an extremely successful, positive model of youth community service. That corps has attracted national attention because they do one thing well. They maintain their primary focus on community service, while giving unemployed youth meaningful work experience.

From tourism, to tutoring, from food banks, to fire departments, the youth of Washington are responding. Service to others, to communities, State, and Nation, is not by any means a new idea. It is emerging, however, from a long period of dormancy. I hope to encourage it. Along with thousands of others in this community, I benefited

greatly from the Peace Corps experience years ago. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It will help unlock the vast potential of our youth to improve their own lives and the well-being of their communities. The National Service Act is a winner for everyone.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, what we have here is a difference in philosophies. There are some who believe that the only way we can have volunteers is if the Federal Government is involved in the process. There are some Members who believe that volunteers are there because they, themselves, want to be there and that that is the kind of voluntarism that has worked for 300 years in this country.

Indeed, the people who bring this bill to Members today, believe, evidently, that there is a Federal solution to everything, including things that have no useful Federal role. That is the case here.

There is an old adage that says, "If it ain't broke don't fix it." Well, that is what we ought to be looking at right now. We have 300 years of experience in this country of people volunteering. In the earliest days, volunteering to save their neighbors from fires on their farms, or in their homes, or to defend the community. Volunteering in all kinds of ways. And it has been getting better in recent years. In recent years, we have had more people volunteering, not less. We have had fantastic participation in voluntary organizations, and we ought not to get the Federal Government involved in ways that would be harmful.

I have to ask some of my colleagues who bring this bill to Members, have they been in high schools recently? Have those Members been on the college campuses recently? The young people in our colleges today and in our high schools today are doing a fantastic job. We have service clubs that have oversubscriptions of kids. We have church groups where kids are volunteering, doing all kinds of community work. We have fraternity and sororities that are holding all kinds of charitable events. These are kids who want to serve their country and are doing a good job of it.

Why in the world would we impose a new kind of Federal program on top of this? Why would we take real voluntarism and convert the people who are volunteers into simply tools for Federal bureaucrats? That makes no sense at all. Why do we do that? You have got young people today who are enthusiastically serving their country. Let Members keep it that way.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], as well as the gentleman

from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the others for bringing this legislation to the floor. It is a compilation of a number of Members' initiatives, and a response to the interest that many Members have had for a long time to encourage the community to get more involved in national service, especially the youth of our country.

The task of leadership is to help provide others with the opportunity to give the best of themselves. That is what, basically, we are doing today with this piece of legislation. It has a couple of important features. The school-based programs are particularly important. It encourages students at all levels to get involved in volunteer activities in their community. More and more high schools across this country, and junior high schools, are now requiring that there be some community-based service, and that is good.

My son, just this summer, spent 20 hours working in community service. He worked in a food bank. It had a tremendous and profound maturing effect on him. We need to be doing more of that type of thing. We need to be bringing in people with skills into our schools from the business community. New England Life Insurance is doing a magnificent job in a partnership between our young people in the schools and the business community, teaching them skills, getting them involved. We need to be bringing the skills of those who have worked with their hands, to help our young people in school understand those processes.

The school-based program is a wonderful component of this. It encourages partnership with business and labor and with our young people. The American Conservation and Youth Corps is another important part of that, recruiting youth for public service needs, conservation needs, historical preservation, day care, all of the important things in our society, why our youth can be productive, can obviously handle these cases, these activities better than some in other age categories. I know in my own State, the Michigan Conservation Corps and Youth Corps has done a tremendous job in helping many, many young people today develop a sense of responsibility, and to contribute to the community in health and environmental and other important ways.

I would like to see this whole concept broadened. I mentioned this to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] and others. Ms. MIKULSKI, the Senator from Maryland and I have introduced legislation that would encourage community development among all ages, not just young people. We get an intergenerational mix with the old and young, they would work together and benefit, on a very small model scale. Those people who would give time, based on the concept of the National Guard, 2 weeks during the summer, 2 weeks during the year, they could earn a stipend which would help

finance a college education or perhaps a first home buy.

I would like to have Members look at that, perhaps in conference, on a very small scale. I have no idea that that will work, but I think it is worth visiting. The Senate has included it in their package, and I think it is indeed a worthy idea to look at. Therefore, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me congratulate the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], for bringing this to the floor of the committee. I look forward to working with the gentleman on this bill in the months ahead.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply say that this proposal simply brings before the body, and hopefully it will go into conference with the other body, which has already approved a companion bill, the views and proposals of many Members of the House, more than 140. What we have tried to do is incorporate those various ideas into the proposal.

□ 1330

I do not understand those who now preach that we are creating some new bureaucracy. The bill simply provides grants to States and local governments that will in turn encourage already existing agencies. Not one bureaucracy is created. For a Member of the opposition to say that we are creating some great new bureaucracy, particularly at the Federal level, simply is not true.

The bill is not as broad, not as comprehensive as some of us would want to do. It certainly is not a Federal intervention into the subject matter.

The President in his Inaugural Address merely continued a Federal encouragement to volunteers in this country. If there is any intervention, it certainly is largely a result of the President proposes the creation of an initiative, a specific initiative to stimulate such volunteer service to America, and not certainly the members of this committee or the author of the proposal.

Now, I am also shocked that there seems to be a great desire to refer to the cost of the program, that we cannot afford it. It would be concluded that simply by authorizing \$183 million for the National Service that somehow is going to bankrupt the country.

First of all, it would leverage millions of dollars that are not now being made available from local public funds, from corporations, from senior citizens who will use or volunteer out of their Social Security benefits, from students who already receive financial aid who would volunteer, from agencies as the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the YMCA's, the YWCA's, the Youth Corps, the United Way, and other such agencies. To me, that is not a tremendous departure. It certainly does not involve a great cost.

I am wondering what some of these individuals would have done had they been our Founding Fathers. We probably would never have closed the borders of our country. We would never have purchased Louisiana and Texas would be a part of Mexico. We would not have the Panama Canal. We would not have had the GI bill of rights at the end of World War II, one of the great investments that we have made. These were larger investments, but they paid off. Here is an investment that also will pay its own way and leverage millions of dollars, but most of all will give dignity to those who volunteer in National Service in behalf of America.

I would certainly hope that we further the cause by approving this bill and allowing us to continue the subject matter.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990. The bill would authorize a variety of youth service programs which I believe will better prepare our young people for the future while benefiting communities now.

The bill authorizes grants for model community service youth programs and special service programs for dropouts and out-of-school youth. Among the programs provided for in the bill is youth build, through which young people are employed in the construction and rehabilitation of housing for low income and homeless families as well as health service facilities.

In my district of San Francisco, voluntary youth service has been a hallmark of the community. The San Francisco Conservation Corps (SFCC) has become a model for youth service programs throughout the country, offering training for at-risk youths and services for the community at large. The National Service Act would provide needed support for programs such as the SFCC.

Mr. Chairman, young people are the foundation of our country; they represent our aspirations for the future. Investing in young people is the best use of our tax dollar. The National Service Act is a sound investment—it prepares our young people for the challenges of the 21st century. I urge my colleagues to vote for the passage of H.R. 4330.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of national service.

We are all here today because we believe in national service. First, and foremost, the need is real; real in communities like my own Hartford, CT, where volunteers are desperately needed to help care for the elderly, feed the hungry and educate our children.

But aside from meeting these needs of the Nation, national service goes to the heart of what it means to be an American. Often we are so caught up with our problems—the budget deficit and the summit and the Persian Gulf and a renewed energy crunch—that we forget how fortunate we are in America. But with the advantages and privileges of being Americans comes civic responsibility. This responsibility is what national service is all about.

All we are asking today is that Americans respond to this challenge, to give something back and to fulfill the promise that is America. As a Democrat, I believe in civic obligation. I believe in helping the less fortunate in the

world and each other. I believe in hard work and equal sacrifice for the common good. These values are the key to our stature in the world, our survival and our future.

Today we are asking Americans to dedicate themselves to a higher standard of excellence. The Nation needs the courage, the ingenuity and the idealism of our citizens. We all have limits as individuals, but as a community, a nation, there is nothing we cannot accomplish, no problem we cannot solve. National service can unify our sense of national purpose and direction.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990. This bill represents an initial step in fostering a sense of community service and expanding opportunities for community service among America's young people. And for that step, I applaud Chairman HAWKINS and the Education and Labor Committee. For the most part, this legislation uses existing structures to expand volunteer opportunities. It builds on State programs, such as the one in my State of Minnesota, that have already been successful. And, it expands loan cancellations to volunteers serving in non-profit, non-governmental agencies. This is comparable to a provision I would like to see adopted on an international level as well.

My interest in national service legislation, however, goes far beyond the scope of this bill. I recently introduced H.R. 5514, The Voluntary National Service Act of 1990, which has many of the same goals as H.R. 4330, namely to create, restore and expand opportunities for voluntary national service. My legislation would encourage volunteer participation by providing assistance in student financial aid in exchange for voluntary service. It would enhance recruitment and retention in our Nation's Armed Forces by improving benefits under the provisions of the Montgomery GI bill education programs. It would expand international volunteer service opportunities by affording educational assistance for those serving overseas with private voluntary organizations as well as those serving in the Peace Corps. And, it would encourage qualified individuals to enter and be trained for law enforcement service. The opportunities for service and the needs to be met are endless.

I am aware that our current Federal fiscal situation does not allow us to adopt national service on a broader basis such as proposed by my legislation. But we can demonstrate support for expanded voluntary service—as provided for in H.R. 4330. As an editorial in the Fairbairn, MN, News supporting my national service concept said: "... There is a need to actively nurture the concept of service, commitment and citizenship." With the passage of H.R. 4330, we can provide the nurturing climate that will allow those values to grow.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I also to express my support for H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990. The legislation will establish school and college-based community service volunteer programs which will ultimately improve the quality of life in this country.

The bill gives States grants to establish school-based student volunteer programs. It creates an American conservation corps to work in wildlife areas, parks, forests, and recreational areas. It also establishes a youth service corps to provide volunteers for running

homes, day care centers, libraries, and government agencies.

H.R. 4330 also provides funding for a rural youth demonstration project which would provide students in rural areas with volunteer opportunities which they would not otherwise have. In my rural southern Illinois district, many of the young people do not have as many recreational options as their counterparts in cities. When kids do not have constructive activities to occupy their time, they get into trouble. Alcohol abuse and teenage pregnancy are just two of the problems which plague rural schools in my district and across the country. The rural youth demonstration program would give those students a volunteer job and a chance to serve their communities.

Mr. Chairman, this bill reflects our strong commitment to volunteerism and it establishes important new programs, and it deserves the full support of each and every member of the House. I applaud the efforts of my colleagues on the committee for the work they have put into this important bill and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to rise in support of H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990, of which I am an original cosponsor. This comprehensive bill will encourage and reward public service by Americans of all ages, but particularly young people. This bill will help call on the altruism and generosity of Americans to make significant contributions toward alleviating some of our Nation's most pressing problems—illness, inadequate health care, homelessness, environmental degradation, crime, drug and alcohol abuse and insufficient care for children and the elderly.

Crafting this bill has been a very challenging and complex task that has involved the Subcommittees on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, Postsecondary Education, Employment Opportunities, Select Education and Human Resources of the Education and Labor Committee. The chairman of those Subcommittees—Congressman HAWKINS, Congressman WILLIAMS, Congressman MARTINEZ, Congressman OWENS and Congressman KIDDER—deserve commendation for their work in developing various facets of this bill. Chairman HAWKINS and his staff, especially Gene Sofer, merit special recognition for artfully weaving together the diverse strands of this legislation. Many Members who do not serve on the Education and Labor Committee, including Congressman NEAL of Massachusetts, Chairman PANETTA, Congressman BOMER, Congressman McCARTHY, Congresswoman KENNELLY and Congressman MORELLA have also been strong advocates of national service legislation and contributed to the development of this bill. The Committees on Foreign Affairs; Banking, Finance of Urban Affairs and Interior and Insular Affairs were also extremely cooperative in expediting this bill and making its timely consideration by the House possible.

I am particularly pleased to support this bill because it substantially incorporates H.R. 2591, the Serve America, the Service to America Act of 1989, which I introduced on June 8, 1989. In particular, the School-Based Service Learning Program in title I of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Education to make grants to State education agencies to plan

and build statewide capacity for school-based service learning programs. The State education agencies will make grants to local partnerships between local education agencies and local government agencies, community-based organizations, institutions of higher education or private nonprofits. Priority will be given to projects undertaken by the partnership which target low-income areas, promote intergenerational contact, promote drug and alcohol prevention and include mentoring activities. Thirty-five million dollars is authorized for these activities in fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 3 succeeding years. In addition, the Higher Education Community Service Program authorizes the Secretary of Education to make grants, or enter into contracts, with institutions of higher education to enable them to create or expand service activities for their students. This program is authorized at \$10 million in fiscal year 1991 and at such sums thereafter for the next 3 years. I believe that service opportunities which effectively use our schools at all levels and which engage the energy and idealism of students are likely to be most effective. Support for these school-based service opportunities were the centerpiece of my national service bill, H.R. 2591, and I am delighted that they remain central to National Service Act of 1990.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4330.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, when Congress sees a problem, its first impulse is to enact a law, any law, to spend money to solve it. Countless examples have shown that money spent does not always equal results. But what happens when there is no problem.

Welcome to the National Service Act of 1989. The National Service Act attempts to fight the problem of waning voluntarism nationwide. This measure spends \$183 million each year to promote the oxymoron of the year—paid voluntarism.

According to a 1988 survey conducted by the Independent Sector, an umbrella organization for most of the charitable groups in the country, voluntarism thrives without government intervention. In the study, 45 percent of people surveyed said they regularly volunteered. Further, one-third of those respondents reported spending more time on volunteer work in the previous 3 years. In all, an estimated 80 million adults gave a total of 19.5 billion hours in 1987, at a value of \$150 billion.

In the face of such huge success, Congress is well on its way to spending millions of tax dollars to solve a problem that doesn't exist or, at the very least, considering the debt and deficit, is of lowest priority. The national service bill will pay volunteers to fill a variety of roles. A few examples are: programs establishing a youth service corps to work in government agencies, libraries, law enforcement agencies, and other activities that are of substantial social benefit; paying Peace Corps volunteers' college tuition; and deferring the guaranteed student loans of those who would undertake full time volunteer service.

But voluntarism thrives without Government subsidies. Where Federal money will make a difference, however, it will surely destroy the spirit which initially led people to volunteer. The example I cited above demonstrate the point. As for the Peace Corps, applicants for the Corps far exceed the spaces

available, because young college graduates and older technicians view the experience as gratifying and beneficial for future career prospects. Tuition subsidies—which could total \$40,000 at an elite university—are unnecessary. Finally, a GSL deferral for those who choose full-time volunteer service is of little financial consequence and barely an incentive.

The only sure effect of paying volunteers will be to increase the size of the already mammoth Federal debt. Based on the most recent Congressional Budget Office [CBO] projections, the deficit for fiscal year 1991 will exceed \$230 billion, not including borrowing from the Social Security trust fund. The Federal debt is over \$3 trillion dollars, and interest on the debt alone is projected to be \$286 billion in fiscal year 1991. With this unshakable burden resting upon us, I found it hard to believe Congress is even considering a \$180 million bill to address a problem that doesn't exist.

The American people know to volunteer—let's prove to them that Congress knows how to earn its salary. Vote no on the National Service Act.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990.

I was privileged to be an original cosponsor of the Act, as introduced by the able Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS]. At the time of the bill's introduction, I was serving as a Temporary Member of that Committee.

The Education and Labor Committee approved a bill that encourages a greater spirit of community service, particularly among America's youth by building upon existing State and local efforts and enhancing their potential for addressing unmet social needs. Funds are authorized in the bill for the coordination of school-based community services programs, both K-12 and higher education, as well as for the American Conservation Corps and the Youth Service Corps.

The bill as reported provides matching support for a variety of school-based and full-time service programs for America's young people, providing them with opportunities to serve their communities in significant ways, while improving their own skills. These opportunities will ease their transition to productive adulthood and give them an understanding of their responsibilities as citizens in a democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I am appalled that the administration is opposed to this measure, saying among other things that it authorizes unwarranted new Federal programs, such as loan deferment and cancellation provisions, or the costs of administering the new programs, or the authorization of \$28 million in fiscal year 1991 for the Youth Service Corps.

The Secretary of Education claims that our bill attempts to direct community services from the Federal level, rather than from the community.

Mr. Chairman, I would characterize our bill as forming a partnership with States and localities who cannot afford to do what needs to be done by themselves. They cannot, and they have said they cannot, do it alone.

H.R. 4330, as reported, expressed a need for the legislation thrusty. " * * * seeks to maintain and where necessary, revive the American spirit of civilian service. While Americans have a rich history of commitment to service efforts, the availability of service op-

portunities has been less consistent. This bill intends to build upon existing Federal programs like VISTA, Peace Corps, Older Americans Volunteer Programs, and the Student Literacy Corps to expand service opportunities and to increase the number of Americans who perform community services."

I think that says a lot. In fact, I think that says it all.

H.R. 4330 also addresses the issue of sectarian activity or participation in these programs, and the Committee expresses its intent that prohibitions on sectarian activity in the performance of program responsibilities found in title I, section 157 shall not be interpreted to abridge or interfere with the rights of such individuals or organizations to freedom of speech and expression.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee also acknowledges that the country's 960 community action agencies mobilize a vast and committed network of volunteers representing a broad cross-section of the local community. Community Action Agencies, or CAP's as they are known, are given the opportunity to use their more than 25 years experience to carry out programs authorized in this bill.

The inclusion of CAP's is of enormous satisfaction to me. While I was a Member of the Education and Labor Committee early this year when the bill was originally introduced, regrettably I was rotated off the committee in June prior to its consideration and reporting of H.R. 4330. Prior to going off the committee, I had been urged by the Director of the WV State Community Action Agency Association, David Trehame, to include community action agencies throughout the bill. The simple justification was: If anybody or entity knows how to deliver volunteer and community services at the local level, it is the 25 year-old CAP's, who began their service in 1964 as part of the old EEO Program.

Last March I had prepared an amendment which was submitted at the Committee staff level, prior to leaving the committee, to include CAP's in the bill as eligible participants. I want to express again my pleasure that this has been done in the committee bill, and to commend the Subcommittee on Human Resources Chairman DALE KILDEE for his foresight in making CAP's eligible participants.

Chairman KILDEE's outstanding record to improve and enhance the programs under his subcommittee's jurisdiction is legend, and particularly on behalf of the Community Action Agencies and their continuing war on poverty begun back in 1964.

This bill will help prepare our young people to be the workers and citizens we will need in our global economy as we approach the 21st Century. It also provides modest resources to energize the partnership we intend to forge with State and local governments in providing community services, among young and old alike.

Again, I commend the distinguished Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee GUS HAWKINS, and its ranking minority member BILL GOODLING, for bringing this bill to the floor of the House for our consideration. I include all Members of the Education and Labor Committee in my congratulations for reporting this tremendously important measure, and I also wish to convey my appreciation to the Chairmen of other Standing Committees with jurisdiction over many of its parts, for their agree-

ment to waive jurisdiction so that this bill can move forward to enactment by the House. These include the Committees on Foreign Affairs (Peace Corps), Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs (construction and rehabilitation of housing), and Interior and Insular Affairs (conservation).

I strongly support passage of H.R. 4330, and encourage my colleagues to vote for its passage as well.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990, introduced by Representative AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, which now has the support of over 100 of our colleagues. That support alone indicates the tremendous interest this issue has garnered. Chairman HAWKINS has done an outstanding job in providing the leadership necessary to balance the various interests and concerns of the Members who were responsible for contributing to the titles represented in this comprehensive bill. This legislation we are addressing today will indeed promote and coordinate efforts to address social problems through community service across this great Nation.

H.R. 4330 authorizes \$35 million for school-based programs that make community service an important element of learning. Such service learning programs have beneficial impacts on attendance, behavior, and achievement and energizes teachers and administrators as well as students. In addition, the bill authorizes \$25 million in grants to institutions of higher education to create or expand service opportunities for their students. It also encourages students to tutor both disadvantaged students in chapter 1 schools and their parents.

The National Service Act of 1990 authorizes \$93 million to establish the American Conservation Corps [ACC], the Youth Service Corps [YSC] and Youthbuild demonstrations. Both the ACC and the YSC, which are based on H.R. 717, the American Conservation and Youth Service Corps Act of 1989 which I introduced last year, would provide innovative means of restoring lost social services to our communities and performing vital conservation tasks. The American Conservation Corps would focus on environmental and conservation projects on public Federal and State lands. The Youth Service Corps would work with projects in nonprofit social service agencies, schools, nursing homes, and other facilities meeting human needs. Richard Danzig and Peter Szanton, in their book, "National Service: What Would It Mean?" estimated that up to 3.5 million positions could be filled by youth service workers each year to help fill the gaps without displacing current workers. These included over 1 million in education, over 700,000 in the health field, nearly 1.5 million in child care, over 165,000 in conservation and the environment, and 250,000 in criminal justice and public safety.

Youthbuild combines compensatory education and construction skills training to provide disadvantaged youth with an opportunity to learn and to revitalize their community's housing stock. In addition to performing service, participants receive education, job training, work experience and enhance self-esteem. Service benefits both the participant as well as the community, and this bill gives disadvantaged youth the opportunity to serve their communities, their country and themselves.

This bill also includes \$30 million to fund demonstration programs targeted to school dropouts and rural youth; to encourage college students to join the Peace Corps; to encourage Foster Grandparents to participate in Head Start; to allow Governors to sponsor new and innovative community service programs at the State level; and to fund Presidential awards recognizing excellence in community service.

The bill also contains provisions regarding job displacement and, education and job training, where necessary. No new bureaucracy is created and in fact builds upon service efforts currently underway in local communities throughout the country. Finally, the bill does not include any linkage between service and student financial assistance.

I am very proud to be a part of this national service movement and am encouraged both by the passage of S. 1430, the National Community and Service Act, and by the President's interest in the national service issue. Community service helps address social and environmental needs; provides the chance to serve fellow citizens and communities, and provides participants with valuable experience and, often, education and training as well.

This call to service is not issued lightly, and it is the entire Nation, in the long run, which stands to gain the most from the more outward-looking citizenry that would develop from such a program. A national service program would offer young adults a renewed opportunity to earn a sense of pride and self-respect, and fulfill many pressing national, human, social and environmental needs. Fellow colleagues, I fervently hope that the House will take timely action, and build on extensive efforts, to create the national service program and make national service a national reality. I urge your support of the National Service Act of 1990.

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the volunteer liability protection amendment offered by my friend from Illinois, JOHN PORTER.

This amendment is virtually identical to a bill he has sponsored in the House, H.R. 911, which has 215 cosponsors.

We cannot introduce such a strong Federal presence in volunteerism without sending a firm message to States about the need to protect volunteers from malicious lawsuits.

I offered this amendment when we considered this bill in the Education and Labor Committee because it is an important component of an infrastructure we are attempting to build to support and encourage volunteerism.

A story I relayed during the Committee markup is worth mentioning here. This occurred in Runnymede, NJ in 1985. A child playing in the outfield during a little league playoff game misjudges a fly ball, is hit in the eye, and injured. The parents sued the four coaches as individuals. The allegation: the child was an infielder, not an outfielder and the coaches knew this. The case was settled out of court for several hundred thousand dollars.

We are seeing greater and greater incidences of potential volunteers unwilling to give their time in service for fear of being sued.

A 1988 Gallup survey revealed: 20 percent of directors of nonprofit associations indicated that fear of liability was hurting their ability to recruit and retain volunteers to serve on boards.

A growing number of States are passing volunteer protection laws. This amendment does not usurp State's authority in this area. This amendment does not interfere with State participation in the act, except for one program, the new Governor's service program.

This amendment protects the volunteer as an individual, the organization must still answer in court for any injury.

In order for the volunteer to receive this protection, the volunteer must have been acting in good faith, not in a willful or wanton manner, and in a way that is within the scope of his duties.

The National Service Act will create thousands of federally-sponsored volunteers in all 50 States. These volunteers will be subject to different civil justice standards in each State. This amendment will encourage States to treat all volunteers, equitably and fairly.

The amendment is supported by over 75 organizations representing tens of millions of volunteers across the Nation including: The United Way, American Society for Personnel Administrators, U.S. Farm Bureau, the American Medical Association, and the National Association of Manufacturers.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990, and in particular support of the title 2 provisions, which are similar to those in the service bill I introduced February 2, 1989.

Our Nation's young people must have the opportunity to experience both the tangible and the intangible benefits stemming from giving of themselves.

The experiences young men and women have while serving and later walk away with are more than just job related. In addition to helping other people, they learn that they can make a difference in their schools, their communities, their families, and in their own lives.

To show how effective these programs can be, let me tell you about just two of the many programs that are part of a statewide effort in Pennsylvania, my home State.

The Successful Student Partnership Program is an integral part of school dropout prevention efforts. It now operates in 30 school districts and will soon expand to 15 more because of the significant achievement of participating students. For example—out of 100 seventh graders at risk of leaving school before completing high school, after just 1 year in the program, 18 of these students were on the honor roll.

And, statistics from the Pennsylvania Conservation Corps Program, which targets youth who have already left school, show an even higher success rate. Out of the 8,000 young men and women the Pennsylvania corps had helped:

Each one was unemployed when joining the corps;

Almost 40 percent were on some form of public assistance; and

Fifty percent had not finished high school.

Today, 72 percent of these young people—5,760 of the original 8,000—have moved on to unsubsidized employment, further education, or military service.

Mr. Chairman, many of us in this Chamber don't even need statistics to know these programs work.

During the Depression, we saw firsthand the positive effect service programs had on thousands of families because some of those families were either our own, or those of close friends or classmates. We saw how these programs cannot only instill the work ethic, but also pull people out of the pits of despair by changing their lives and their outlooks on life.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for H.R. 4330 the National Service Act of 1989.

While I still have the floor, I'd like to point out that Pennsylvania has been and continues to be a leader on this front. Currently, Pennsylvania invests more than \$7 million in service programs through the Pennsylvania Conservation Corps and PennSERVE, the large program of which the Successful Student Partnership program I talked about earlier is only a small part.

Since 1985, PennSERVE has created 66 model school-based community service programs, launched two full-time year-round service corps in McKeesport and Pittsburgh, worked to expand the Pennsylvania Campus Compact to 26 colleges, initiated the Pennsylvania Model Literacy Corps on 13 college campuses, strengthened volunteer programs for 180,000 State employees, and collaborated with the United Way to establish the Pennsylvania citizen service project.

In addition, four school districts in the State have made community service a graduation requirement and the State's two largest districts—Philadelphia and Pittsburgh—have made community service and integral part of major restructuring efforts.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Chairman, National Youth Service is a phrase that has many definitions but one common goal. That goal is the development of patriotism and community spirit by encouraging America's youth to devote a portion of their lives to working for the common good. Our communities need the voluntary services of our Nation's college students and many of our young people are willing to serve their community. But one thing often stands in their way—looming student loan indebtedness.

In the past two Congresses, I have introduced youth service legislation that calls for the deferral or partial forgiveness of student loans for college graduates who spend at least 1 year of their life working in charitable or community service activities. Aspects of my legislation have been included in H.R. 4336, the National Service Act, and I commend Chairman HAWKINS for realizing that loan deferral and partial forgiveness can play a vital in the promotion of community service activities.

As a member of the Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Mentoring and Youth Community Service in the State of Minnesota, I have seen firsthand the impact that volunteerism and service has on our Nation's communities, on its citizens, and especially, the positive impact it has on our Nation's young people—our future. H.R. 4330 consolidates many of the best ideas of the several youth service proposals that have been introduced in the House of Representatives that past Congress, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation.

I would like to commend Chairman HAWKINS for his strong leadership on this legislation, and as a member of the Minnesota Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Mentoring

and Youth Community Service, express the committee's full support of H.R. 4330.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1989.

This legislation is a significant but appropriately modest response to the renewed interest in volunteerism and service we are seeing around the Nation. This bill will encourage and provide necessary support to State and local youth volunteer efforts, but it does not, as some urged us to do earlier in this Congress, create any massive new volunteer program. H.R. 4330 also recognizes that young people do care and are willing to serve their communities if they are given an opportunity and do not need to be compelled or coerced to serve as some have advocated. H.R. 4330 also forthrightly rejects the demands of some that postsecondary financial aid be provided only to those who perform service, recognizing that the Nation's woefully underfunded postsecondary aid programs are not welfare but a critical investment in our future. Finally, H.R. 4330 does not, as some had recommended, create any new bureaucracies to administer volunteer programs, recognizing that the ACTION Agency, an entity created by President Nixon specifically to support volunteerism and administer service programs like VISTA and Foster Grandparents, must have a pivotal role in administering any new volunteer programs.

Most of the resources provided by H.R. 4330 are targeted to improving opportunities for service by low-income and other disadvantaged young people. I am particularly pleased that the legislation includes provisions I authored to support Youthbuild training and employment projects. Up to \$10 million is authorized for grants to assist local development projects which provide disadvantaged youth with education, skills training, and work experience in the construction or rehabilitation of housing for homeless and other low-income people or community facilities needed in low-income communities.

All Youthbuild participants must be economically disadvantaged and at least 75 percent of the participants in each Youthbuild project must be high school dropouts with reading or math skills below the eighth grade level—persons who are frequently unserved by JTPA and other training programs and who are among those with the greatest difficulties in the job market. The remaining 25 percent of the participants could be high school dropouts with reading skills above the eighth grade level or high school graduates who have educational needs despite their attainment of a degree. Special recruitment activities would have to be undertaken by each project to attract the participation of young women, ex-offenders, foster care youth, and youth who are homeless.

Youthbuild participants would spend half their time in academic remediation, GED classes, and other educational programs. The rest of their time would be spent on the construction site, working at minimum wage and learning marketable job skills. Upon its completion, the housing Youthbuild participants help to build would be reserved permanently for homeless and low-income families at affordable rents.

The innovative model upon which Youthbuild is based has proven successful wherever it has been tried. It has been carefully de-

veloped in East Harlem by the Youth Action Program since 1976. The Banana Kelly Community Improvement Association has successfully replicated it in the South Bronx since 1984. Public/Private Ventures has implemented the model in 12 cities. Youthbuild programs are now being developed by community groups in Minneapolis, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, Cleveland, Youngstown, Boston, Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, Newark, and in many other locations, but they are struggling without an adequate and stable source of funding.

The Youthbuild Program has proven to be particularly attractive to and beneficial for young minority males and comprises an important part of the response we must make to the terrible crisis facing these young people. The average earnings of all young men have fallen since the early 1970's, but the earnings losses of young black and Hispanic men have been particularly severe: the average annual earnings of young black men fell by 36.7 percent between 1973 and 1987. Young Hispanic men lost 26.7 percent and young white men lost 21.5 percent. Black male dropouts have been hardest hit by changes in the economy. In 1987, young black male dropouts earned an average of only \$2,966, compared to \$9,496 in 1973—a drop of 64.6 percent. This is twice the size of earnings losses experienced by white and Hispanic male dropouts.

A devastatingly high proportion of young black and Hispanic men are in prison, in jail, or on probation or parole. In 1989, nearly one in four black men between the ages of 20 and 29 were under the control of the criminal justice system—either in prison, in jail, or on parole—on any given day. The proportion was 1 in 10 for young Hispanic men and 1 in 16 for young white men. Young black and Hispanic men are also disproportionately the victims of violent crimes. For example, black men are seven times more likely to die from homicide than their white peers.

Despite the magnitude of this crisis, precious little is being done at the Federal, State, and local levels to arrest and reverse this horrible waste of human potential. There are few programs available to meet the needs of young men in the inner city. As the founder of Youthbuild, Dorothy Stoneman, put it in testimony before our committee: "The only active recruitment of low-income minority men is for them to become drug dealers." By providing support for the replication of the Youthbuild model in communities across the Nation, H.R. 4330 will help to remedy this paucity of meaningful alternatives for young minority males. During consideration of H.R. 4330, our committee heard testimony from Mr. Ventura Santiago, a Youthbuild graduate from East Harlem who obtained his GED through the program and learned construction skills which helped him to obtain a good job paying over \$23 per hour. Mr. Santiago spoke eloquently about what Youthbuild meant for him and what it could mean to other young people.

It is not easy growing up in East Harlem. Especially nowadays everybody thinks everybody is on crack or selling drugs or something. A lot of young guys are dropping out at early ages. It's just a shame. Most of them drop out because they really don't have anything to do. You've got to give people something to look forward to, like this training, something to look forward to that they could use in the future. If it

wasn't for this training, I don't know where I'd be today. I really don't.

Through Youthbuild, H.R. 4330 will provide many more opportunities for young men like Mr. Santiago. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation without crippling amendments.

Ms. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 4330, the National Service Act. It encourages the spirit of volunteerism and community spirit, while addressing unmet social needs. I'd say that's a winning combination.

The National Service Act will help young Americans gain a sense of accomplishment and civic participation. The rewards of instilling this personal sense of commitment to community in our youth will go a long way. It will help prepare our young people to be the workers and citizens we will need in our global economy as we approach the 21st century.

This critical legislation will promote National Service by providing support for a variety of school-based and extracurricular service programs for young people. In addition, this bill will provide Federal assistance to programs for conservation, rehabilitation of wildlife habitats, historical and cultural preservation, and other environmental projects.

I recently enjoyed a visit to Brown University and met with President Vartan Gregorian, and a group of committed youth service leaders. Brown has a proud history of promoting National Service. In February 1988, Brown and Youth Service America sponsored a "Youth Service Leadership Conference" which attracted a number of senior Government representatives. I am proud to represent an institution which has shown such leadership in preparing our young people to understand their responsibilities as citizens in a democracy.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4330, a bill that is designed to ignite all 1,000 of President Bush's famous points of light.

This bill is about emphasizing the importance of giving something back to this great Nation—about meeting the enormous needs of our communities through the great American tradition of volunteerism.

The programs created by this bill have the potential to make a real difference in our schools and communities. Half of the funding is provided for service programs in our Nation's schools, with a significant portion devoted to encouraging the concept of service learning, a tool which combines community service with academics and is used by teachers to energize themselves and their students. This program is going to improve the quality of education in this country.

In addition, half of the bill's funding is devoted to the creation of the American Conservation Corps and the Youth Service Corps, which are designed to conserve our resources and to meet urgent human needs in our communities.

As I meet with young people around my district, I have sensed an increasing desire to help solve local problems—a real yearning to serve the community and the Nation. This bill will help local students realize these objectives.

The bill builds on a long tradition of volunteerism in American society. It simply seeks to encourage the instinct of many Americans to serve those around them who need our help and assistance.

President Bush has talked about "a thousand points of light." However, if we look around our Nation today, we realize that many of those points of light are not visible or are flickering and on the verge of going out. This legislation will help ignite those points of light—particularly among our young people, many of whom are searching for ways to contribute.

This bill will help increase participation across the Nation and help encourage better citizenship across the country. It deserves our strong support, and I hope that all Members will join in approving this valuable legislation.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Chairman, everyday on this floor, Americans from every corner of our Nation discuss and debate the great ills facing our society. Crime, substance abuse, homelessness, economic destitution, illiteracy. Today, Congress has an opportunity to address all these concerns in a substantive and progressive way. Some call it preventative maintenance, but I prefer to call it common sense.

I am referring to the National Services Act, a bill that promotes community service at all school levels and establishes youth service programs. As legislators, we should resist looking upon the notion of volunteerism as just a way of providing services to our communities, but as an avenue through which the volunteer can become a productive participant in our society. That's the motivation behind this bill and it is sound.

H.R. 4330 will provide funding, with language for matching funds from State and local government, to create youth corps around the country. The work performed by these young men and women, most of whom have poor educations and few work skills, will have wide-ranging impact. What communities nationwide will receive are low-cost, quality services in the form of housing rehabilitation, day-care help, tutoring of young children, and conservation maintenance of parks and highways. Our disadvantaged and disenfranchised youth will get hands-on experience that will lead to real job skills, no wages but in some cases small stipends to help make ends meet, and opportunity to receive their GED's or college scholarships. And as importantly, they will receive an understanding of how their lives can have a significant effect on the people around them, an education they could never receive in a classroom.

What our society as a whole gets is something less tangible, but more substantive. Instead of embittered, unemployed and unemployable youths, our cities, towns and county's get productive, useful, caring citizens. Instead of drug usage and delinquent activities, the recourse for many who feel shunted from the mainstream, we will have willing and enthusiastic participants in our businesses, schools and churches, and the foundation of a competitive, global economy to take us into the next century.

It is not an oversight process. We will not wake up tomorrow from passing this bill and see the change. But like the violent crime, school dropout, and drug problems that develop over a number of years, it's a gradual process. However, it will happen if we give ideas like H.R. 4330 a chance.

For those in school, the National Service Act will expand their education in ways not possible without impetus from the Federal Government. Instead of just attending social

studies classes, students could set up voter registration drives. Instead of attending science classes, kids could help the Red Cross in setting up blood drives. There are many applications and all of them positive because they reinforce that what our children learn in the classrooms is not all boring theory out of textbooks, but can have real and exciting implications in their daily lives. That is enriching and the full measure of what education is all about.

For some schools, these are extracurricular activities, but I would like to see these programs become part of the curriculum. For educators and parents who are worried about providing basic reading and writing skill for students, I think youth service programs reinforce those skills and will make our kids realize the value of having a solid foundation in the basic education fundamentals. It will teach kids how to learn, something they will need the rest of their lives as jobs change and become obsolete.

It is the hope for many supporters of H.R. 4330, that the Federal Government will provide the impetus for State legislatures to create programs within their jurisdiction. A number of States already have programs, and many more have legislation that would establish youth corps. Among them, I am pleased to note, is Utah, which this past session passed a measure to create a Youth Conservation Corps. This new youth corps program will assist Utah in maintaining its highways, hiking trails, and rural areas.

America's business and civic leaders have already recognized that there are plenty of high skill positions available in our current job market, but there are not enough students who have received the education and job skills training needed to take on those jobs. More and more, corporate America is willing to make an investment in its future. Congress should too.

The funding level this legislation authorizes is \$180 million, not a significant sum to ask for with regard to the future of thousands of young Americans. And as I mentioned before, this legislation will act as motivation for States and localities to create youth services programs that one day they will have the principal responsibility in funding.

In closing, let me once again encourage your support for the National Services Act, legislation that I believe will have beneficial ramifications we have not even envisioned yet.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill shall be considered by titles as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and each title shall be considered as read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Services Act of 1990".

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as was evident from my previous remarks, I saw a little concerned about the fact that we are asking voluntarism and making it into kind of a bureaucratic entity rather than in the true spirit of voluntarism.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman specify what bureaucracy is being created?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I have a couple questions of the gentleman just to try to clarify that.

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, would the gentleman answer mine, please, as a matter of courtesy?

Mr. WALKER. Excuse me?

Mr. HAWKINS. I asked whether or not the gentleman will specify what bureaucracies are being created.

Mr. WALKER. Well, for example, I think that we may involve the bureaucracy of the IRS in all this. Can the gentleman tell me what the situation is with regard to the loan forgiveness? Is that regarded as income to the individual involved? What is the status of that particular item? Are we not going to get the IRS involved in this?

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman should understand the IRS is already created. Is the gentleman saying that is a bureaucracy that we are going to create? The gentleman is saying the IRS will be involved in the creation of another new bureaucracy?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will listen to what I said, I said we are going to make these people into tools of Federal bureaucrats. That is what I said, and tools of Federal bureaucrats means that, for example, the IRS, it looks to me they get involved here unless there is some solution within this bill.

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, perhaps the gentleman, if he will yield further, does not realize that they are already involved. We are not asking for their involvement.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is creating in his bill a whole host of new loan forgiveness.

My first question is, is that going to count as income for the individuals involved?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, there is no change in the relationship between the IRS regulations, laws and bureaucracy, as currently exists. There is cancellation in the law now. The IRS would treat the cancellations and deferments envisioned by this act exactly as it now treats other cancellations and deferments.

Mr. WALKER. And can the gentleman tell me, does that count as income to the individuals involved?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not income.

Mr. WALKER. It is not income to the individuals involved, so in this case the IRS will not count this forgiveness as income to the individuals involved. If I understand the gentleman.

Then I look at page 49 of the bill and I find a term called a full-time volunteer in service comparable to service referred to in subparagraph (E) and so on, but I do not see any definition in the bill of full-time volunteer. That is an interesting concept. This is somebody who is full time. What does that mean in terms of hours? Who is a full-time volunteer that is going to be eligible here? Is that somebody who works 40 hours a week as a volunteer? Who are these full-time volunteers?

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, that is already in the code. The definition would follow what is already in the code. We do not change the definition.

Mr. WALKER. Well, what is the definition of a full-time volunteer?

Mr. HAWKINS. It is 40 hours.

Mr. WALKER. It is 40 hours, so it is someone who works at voluntarism for 40 hours.

Then it goes on to say that this person must not receive compensation for services in excess of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In other words, we have now created a new title for minimum wage workers called a full-time volunteer. Is that what we are doing here in this language?

Mr. HAWKINS. The gentleman is referring to categories that already exist.

Now, I understand the gentleman is opposed to the bill and obviously he is trying to obfuscate the issues to protect his position.

Mr. WALKER. I am not trying to obfuscate anything, and I resent the chairman saying that. I am trying to find out what the gentleman's bill means.

Mr. HAWKINS. I tried to indicate to the gentleman that these are not new definitions. These are definitions already in existence.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the gentleman for that, but the problem is, that the gentleman is including under a loan cancellation authorization which is making a brandnew entitlement program. The gentleman is creating a brandnew entitlement program here and I am trying to find out what all this terminology means. I am telling the gentleman, I am not trying to obfuscate. I am trying to find out where the obfuscation is in the bill that the gentleman brings before us, because I will say that it sounds to me as though full-time volunteer is just another fancy word for minimum wage worker, if we go by the language which is in the gentleman's bill.

I also have another problem. When we go over to page 50, we find out over

there that we are talking about cancellation of loans not to volunteers in this bill but under the gentleman's—

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. Montgomery). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Over on page 50 of the bill we find it is not volunteers that we are dealing with. Then we begin dealing with full-time professionals.

Now, down in the bill here it says "as a full-time professional employee engaged in drug counseling, prevention, intervention, treatment, or education and employed by a public or nonprofit private agency or organization."

□ 1349

Now all of a sudden we have gotten out of the business of cancelling loans for volunteers. Now we are in the business of cancelling loans in this bill for full-time professional employees.

How did that get in there if this is a volunteer bill? Where did that one come from?

I would be glad to yield to someone.

The question is how did we end up with a volunteer bill with full-time professional employees getting the cancellation? Why not doctors? I have got people who are serving the poor, doctors who are full-time professional employees. Why not cancel some of their loans in the bill as well? Why do we pick out one category? Why are we dealing with full-time professional employees and not volunteers?

Well, I do not get an answer.

I mean that is a problem. You have a series of bureaucratic decisions that are going to be made here about this bill, and these people are literally going to be tools of the Federal bureaucrats.

I will tell you this bill has got problems. They are problems that are not being resolved. Good heavens, we cannot even get answers. I could not get an answer earlier as to how many volunteers this was going to create. I suppose there is no answer to that. I cannot get an answer about what we mean by a "full-time volunteer." I cannot find out why we are including full-time professionals in the bill.

I got to tell you I am a little bit concerned that this is a major intrusion into what has been a working system in this country. Voluntarism in this country has worked.

For Congress to get involved in ways that we do not even pretend to understand on the House floor is wrong. It makes a mockery of the title of this bill that suggests that we are doing something to help voluntary organizations, or people participating, contributing their skills in meaningful ways in our society.

I think we ought to reject this bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Are there any amendments to section 1? If not, the Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I—SCHOOL-BASED AND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMUNITY SERVICE

PART A—SCHOOL-BASED COMMUNITY SERVICE

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This part may be cited as the "Schools and Service-Learning Act of 1990".

Subpart 1—School-Based Service Learning
SEC. 106. SCHOOL-BASED SERVICE LEARNING PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Education is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this subpart, to make grants to States through their State educational agencies for—

(1) planning and building State capacity for implementing statewide, school-based, service-learning programs, including—

(A) preservice and in-service training for teachers, supervisors, and personnel from community organizations in which service opportunities will be provided;

(B) developing service-learning curricula, including age-appropriate learning components for students to analyze and apply their service experiences;

(C) forming local partnerships to develop school-based community service programs in accordance with this subpart;

(D) devising appropriate methods for research and evaluation of the educational value of youth service opportunities and the effect of youth service programs on communities;

(E) establishing effective outreach and dissemination to ensure the broadest possible involvement of nonprofit community-based organizations and youth-service agencies with demonstrated effectiveness in their communities; and

(F) integration of service-learning into academic curricula; and

(2) the implementation, operation, or expansion of statewide, school-based, service-learning programs through State distribution of not less than 80 percent of Federal funds made available under this subpart to projects and activities coordinated and operated by local partnerships of local educational agencies and other agencies and organizations in accordance with this subpart.

SEC. 107. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; ALLOTMENTS TO STATES.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subpart \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year 1991, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994.

(b) **RESERVATIONS.**—Of the sums appropriated to carry out this subpart for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve not more than 1 percent for payments to Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands, to be allotted in accordance with their respective needs.

(c) **ALLOTMENT.**—The remainder of such sums shall be allotted among the States as follows:

(1) From 50 percent of such remainder the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 percent of such remainder as the school-age population of the State bears to the school-age population of all States.

(2) From 50 percent of such remainder the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 percent of such remainder as allocations to the State for the previous fiscal year under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and

Secondary Education Act of 1965 bear to such allocations to all States.

(d) **LIMITATION.**—For any period during which a State is carrying out planning activities under section 106(1) prior to implementation under section 106(2), a State may be paid not more than 25 percent of its allotment under this subpart.

(e) **REALLOTMENT.**—The amount of any State's allotment for any fiscal year to carry out this subpart which the Secretary determines will not be required for that fiscal year shall be available for reallocation to other States as the Secretary may determine.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "school-age population" means the population aged 5 through 17, inclusive.

(2) The term "State" includes the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 108. ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) **ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS.**—From the sum made available under section 107 to a State educational agency for each fiscal year, such agency shall, through grants or contracts, provide not more than the Federal share of financial assistance to local partnerships for school-based service projects (in this subpart referred to as "partnerships") for the purpose of carrying out the projects and activities authorized by this subpart.

(b) **LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS.**—

(1) Each partnership shall consist of at least 1 local educational agency and at least 1—

- (A) local government agency;
- (B) community-based organization;
- (C) institution of higher education; or
- (D) private nonprofit organization.

(2) A partnership may include representation by private for-profit business organizations and private elementary and secondary schools.

(c) **PRIORITY.**—In providing financial assistance pursuant to this subpart, State educational agencies shall give priority consideration to proposals for projects that—

(1) are in greatest need of assistance, such as projects serving low-income areas;

(2) involve participants in the design and operation of the program, where appropriate;

(3) involve students from both public and private elementary and secondary schools and individuals of different ages, races, sexes, ethnic groups, and economic backgrounds serving together;

(4) involve adults, particularly older individuals, as mentors and in other capacities that provide significant interaction with youth performing community service in a school-based setting, including at-risk youth;

(5) involve a partnership which includes private sector employees with talents and skills in short supply in the schools; and

(6) focus on drug and alcohol abuse prevention, school drop-out prevention, or nutrition and health education.

SEC. 109. STATE APPLICATIONS.

(a) **APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.**—A State educational agency which desires to receive its allotment under this subpart shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require, including—

(1) evidence of substantial cooperative efforts among local educational agencies, local government agencies, community-based organizations, the private sector, and State agencies to develop service-learning opportunities;

(2) an assurance that participation of economically and educationally disadvantaged

youths, including youths in foster care who are becoming too old for foster care, youths of limited English proficiency, and youths with disabilities, will participate in service opportunities;

(3) provision for the coordination of service opportunities with other federally assisted education programs, training programs, social service programs, and other appropriate programs that serve youth;

(4) an assurance that urban, rural, and tribal areas will be served;

(5) an assurance that the State will give special consideration to providing assistance to projects that will provide academic credit to participants;

(6) an assurance that the State will keep such records and provide such information to the Secretary as may be required for fiscal audits and program evaluation; and

(7) an assurance that the State will comply with the specific requirements of this subpart.

(b) **DIRECT GRANTS.**—In any fiscal year in which a State does not participate in programs under this subpart, the Secretary may use the State's allotment to make direct grants for school-based service-learning projects to local applicants in that State.

(c) **PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN AND TEACHERS FROM PRIVATE SCHOOLS.**—

(1) To the extent consistent with the number of children in the State or in the school district of the local educational agency involved who are enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools, such State or agency shall (after consultation with appropriate private school representatives) make provision—

(A) for including services and arrangements for the benefit of such children as will assure the equitable participation of such children in the purposes and benefits of this subpart; and

(B) for such training for the benefit of teachers of such children as will assure equitable participation of such teachers in the purposes and benefits of this subpart.

(2) If by reason of any provision of law, a State or local educational agency or institution of higher education is prohibited from providing for the participation of children or teachers from private nonprofit schools as required by paragraph (1), or if the Secretary determines that a State or local educational agency substantially fails or is unwilling to provide for such participation on an equitable basis, the Secretary shall waive such requirements and shall arrange for the provision of services to such children and teachers. Such waivers shall be subject to consultation, withholding, notice, and judicial review requirements in accordance with section 1017 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

SEC. 110. LOCAL PROGRAM PROPOSAL.

(a) **PROPOSAL REQUIREMENT.**—A partnership that desires to receive financial assistance pursuant to this subpart shall submit to the State educational agency of the State in which it is located a proposal which meets the requirements of this section. Such proposal shall be submitted at such time and in such manner as the State educational agency may reasonably require.

(b) **PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.**—Each proposal submitted under subsection (a) shall—

(1) contain a written agreement among the partners, including the entities with which students or school volunteers are affiliated, community representatives, and the local educational agency where service opportunities will be provided, which states that the program was developed by all the partners and that the program will be jointly operated by the partnership;

(2) provide for the establishment of an advisory committee consisting of representatives of community agencies, services recipients, youth serving agencies, students, parents, teachers, administrators, school board members, labor, and business, and describe the membership and role of such committee;

(3) describe the goals of the program, including goals that are quantifiable, measurable, and demonstrate benefits to both the students or school volunteers and the community;

(4) describe the service opportunities to be provided;

(5) describe how the students or school volunteers will be recruited, including special efforts to recruit school dropouts with the assistance of community-based organizations;

(6) describe how students or school volunteers were or will be involved in the design and operation of the program;

(7) state the responsibilities and qualifications of the coordinator of any program assisted under this subpart;

(8) describe preservice and in-service training to be provided to supervisors and students or school volunteers;

(9) describe potential resources that will permit continuation of the program, if necessary, upon the expiration of Federal funding;

(10) describe an age-appropriate learning component for students that includes, at a minimum, a chance for students to analyze and apply their service experiences and expected learning outcomes;

(11) indicate whether students will receive academic credit for participation;

(12) establish target numbers for—

(A) students who will participate in the program assisted under this subpart; and

(B) hours of service such students will provide individually and as a group;

(13) describe the proportion of students expected to participate who are educationally or economically disadvantaged, including students with disabilities;

(14) describe the ages and grade levels of students who are expected to participate;

(15) include other relevant demographic information about students who are expected to participate; and

(16) provide assurances that students will be provided with information (including information relating to student loan deferment and forgiveness provisions) concerning the Volunteers in Service to America program, the Peace Corps, full-time Youth Service Corps programs funded under this Act, and other appropriate civilian and military service options.

SEC. 111. FEDERAL SHARE.

(a) STATE SHARE.—

(1) The Federal share of the cost of planning and capacity building under section 106(1) may not exceed 90 percent of the total cost of such planning and capacity building.

(2) The State share of the cost of such planning and capacity building shall be in cash. The State share shall be provided through public or private non-Federal sources and may not be provided by any local public agency.

(b) LOCAL SHARE.—

(1) The Federal share of a grant or contract for a project under this subpart may not exceed—

(A) 90 percent of the total cost of a project for the first year for which the project receives assistance under this subpart;

(B) 80 percent of the total cost of a project for the second year for which the project receives assistance under this subpart;

(C) 70 percent of the total cost of a project for the third year for which the project receives assistance under this subpart; and

(D) 50 percent of the total cost of a project for the fourth year and each succeeding year for which the project receives assistance under this subpart.

(2) The State and local share of the costs of a project may be in cash or in kind fairly evaluated, including facilities, equipment, or services.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the requirements of subsection (b) with respect to any project in any fiscal year if the Secretary determines that such a waiver would be equitable due to a lack of available financial resources at the local level.

SEC. 112. USES OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS.

(a) STATE USES OF FUNDS.—The State educational agency may reserve, from funds made available to such agency under this subpart—

(1) not more than 5 percent of such funds for administrative costs for any fiscal year; and

(2) to build capacity through training, technical assistance, curriculum development, and coordination activities, not more than—

(A) 15 percent of such funds in the first year in which a State operates a program under this subpart;

(B) 10 percent of such funds in each of the second and third years in which a State operates a program under this subpart; and

(C) 5 percent in the fourth year and each succeeding year in which a State operates a program under this subpart.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES FOR LOCAL PROJECTS.—

(1) Local projects may use funds made available under this subpart for supervision of participating students, program administration, training, reasonable transportation costs, insurance, and other reasonable expenses.

(2) Funds made available under this subpart may not be used to pay any stipend, allowance, or other financial support to any participant, except reimbursement for transportation, meals, and other reasonable out-of-pocket expenses directly related to participation in a program assisted under this subpart.

Subpart 2—Youthbuild Projects

SEC. 114. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this subpart—

(1) to provide economically disadvantaged young adults with opportunities for meaningful service to their communities in helping to meet the housing needs of homeless individuals and low-income families; and

(2) to enable economically disadvantaged young adults to obtain the education and employment skills necessary to achieve economic self-sufficiency.

SEC. 117. AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.

(a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Director of the ACTION Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, may provide grants to pay the Federal share of the cost of carrying out Youthbuild projects in accordance with this subpart.

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share under subsection (a) for each fiscal year shall not exceed 90 percent.

SEC. 118. SERVICE IN CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION PROJECTS.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION PROJECTS.—Eligible participants serving in Youthbuild projects receiving assistance under this subpart shall be employed in the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of real property to be used for purposes of providing—

(1) residential rental housing that is occupied solely by, or available for occupancy solely by, homeless individuals and low-income families;

(2) transitional housing for homeless individuals;

(3) facilities for the provision of health, education, and other social services to low-income families, including—

(A) senior citizen centers;

(B) youth recreation centers;

(C) Head Start or child care centers; and

(D) community health centers.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES.—No assistance may be provided under this subpart to support the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of real property to be used to provide facilities described in subsection (a) unless the property—

(1) is used principally by or for the benefit of low-income families;

(2) is owned and occupied solely by public or private nonprofit entities; and

(3) is located in census tracts, or identifiable neighborhoods within census tracts, in which the median family income is not more than 80 percent of the median family income of the area in which the facility is located, as such median family income and area are determined for the purposes of assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(c) RESTRICTION OF USE.—Participants under this subpart may not be employed in the construction, operation, or maintenance of any facility used for sectarian instruction or religious worship.

SEC. 119. EDUCATION AND JOB TRAINING SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Assistance provided under this part shall be used by each Youthbuild project to provide to participants the following:

(1) SERVICE OPPORTUNITIES.—Service opportunities in the construction or rehabilitation projects described in section 118, which shall be integrated with appropriate skills training and coordinated with, to the extent feasible, preapprenticeship and apprenticeship programs.

(2) EDUCATIONAL SERVICES.—Services and activities designed to meet the educational needs of participants, including—

(A) basic skills instruction and remedial education;

(B) bilingual education for individuals with limited English proficiency; and

(C) secondary education services and activities designed to lead to the attainment of a high school diploma or its equivalent.

(3) PERSONAL AND PEER SUPPORTS.—Counseling services and other activities designed to—

(A) ensure that participants overcome personal problems that would interfere with their successful participation; and

(B) develop a strong, mutually supportive peer context in which values, goals, cultural heritage, and life skills can be explored and strengthened.

(4) LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT.—Opportunities to develop the decisionmaking, speaking, negotiating, and other leadership skills of participants, such as the establishment and operation of a youth council with meaningful decisionmaking authority over aspects of the project.

(5) PREPARATION FOR AND PLACEMENT IN UNSUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT.—Activities designed to maximize the value of participants as future employees and to prepare participants for seeking, obtaining, and retaining unsubsidized employment.

(6) NECESSARY SUPPORT SERVICES.—To provide support services and need-based stipends necessary to enable individuals to participate in the program and, for a period not to exceed 6 months after completion of training, to assist participants through support services in retaining employment.

(b) CONDITIONS.—The provision of service opportunities to participants in Youthbuild

projects shall be made conditional upon attendance and participation by such individuals in the educational services and activities described in subsection (a). The duration of participation for each individual in educational services and activities shall be at least equal to the total number of hours for which a participant serves and is paid wages by a Youthbuild project.

SEC. 124. USES OF FUNDS.

(a) **FUNDS.**—Funds provided under this subpart may be used only for activities that are in addition to activities that would otherwise be available in the absence of such funds.

(b) **ASSISTANCE CRITERIA.**—Assistance provided to each Youthbuild project under this part shall be used only for—

(1) education and job training services and activities described in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 119(a);

(2) wages and benefits paid to participants in accordance with sections 119(a) and 122; and

(3) administrative expenses incurred by the project, in an amount not to exceed 15 percent of the total cost of the project.

SEC. 121. ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—An individual shall be eligible to participate in a Youthbuild project receiving assistance under this subpart if such individual is—

(1) 16 to 24 years of age, inclusive;

(2) economically disadvantaged; and

(3) except as is provided in subsection (b), an individual who has dropped out of high school whose reading and mathematics skills are at or below the 8th grade level.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Not more than 25 percent of the participants in a Youthbuild project receiving assistance under this subpart may be individuals who do not meet the requirements of subsection (a)(3) if such individuals—

(1) have not attained a high school diploma or its equivalent; or

(2) have educational needs despite the attainment of a high school diploma or its equivalent.

(c) **PARTICIPATION LIMITATION.**—Any eligible individual selected for full-time participation in a Youthbuild project may participate full-time for a period of not less than 6 months and not more than 18 months.

SEC. 122. WAGES, LABOR STANDARDS, AND NONDISCRIMINATION.

(a) **WAGES AND LABOR STANDARDS.**—To the extent consistent with the provisions of this subpart, sections 142 and 143 of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1552, 1553, and 1577), relating to wages and benefits and labor standards, shall apply to the projects conducted under this subpart as if such projects were conducted under the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

(b) **NONDISCRIMINATION.**—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), an individual with responsibility for the operation of a Youthbuild project shall not discriminate on the basis of religion against a participant or a member of the project staff who is paid with funds under this title.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the employment, with funds provided under this title, of any member of the staff of a Youthbuild project who was employed with the organization operating the project on the date the grant funded under this title was awarded.

SEC. 123. CONTRACTS.

Each Youthbuild project shall carry out the services and activities under this subpart directly or through arrangements or under contracts with administrative entities designated under section 103(b)(1)(B) of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C.

1501(b)(1)(B)), with State and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, State and local housing development agencies, and with other public agencies and private organizations.

SEC. 124. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe standards for evaluating the performance of Youthbuild projects receiving assistance under this subpart, including the following factors:

(1) Placement in unsubsidized employment.

(2) Retention in unsubsidized employment.

(3) An increase in earnings.

(4) Improvement of reading and other basic skills.

(5) Attainment of a high school diploma or its equivalent.

(b) **VARIATIONS.**—The Director shall prescribe variations to the standards determined under subsection (a) by taking into account the economic conditions of the areas in which Youthbuild projects are located and appropriate special characteristics, such as the extent of English language proficiency and offender status of Youthbuild participants.

SEC. 125. APPLICATIONS.

(a) **SUBMISSION.**—To apply for a grant under this subpart, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Director in accordance with procedures established by the Director.

(b) **CRITERIA.**—Each such application shall—

(1) describe the educational services, job training, supportive services, service opportunities, and other services and activities that will be provided to participants;

(2) describe the proposed construction of rehabilitation activities to be undertaken and the anticipated schedule for carrying out such activities;

(3) describe the manner in which eligible youths will be recruited and selected, including a description of arrangements which will be made with community-based organizations, State and local educational agencies, public assistance agencies, the courts of jurisdiction for status and youth offenders, homeless shelters and other agencies that serve homeless youth, foster care agencies, and other appropriate public and private agencies;

(4) describe the special outreach efforts that will be undertaken to recruit eligible young women (including young women with dependent children);

(5) describe how the proposed project will be coordinated with other Federal, State, and local activities, including vocational, adult and bilingual education programs, job training supported by funds available under the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) and the Family Support Act of 1988, housing and economic development, and programs that receive assistance under section 106 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5306);

(6) provide assurances that there will be a sufficient number of supervisory personnel on the project and that the supervisory personnel are trained in the skills needed to carry out the project;

(7) describe activities that will be undertaken to develop the leadership skills of participants;

(8) set forth a detailed budget and describe the system of fiscal controls and auditing and accountability procedures that will be used to ensure fiscal soundness; and

(9) set forth assurances, arrangements, and conditions the Director determines are necessary to carry out this subpart.

SEC. 126. SELECTION OF PROJECTS.

In approving applications for assistance under this subpart, the Director shall give priority to applicants that demonstrate the following:

(1) **POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS.**—The greatest likelihood of success, as indicated by such factors as the past experience of an applicant with housing rehabilitation or construction, youth and youth education and employment training programs, management capacity, fiscal reliability, and community support.

(2) **NEED.**—Have the greatest need for assistance, as determined by factors such as—

(A) the degree of economic distress of the community from which participants would be recruited, including—

(i) the extent of poverty;

(ii) the extent of youth unemployment; and

(iii) the number of individuals who have dropped out of high school; and

(B) the degree of economic distress of the locality in which the housing would be rehabilitated or constructed, including—

(i) objective measures of the incidence of homelessness;

(ii) the relation between the supply of affordable housing for low-income families and the number of such families in the locality;

(iii) the extent of housing overcrowding; and

(iv) the extent of poverty.

SEC. 127. MANAGEMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) **DIRECTOR ASSISTANCE.**—The Director may enter into contracts with a qualified public or private nonprofit agency to provide assistance to the Director in the management, supervision, and coordination of Youthbuild projects receiving assistance under this subpart.

(b) **SPONSOR ASSISTANCE.**—The Director shall enter into contracts with a qualified public or private nonprofit agency to provide appropriate training, information, and technical assistance to sponsors of projects assisted under this subpart.

(c) **APPLICATION PREPARATION.**—Technical assistance may also be provided in the development of project proposals and the preparation of applications for assistance under this subpart to eligible entities which intend or desire to submit such applications. Community-based organizations shall be given first priority in the provision of such assistance.

(d) **RESERVATION OF FUNDS.**—The Director shall reserve 5 percent of the amounts available in each fiscal year under section 130 to carry out subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

SEC. 128. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this subpart:

(1) **COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS.**—The term "community-based organizations" has the meaning given the term in section 4(8) of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1503(8)).

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term "Director" means the Director of the ACTION agency.

(3) **DROPPED OUT OF HIGH SCHOOL.**—The term "individual who has dropped out of high school" means an individual who is neither attending any school nor subject to a compulsory attendance law and who has not received a secondary school diploma or a certificate of equivalency for such diploma, but does not include any individual who has attended secondary school at any time during the preceding 8 months.

(4) **ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.**—The term "economically disadvantaged" has the meaning given the term in section 4(8) of

the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1503(b)).

(5) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term "eligible entity" means a public or private nonprofit agency, such as—

(A) community-based organizations;
(B) administrative entities designated under section 103(b)(1)(B) of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1501(b)(1)(B));

(C) community action agencies;
(D) State and local housing development agencies;

(E) State and local youth service and conservation corps; and

(F) any other entity that is eligible to provide education and employment training under other Federal employment training programs.

(6) **HOMELESS INDIVIDUAL.**—The term "homeless individual" has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11302).

(7) **HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AGENCY.**—The term "housing development agency" means any agency of a State or local government, or any private nonprofit organization that is engaged in providing housing for the homeless or low-income families.

(8) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given the term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)).

(9) **LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY.**—The term "limited English proficiency" has the meaning given the term in section 7003 of the Bilingual Education Act (20 U.S.C. 3223).

(10) **LOW-INCOME FAMILY.**—The term "low-income family" has the meaning given the term "lower income families" in section 3(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(2)).

(11) **OFFENDER.**—The term "offender" means any adult or juvenile with a record of arrest or conviction for a criminal offense.

(12) **QUALIFIED NONPROFIT AGENCY.**—The term "qualified public or private nonprofit agency" means any nonprofit agency that has significant prior experience in the operation of projects similar to the Youthbuild program authorized under this subpart and that has the capacity to provide effective technical assistance under this section.

(13) **RESIDENTIAL RENTAL PURPOSES.**—The term "residential rental purposes" includes a cooperative or mutual housing facility that has a resale structure that enables the cooperative to maintain affordability for low-income individuals and families.

(14) **SERVICE OPPORTUNITY.**—The term "service opportunity" means the opportunity to perform work in return for wages and benefits in the construction or rehabilitation of real property in accordance with this subpart.

(15) **STATE.**—The term "State" means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

(16) **TRANSITIONAL HOUSING.**—The term "transitional housing" means a project that has as its purpose facilitating the movement of homeless individuals and families to independent living within a reasonable amount of time. Transitional housing includes housing primarily designed to serve deinstitutionalized homeless individuals and other homeless individuals with mental or physical disabilities and homeless families with children.

(17) **YOUTHBUILD PROJECT.**—The term "youthbuild project" means any project that

receives assistance under this subpart and provides disadvantaged youth with opportunities for service, education, and training in the construction or rehabilitation of housing for homeless and other low-income individuals.

SEC. 122. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary shall issue any regulations necessary to carry out this subpart.

SEC. 123. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this subpart \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years. Amounts appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

Subpart 3—Other Federal Volunteer Service Programs

SEC. 131. RURAL YOUTH SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this subpart, to make grants and enter into contracts for demonstration projects in rural areas. Such projects may include volunteer service involving the elderly and assisted-living services performed by students, school dropouts, and out-of-school youth.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994.

SEC. 132. GOVERNORS' VOLUNTARY SERVICE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the ACTION agency (in this section referred to as the "Director") is authorized to make grants to the chief executive officer of each State for initiatives involving non-school-based voluntary service projects in the State.

(b) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—Grants under this section may be used for—

(1) enhancing State volunteer service programs;

(2) volunteer service demonstration programs;

(3) research concerning, assessment of, and evaluation of volunteer service programs;

(4) State coordination of volunteer service programs;

(5) technical assistance;

(6) training and staff development; and

(7) collection and dissemination of information concerning volunteer service programs.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section \$3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994.

(d) ALLOTMENTS.

(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Director shall allot to the chief executive officer of each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated under subsection (b) as the school-age population of the State bears to the school-age population of all States.

(2) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the chief executive officer of each State shall receive at least \$30,000 for each fiscal year for purposes of carrying out an initiative under this section.

(e) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section the term "State" includes the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 133. MODEL SERVICE-LEARNING PROGRAM.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this subpart, to make grants to, and enter into contracts with, States, local edu-

cational agencies, local government agencies, and community-based organizations for innovative community service and service-learning programs and curricula that can serve as national models.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994.

SEC. 134. MODEL SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR DROP-OUTS AND OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this subpart, to make grants to, or enter into contracts with, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, local government agencies, community-based organizations, and other public or private nonprofit organizations to develop plans for model programs to enhance the capacity of educational institutions and community-based organizations to administer service-learning programs for school dropouts and out-of-school youth.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994.

SEC. 135. ASSISTANCE FOR HEAD START.

Section 502(b) of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 5082(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(b)", and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the three subsequent fiscal years for the purpose of increasing the number of low-income individuals who provide services under part B of title II of this Act to children who participate in Head Start programs."

Subpart 4—Activities of the Secretary of Education

SEC. 141. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.

The Secretary shall widely disseminate information about programs under this part.

SEC. 142. CLEARINGHOUSES ON VOLUNTEER SERVICE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies with extensive experience in student community service and school volunteer and partnership programs for the establishment and operation of national or regional clearinghouses for information on volunteer service.

(b) **DUTIES.**—National or regional clearinghouses established or operated with assistance provided under this section shall provide information, curriculum materials, technical assistance, and training to States and local entities participating in programs under subpart 1.

SEC. 143. EVALUATION.

(a) **EVALUATION.**—The Secretary shall provide, through grants or contracts, for the continuing evaluation of programs assisted under this part in order to determine program effectiveness in achieving stated goals in general and in relation to cost, the effect on related cost-saving programs, and the structure and mechanism for delivery. Such evaluation shall measure the effects of programs authorized by this part, including, where appropriate, comparisons with appropriate control groups composed of individuals who have not participated in such programs. Evaluations shall be conducted by

individuals not directly involved in the administration of the program evaluated.

(b) **STANDARDS.**—The Secretary shall develop and publish general standards for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this part.

(c) **COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.**—In evaluating a program receiving assistance under this part, the Secretary shall consider the opinions of participating students, dropouts, out-of-school youth, and members of the communities where services are delivered concerning the strengths and weaknesses of such program.

(d) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—The results of evaluations conducted under this section, including opinions obtained under subsection (c), shall be made available to the public.

(e) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The results of evaluations conducted under this section shall be analyzed and submitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress with the annual report of the Secretary.

SEC. 144. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for purposes of carrying out the provisions of this subpart \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994.

Subpart 5—Volunteer Service Activities of the President

SEC. 151. PRESIDENTIAL VOLUNTEER SERVICE AWARDS.

(a) **PRESIDENTIAL AWARD FOR SCHOOL-BASED SERVICE.**—The President is authorized to make Presidential Awards for School-Based Service recognizing excellence in school-based service programs.

(b) **CATEGORIES OF AWARDS.**—Each year the President is authorized to make 1 award to an individual in each State in each of the following categories:

(1) Excellence in a service program in kindergarten through grade 6.

(2) Excellence in a service program in grade 7 through grade 12.

(3) Excellence in a service program for dropouts and out-of-school youth.

(4) Excellence in teaching to a teacher in kindergarten through grade 6 who has demonstrated outstanding teaching ability in the area of volunteer service.

(5) Excellence in teaching to a teacher in grade 7 through grade 12 who has demonstrated outstanding teaching ability in the area of volunteer service.

(6) Excellence in teaching to a teacher in a service program for dropouts and out-of-school youth who has demonstrated outstanding teaching ability in the area of volunteer service.

(c) **PRESIDENT'S SERVICE LEARNING TASK FORCE.**—The President is authorized to create an interagency task force chaired either by the President or the Vice President, whose purpose shall be—

(1) the creation and monitoring of effective measures for coordinating the various parts of this Act; and

(2) design of a comprehensive Federal service strategy which shall include—

(A) review of existing programs to identify and expand opportunities for service, especially by students and out-of-school youth;

(B) designation of a senior official in each Federal agency who will be responsible for developing youth service opportunities in existing programs nationwide;

(C) establishment of service projects in each Federal agency;

(D) encouragement of participation of Federal employees in service projects;

(E) designation of a senior executive branch official or group of officials to coordinate the Federal service strategy;

(F) annual recognition of outstanding service programs operated by Federal agencies; and

(G) encouragement of businesses and professional firms to include community service among the factors considered in making hiring, compensation, and promotion decisions.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994.

Subpart 6—General Provisions

SEC. 154. DEFINITIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided, the terms used in this part shall have the meanings provided for such terms in section 1471 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(b) **OTHER DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this part the term "service-learning" means a method—

(1) under which students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service experiences that meet actual community needs and that are coordinated in collaboration with the school and community;

(2) that is integrated into the students' academic curriculum and provides structured time for a student to think, talk, or write about what the student did and saw during the actual service activity;

(3) that provides students with opportunities to use newly acquired skills and knowledge in real-life situations in their own communities; and

(4) that enhances what is taught in school by extending student learning beyond the classroom and into the community and helps to foster the development of a sense of caring for others.

SEC. 157. LIMITATION.

(a) **PROHIBITED USES.**—No grant under this part shall be used to provide religious instruction, conduct worship services, or engage in any form of proselytization.

(b) **PARTICIPANTS.**—Participants and project staff funded under this part shall not give religious instruction, conduct worship services, or engage in any form of proselytization as part of their duties.

SEC. 158. APPLICATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS ACT.

Except as otherwise provided, the General Education Provisions Act shall apply to the programs authorized by this part.

PART B—HIGHER EDUCATION COMMUNITY SERVICE

Subpart 1—Innovative Projects for Community Service

SEC. 161. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this part to support innovative projects to determine the feasibility of encouraging students to participate in community service activities while such students are attending institutions of higher education.

SEC. 162. INNOVATIVE PROJECTS FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this part, to make grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education (including combination of such institutions), and other public agencies and nonprofit organizations working in partnership with institutions of higher education—

(1) to enable the institution to create or expand community service activities for students attending that institution;

(2) to encourage student-initiated and student-designed community service projects; and

(3) to facilitate the integration of community service into academic curricula, so that

students can obtain credit for their community service activities.

(b) **TRAINING AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary shall make grants to college and universities and other nonprofit organizations to provide for the training of teachers, related education personnel, and community leaders in the skills necessary to develop, supervise, and organize community service activities. Assistance under this section may be provided to individuals planning to undertake a career in teaching, as well as existing teachers. In awarding such grants, the Secretary shall take into consideration the particular needs of a community and the ability of the grantee to actively involve a major part of the community in, and substantially benefit the community by, the proposed community service activities.

(c) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—The Federal share of all grants under subsections (a) and (b) shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the community service activities.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subpart, \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

(e) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DEFINED.**—For purposes of this subpart, the term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given to such term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Subpart 2—Campus-Based Community Work Learning Jobs

SEC. 164. ADDITIONAL RESERVATION FOR CAMPUS-BASED COMMUNITY WORK LEARNING STUDY JOBS.

Section 415B(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(3)(A) In the event the appropriation for this subpart exceeds \$75,000,000, the Secretary shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 415C(b)(3)(A), allot 50 percent of such excess to the States for the purpose described in section 415C(b)(2)(B).

"(B) The Secretary shall make the allotment required under subparagraph (A) on the basis of the number of students participating in programs assisted under section 415C(b)(2) of this subpart in each State as compared to the total number of students participating in such jobs in all States."

SEC. 167. WORK STUDY PROGRAMS.

Section 441(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by striking "\$656,000,000" and inserting "\$675,000,000"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "In the event that appropriations for this part exceed \$625,000,000, such additional amounts shall be used in accordance with section 447. The Secretary shall allocate the additional amounts to institutions which demonstrate a capacity to use these funds in accordance with section 447."

Subpart 3—Guaranteed Student Loans

SEC. 171. LOAN DEFERMENT FOR VOLUNTEER SERVICE AUTHORIZED.

(a) **GSL PROGRAM.**—Section 428(b)(1)(M) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of clause (z);

(2) by striking the period at the end of clause (iz) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(zii) not in excess of 3 years during which the borrower is in service as a full-time volunteer in service comparable to the service referred to in clauses (iii) and (iv) for an organization which is exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Inter-

nal Revenue Code of 1986 and does not receive compensation at a rate in excess of the rate prescribed by section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938."

(b) **FISL PROGRAM.**—Section 427(a)(2)(C) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by striking "or" at the end of clause (i); and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(iii) not in excess of 3 years during which the borrower is in service as a full-time volunteer in service comparable to the service referred to in clauses (ii) and (iv) for an organization which is exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and does not receive compensation at a rate in excess of the rate prescribed by section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938."

SEC. 172. LOAN DEFERMENT FOR SERVICE IN DRUG COUNSELING AND PREVENTION.

(a) **DEFERMENT OF GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS.**—Section 428(b)(1)(M) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended by section 171 of this Act) is further amended by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

"(iii) not in excess of 3 years during which the borrower is employed full-time as a professional in drug counseling, prevention, intervention, treatment, or education by a public or nonprofit private agency or organization; and"

(b) **INSURED STUDENT LOANS.**—Section 427(a)(2)(C) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended by section 171 of this Act) is further amended by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

"(iii) not in excess of 3 years during which the borrower is employed full-time as a professional in drug counseling, prevention, intervention, treatment, or education by a public or nonprofit private agency or organization; and"

SEC. 173. LOAN DEFERMENT FOR VOLUNTEERS PROVIDING INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES.

(a) **DEFERMENT OF GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS.**—Section 428(b)(1)(M) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended by sections 171 and 172 of this Act) is further amended by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

"(iii) not in excess of 3 years during which the borrower is in service as a full-time volunteer providing health services to individuals who are eligible to receive services from the Secretary of the Interior under title I and section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (Public Law 93-638);"

(b) **INSURED STUDENT LOANS.**—Section 427(a)(2)(C) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended by section 171 of this Act) is further amended by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

"(iii) not in excess of 3 years during which the borrower is in service as a full-time volunteer providing health services to individuals who are eligible to receive services from the Secretary of the Interior under title I and section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (Public Law 93-638);"

SEC. 174. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this subpart shall apply only to loans made to cover the costs of instruction for periods of enrollment beginning on or after 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act to individuals who are new borrowers on that date.

Subpart 4—Direct Loans to Students in Institutions of Higher Education

SEC. 175. LOAN CANCELLATION AUTHORIZED.

(a) **CANCELLATION FOR VOLUNTEER SERV-**

(1) **QUALIFICATION FOR CANCELLATION.**—Section 465(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended—

(A) by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (D);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(F) as a full-time volunteer in service comparable to service referred to in subparagraph (E) for an organization which is exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and"

(2) **RATE OF CANCELLATION.**—Section 465(a)(3)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended—

(A) by striking out "or" at the end of clause (iii);

(B) by striking the period at the end of clause (iv) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(v) in the case of service described in subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2) at the rate of 15 percent for the first or second year of such service and 20 percent of the third or fourth year of such service; or"

(b) **CANCELLATION FOR DRUG COUNSELING AND TREATMENT.**—

(1) **QUALIFICATION FOR CANCELLATION.**—Section 465(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended by subsection (a)) is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following new subparagraph:

"(G) as a full-time professional employee engaged in drug counseling, prevention, intervention, treatment, or education and employed by a public or nonprofit private agency or organization; or"

(2) **RATE OF CANCELLATION.**—Section 465(a)(3)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended by subsection (a)) is further amended by inserting after clause (v) the following new clause:

"(vi) in the case of service described in subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2), at the rate of 15 percent for the first or second year of such service and 20 percent for the third or fourth year of such service; or"

(c) **CANCELLATION FOR VOLUNTEERS PROVIDING INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES.**—

(1) **QUALIFICATION FOR CANCELLATION.**—Section 465(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended by subsections (a) and (b)) is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following new subparagraph:

"(H) as a full-time volunteer providing health services to individuals who are eligible to receive services from the Secretary of the Interior under title I and section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (Public Law 93-638)."

(2) **RATE OF CANCELLATION.**—Section 465(a)(3)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended by subsections (a) and (b)) is further amended by inserting after clause (vi) the following new clause:

"(vii) in the case of service described in subparagraph (H) of paragraph (2) at the rate of 15 percent for the first or second year of such service and 20 percent of the third or fourth year of such service."

SEC. 177. LOAN DEFERMENT AUTHORIZED.

(a) **VOLUNTEER SERVICES.**—Section 464(c)(2)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by striking "or" at the end of clause (viii); and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(ix) is in service as a full-time volunteer in service comparable to the service referred to in clauses (iii) and (iv) for an organization which is exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and does not receive compensation at a rate in excess of the rate prescribed by section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938;"

(b) **DRUG COUNSELING AND TREATMENT.**—Section 464(c)(2)(A) of such Act (as amended by subsection (a)) is further amended by inserting after clause (ix) the following new clause:

"(xi) is employed full-time as a professional in drug counseling, prevention, intervention, treatment, or education by a public or nonprofit private agency or organization; or"

(c) **VOLUNTEERS PROVIDING INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES.**—Section 464(c)(2)(A) of such Act (as amended by subsections (a) and (b)) is further amended by inserting after clause (xi) the following new clause:

"(xii) is in service as a full-time volunteer providing health services to individuals who are eligible to receive services from the Secretary of the Interior under title I and section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (Public Law 93-638)."

(d) **DURATION OF DEFERMENTS.**—The second sentence of section 464(c)(2)(A) of such Act is amended by striking "(v), or (vi)" and inserting "(v), (vi), (x), (xi), or (xii)".

SEC. 178. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by sections 176 and 177 of this subpart shall apply only to loans made to cover the costs of instruction for periods of enrollment beginning on or after 30 days after the date of enactment of this part to individuals who are new borrowers on that date.

Subpart 5—Publication

SEC. 181. INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS.

Section 485(a)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (hereafter in this part referred to as the "Act") is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (J);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (K) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(L) The terms and conditions under which students receiving loans under part B or E of this title, or both, may—

"(i) obtain deferral of the repayment of the principal and interest for service under the Peace Corps Act or under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, or for comparable full-time service as a volunteer for a tax-exempt organization; and

"(ii) obtain partial cancellation of the student loan for service under the Peace Corps Act or under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, or for comparable full-time service as a volunteer for a tax-exempt organization."

SEC. 182. EXIT COUNSELING FOR BORROWERS.

Section 485(b) of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and "and"; and

(3) by adding the following new paragraph after paragraph (2):

"(3) the terms and conditions under which the student may obtain partial cancellation

or defer repayment of the principal and interest for service under the Peace Corps Act or under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 or for comparable full-time service as a volunteer for a tax-exempt organization."

SEC. 183. DEPARTMENT INFORMATION ON DEFERMENTS AND CANCELLATIONS.

Section 485(d) of the Act is amended by inserting the following before the last full sentence: "The Secretary shall provide information on the specific terms and conditions under which students may obtain partial cancellation or defer repayment of loans for service under the Peace Corps Act and Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 or for eligible comparable full-time service as a volunteer with a tax-exempt organization, and shall explicitly state that students may qualify for such partial cancellations or deferments when they serve as a paid employee of a tax-exempt organization."

Subpart 6—Student Literacy Corps

SEC. 184. AMENDMENTS TO STUDENT LITERACY CORPS PROVISIONS.

(a) PRIORITY FOR SINGLE PARENTS OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN.—Section 144(b)(2)(D) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: "and will give priority in providing tutoring services to illiterate parents of educationally or economically disadvantaged elementary school students, with special emphasis on single-parent households".

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 146 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 146. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the three succeeding fiscal years."

Subpart 7—Student Tutorial Corps Initiative

SEC. 184. AMENDMENT.

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART E—STUDENT TUTORIAL CORPS

SEC. 151. PURPOSE.

"It is the purpose of this part to authorize a demonstration program to encourage college students to tutor disadvantaged students receiving services under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 hereinafter in this part referred to as 'chapter 1'.

SEC. 152. GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

"The Secretary is authorized to make demonstration grants in accordance with the purposes and requirements of this part to institutions of higher education submitting applications that meet the requirements of section 158, in order to assist such institutions to establish and conduct student tutorial programs that—

"(1) encourage students enrolled in that institution to provide tutoring to educationally disadvantaged students receiving services under chapter 1;

"(2) are conducted at the request, and with the direction, of personnel providing services under chapter 1, to assist them in the education of such children; and

"(3) that do not displace any of such personnel.

SEC. 154. APPLICATION.

"To receive a grant under this part, an institution of higher education shall submit an application that—

"(1)(A) specifies that such students will be compensated at rates consistent with the rates paid under part C of title IV of this Act; or

"(B) specifies the rate at which the student will obtain academic credit for tutorial services; and

"(2) demonstrate the active interest of the local educational agency for the students receiving services under chapter 1 in establishing the program; and

"(3) contain or be accompanied by such other information of assurances as the Secretary may require to carry out the purposes of this part.

SEC. 154. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part, \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the three succeeding fiscal years."

PART C—PEACE CORPS

SEC. 191. SHORT TITLE.

This part may be cited as the "Peace Corps Volunteer Education Demonstration Program Act".

SEC. 192. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Director of the Peace Corps is authorized to carry out a training and educational benefits demonstration program in accordance with this part.

(b) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—The Director is authorized, either directly or by way of grant, contract, or other arrangement, to carry out the provisions of this part. The authority to enter into contracts under this part shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts.

SEC. 193. ELIGIBILITY.

Any individual who—

(1) has completed at least 2 years of satisfactory study at an institution of higher education, is enrolled in an educational program of at least 4 years at an institution of higher education for which such institution awards a bachelor's degree, and will complete such program within 2 years,

(2) enters into an agreement with the Director to serve at least 3 years as a volunteer in the Peace Corps, and

(3) is selected pursuant to the competitive process established under section 194, is eligible to participate in the demonstration program authorized by this part.

SEC. 194. SELECTION PROCEDURES.

The Director of the Peace Corps shall establish uniform criteria for the selection on a competitive basis of individuals to participate in the training program established under section 195 and to receive educational benefits under section 196. The selection procedures established under this section shall give special consideration to students from groups traditionally underrepresented in the Peace Corps and to students who will specialize in courses of instruction for which there is a special need in the Peace Corps.

SEC. 195. TRAINING PROGRAM.

The Director of the Peace Corps shall establish and carry out a training program under which each individual selected under section 194, as part of the course of study which the individual is pursuing at his or her institution of higher education, receives appropriate training for the work he or she will perform in the Peace Corps.

SEC. 196. EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS.

(a) BENEFITS PROVIDED.—Each individual who has been selected under section 194 shall be eligible to receive educational benefits in an amount not to exceed the costs of tuition, room and board, and books and fees, that the individual incurs in attending his or her institution of higher education during the remaining 2 years of the educational program in which the individual is enrolled.

(b) FORM OF BENEFITS.—The educational benefits provided to an individual under subsection (a) shall be in the form of grants, remissions of expenses, or such other form as the Director considers appropriate.

(c) REPAYMENT OF BENEFITS.—An individual provided benefits under subsection (a) shall repay the amount of the benefits so provided, plus interest—

(1) if the individual fails to complete his or her educational program within the 2-year period specified in section 193(1), or

(2) if the individual fails to serve 3 years as a volunteer in the Peace Corps upon completing his or her educational program.

The Director may waive the repayment requirement if exceptional circumstances, such as illness or death, prevent an individual from meeting such 2-year or 3-year requirement.

(d) COLLECTION BY SECRETARY OF EDUCATION.—The Secretary of Education shall have the authority to collect amounts owed by an individual under subsection (c). The Secretary may, for the purpose of collecting such amounts, exercise the authorities conferred on the Secretary by sections 467 and 468 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1467gg and 1467hh) with respect to the collection of defaulted loans under part E of title IV of that Act. Amounts collected under this subsection shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 197. EVALUATION AND REPORT.

The Director and the Secretary of Education shall jointly conduct an evaluation of the demonstration program authorized by this part and shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress—

(1) not later than October 31, 1993, an interim report on such evaluation, and

(2) not later than October 31, 1995, a final report on such evaluation, together with such recommendations, including recommendations for legislation, as the Director and the Secretary consider appropriate.

SEC. 198. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this part—

(1) the term "Director" means the Director of the Peace Corps, and

(2) the term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given that term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)).

SEC. 199. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Peace Corps to carry out this part \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year ending before October 1, 1994. Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended.

PART D—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

For purposes of this title and the amendments made by this title, the term "community-based organization" includes a community action agency.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODLING: On page 49, strike line 8 and all the follows through line 7 on page 52.

Redesignate sections accordingly.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for several reasons. One of them is that I think if we could pass this amendment the bill

may be more palatable to the administration. But I offer it for other reasons. It strikes section 176, which provides for cancellation of loans held by persons working as full-time volunteers. I think that erodes the concept of voluntarism.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if I may be forgiven, I would like to ask my distinguished friend: Do I understand the gentleman is presenting an amendment?

Mr. GOODLING. I am.

The Clerk read the amendment.

Mr. HAWKINS. Could we have a copy of the amendment? I apologize for the interruption, but we did not really know what was being discussed.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike section 176, which provides for cancellation of loans held by persons working as full-time volunteers.

As I indicated, I do it for several reasons. No. 1, it would certainly make the bill much more palatable to the administration, I would think.

Second, it does have an unknown fiscal impact. I do not know what the cumulative effect will be. I do have a concern that if you take money from the Perkins loan revolving fund, and the student does not have to pay it back into that revolving fund, do we then, as a government, put the money in that they did not get back because the student did not have to pay it back because it was forgiven? Or does it mean that the college and the university no longer has that revolving fund money?

I think it probably would be quite ineffective in enabling persons to engage in community service who otherwise would not be able to do so. In fact, I think that is what CBO said in their statement, and that is how they calculated the costs.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I believe true voluntarism is just that. Attempts by the committee to include loan cancellation and deferment of payment on Perkins loans is really a backdoor way of trying to provide some sort of enticement, monetarily and financially, to people we ought to be encouraging and who ought to have the intention of volunteering on its own merits and for the reasons that all of us hope that people do indeed volunteer for various not-for-profit purposes.

The gentleman is absolutely right when he says and raises questions about the cost of having this section included in the bill. There are no estimates on how loan cancellations there

will be. We do not know what the effect would be on individual colleges and universities, because this is not the guaranteed student loan we are talking about. It is the Perkins campus-based loan, from which each school has a limited amount of funds to utilize for this program. The loan is paid back by the students to the institution again. The revolving fund is there on campus for future students as well.

If the student is a volunteer and has part of his loan forgiven, is that university shorted or do they come back to the U.S. Treasury and ask for additional appropriations? I believe, in all fairness, they would have to come back to the Treasury to ask for additional appropriations.

The real concern I have, as the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, on this section—and why I support the gentleman's amendment—this is not the only legislative vehicle coming along this year which has indicated an inclination to try to utilize loan forgiveness as an incentive. I think it is very wrong to cheapen, if you will, the exemptions already on the books that we have now for loan forgiveness and deferrals. Yes, we know of VISTA volunteers, we know Peace Corps volunteers have, and other parts of the military, and so forth, have these exemptions and loan forgiveness provisions. But just because we have a societal ill, is it necessary for us to attract people to deal with it by forgiving them on loans, be they Perkins or Stafford loans? Or what have you? I think not.

I think it is the wrong direction to go. I think we have gotten this section off of other bills that have come to the floor. My sense of it is that the Congress is recognizing if we are going to have a voluntarism bill, we ought not to try to back-door the payments, if you will, to people so they can come in and volunteer for nothing or volunteer at a minimum wage when in fact we are paying their college tuition costs. That is not right. That is not what the purpose of the voluntarism is for. It certainly does danger and damage. It sets dangerous precedents to increase the already expanding roles of the Higher Education Act where we have exempted, for many students, their needs to pay back.

At a time when the major student loan program in this country is undergoing severe stress, losing almost \$2 billion a year due to lack of paybacks, we are sending the wrong message to other students, that we recognize they would not have to pay back their loans either, just go to work for a nonprofit organization at a minimum wage and you too will not have an obligation.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODLING was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GOODLING. I too would like to say that when the omnibus education bill came before us, there were those who wanted to dabble with loan forgiveness, who wanted to dabble with the higher education bill. We convinced them we should not do these kinds of things until we have a complete rewrite of that legislation.

That comes next year in the higher education bill. And I would think that without careful consideration of what we are doing here, which we have not had time to do, we would postpone this until we do have reauthorization of the higher education bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am at somewhat of a loss to understand all of the emotion that is emanating from the other side about not only this bill but this simple provision, tried and true. In the past 25 years of congressional history, this simple provision to provide the loan cancellation, we do this now for members of the Peace Corps, the exact same provision applies to members of the Peace Corps.

□ 1350

We do it now for those Americans who will volunteer, help out a little bit here at home their fellow citizens through VISTA. Exact same provision. We are only now saying, "Let's extend it as part of these thousand points of light to other young Americans who would agree to take a job temporarily at or below the minimum wage, at or below the minimum wage to help out their fellow citizens in which I think can easily be said to be a voluntary capacity."

As my colleagues know, we have students who are graduating from the colleges and universities and proprietary schools in America who are well educated, highly skilled, and they have a debt because of their loans of maybe up to \$20,000. So we have said to those students, "If you'll come and join the Peace Corps, you'll come and join VISTA, we'll give you a partial or full cancellation of part or all of that debt," and it has worked.

And now we are simply saying, as part of this program envisioned by the President, that some of these same students who are without financial means, but want to become one of these new blinking points of light, can have the same opportunity that their roommate has because he decided, or she decided, to go join Peace Corps. We are saying to the other person, "If you want to come and volunteer in service for America through this new national service legislation, you could have exactly the same loan cancellation as your roommate is getting by going to the Peace Corps, VISTA."

If we listen to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we would think this is a radical new proposal that is going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars. The people who have account-

ed this for as say it is going to cost so little we cannot score it. We do not know how much it is going to cost, but we think it is going to cost very little.

So, let us now throw out all of these what I personally believe to be artificial questions and artificial hurdles in order to burden the passage of this legislation.

This, by the way, would only be a model loan cancellation program. Students could only apply for it in 1991. We would sign on the contract with those students, and then it would expire. No students after that would be eligible for it unless my colleagues in this Chamber and the others decided to reinstitute it.

So, it is in the tried and true American tradition with regard to encouraging voluntarism. We do it for Peace Corps, we do it for VISTA, it works. Let us do it for those who want to become involved in national service as well.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and I yield to his author.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a second to thank again the gentleman from Montana (Mr. WILLIAMS) for making my point very eloquently. He indicated we piece-meal, we piece-meal, we piece-meal. No planning. We do not know which will be next. We just continue it. Maybe drug enforcement officers. Who knows? But again I thank him for making the point.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two points in support of the amendment and against provisions of the bill providing for broadening existing student loan forgiveness provisions in the Federal law which currently cover people who are selected by the armed services who are in specialties that are needed. They are sometimes attracted to serve, at the option of the military, by being granted student loans forgiveness. The same applies to volunteers in VISTA or in the Peace Corps who are, again, enlisting in a Federal agency. They are sometimes qualified for student loan forgiveness in exchange for that service. But this bill broadens that to cover service in voluntary, nonprofit organizations across the United States that are not run by the Federal Government. They are not Federal agencies. They are not the armed services of the United States. They are not the Peace Corps. They are not VISTA.

It seems to me that we are opening up the potential for a great deal of abuse. Not to say it will occur, but these are not going to be Federal agencies. Eligibility for student loan forgiveness is going to be determined by the local YMCA director or someone else, whoever happens to be running the volunteer, nonprofit program at which the person puts in the hours.

I just think that we ought to think this through carefully. If we try to go in and supervise the non-Federal orga-

nization, and prevent the abuse, we will raise the costs so much and the paperwork requirements so much that it really will be counterproductive. If we do not supervise it, we may end up having a lot of abuse—they will put their kids, or get their neighbors' kids or cousins on the volunteer minimum wage payroll and have 20,000 to 30,000 dollars' worth of student loans forgiven, that it would cost them twice as much in earned income to repay.

So, I think it will come back to haunt us if we were to actually enact this bill.

Second, Mr. Chairman, this loan forgiveness approach goes in exactly the opposite direction than the IRS is currently pursuing. During this break I had occasion to meet in office hours, as many of us do, with many of my constituents. Several came in who had sons or daughters in college today who are given educational grants, and, believe it or not, if the grant, even if it is a small grant, is in excess of the educational component of the education, if the grant covers room and board in addition to tuition and books, the IRS is attempting to tax young people on the portion that they call personal benefit, room and board, and meanwhile we are going to be giving loan forgiveness. So, what we are saying to young people is, "Take out loans, don't get a grant, then go and volunteer and have it forgiven. If you get a grant or are qualified for a grant, we're going to tax you while you're in school." So, that is disjunction, or an imperfection, or an unfairness that I think really ought to be addressed and is not.

Final thing—and I think it is a big flaw here—is that there is an unstated assumption in this legislation that somehow working for the minimum wage or for nothing in voluntary, nonprofit organizations is providing something of value and is helping other people, whereas working in the real world of work, whether it is building someone's house as a carpenter, or making a car or working on cancer research at the National Cancer Foundation or for some drug company is not, and I think that is a very narrow definition of community service, and it is wrong, and why someone working as a cancer researcher at the National Cancer Institute will not have loan forgiveness even if they come up with a cure for cancer, and someone working as a drug counselor should have their loan forgiven beyond me. It is just almost mindless tinkering with the Tax Code, and I regret this bill was not referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. It should have been.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking large amounts of money when we get into student loan forgiveness if they do not have to pay Social Security tax, do not have to pay various other payroll taxes on the amount that is forgiven. They would pay this later if they earned the money and then use what is left to repay the loan, so I urge my colleagues to support the amendment,

avoid this thicket and clean up this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the loan forgiveness provisions of the bill are needed and should be preserved. The opponents of the loan forgiveness provisions of the bill want to have it both ways, and I do not think we can. It is argued that it is not effective, and then it is argued that it will cost too much.

However, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that if it is not effective, then not many people will take advantage of it, and the costs will not be that high.

I agree that we need more information about the effectiveness of loan forgiveness programs. However, I do not believe that these concerns warrant the elimination of all loan forgiveness provisions in the bill. Instead I feel strongly that we should join together to get additional information about loan forgiveness and then to assess the effectiveness of these programs. If it turns out that the program are not effective or too costly, we will have plenty of opportunity in the future to revisit these issues.

My own support, strong support, for the loan forgiveness provision of the bill is based on discussions with organizations and individuals who are involved in various community service programs in my district. Without exception these individuals have expressed strong support for these provisions and have indicated that they believe loan forgiveness is an effective tool in encouraging people to enter community service programs. It may not be the whole answer, but they feel that it will be an effective tool.

I am particularly concerned about the importance of providing loan forgiveness and deferment to those who work, for example, in the drug treatment field. Everyone is aware that we are facing a crisis in drug treatment. There is a huge shortage of available treatment slots. Moreover, there is a severe shortage of qualified personnel and an enormous turnover rate. Drug treatment professionals are paid a pittance and are subject to severe stress on the job. The result is a turnover of more than 50 percent a year throughout the field. This means that we do not have the continuity that is needed for effective treatment of addicts, and our efforts to fight what we are calling an effective war on drugs are hampered as a result.

Let me read to my colleagues a letter from the National Association of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors which said, and I quote:

□ 1400

Alcoholism and drug abuse counselors are expected to put in long hours, be on call around the clock and throughout the week and to assist the rebuilding of human lives, for little recognition and compensation. We have seen a tremendous turnover in our pro-

fession, along with increased and acute shortages of adequately trained individuals. We need an incentive to recruit more, not fewer, individuals in the profession.

In addition, I received a letter from the director of the renaissance project. This is an outstanding drug rehabilitation facility in my district. He said: "The system is put together with band aids and is carried on the backs of an underpaid work force." He has also indicated that additional incentives for the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel are urgently needed.

In addressing this issue, members of the committee should ask themselves the following question: "Is the problem of drugs and crime of sufficient importance in my community to justify providing an incentive to our students to enter the field of drug treatment?"

I think the answer is a resounding "yes." Drugs and crime are destroying our communities, they are destroying our families and they are threatening the lives of innocent victims. Drug treatment is an effective method of ending the cycle of drug abuse, crime, and violence. But unless we have trained drug abuse treatment professionals, quality drug treatment programs will just remain a dream for many addicts who need help.

Let me also say a word about the cost of this program. CBO estimates the cost of this program to be negligible in the next several years and to rise to \$5 million per year by 1988. In fact, the entire cost of all loan cancellations under the Perkins program was \$22 million in fiscal year 1989.

The war against drugs in this Nation is urgent enough that we must take firm steps to get that battle won on all fronts. Drug treatment is one of the fronts that cannot be ignored, and the provisions before us today will help make quality drug treatment a reality around the Nation.

We have an opportunity now to assist in this all-important battle by rejecting this amendment and retaining these very important provisions for loan forgiveness.

Mr. HOYER. Mr Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in very, very strong support of the bill.

I will be brief. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] made some points that are good. On the other hand, as I was listening to him with respect to loan forgiveness in the Peace Corps and VISTA but not in the private sector, I recalled that President Reagan urged and I very strongly supported the increase in voluntarism and public service. Not necessarily through a Government program but through the private programs such as the Boys' and Girls' Clubs, such as the chamber of commerce, the Kiwanis Clubs, the Lions Clubs, volunteer fire departments, and other organizations

in our communities that do such good work.

I understand the gentleman's point, but as the chairman of the committee, and the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWRY] just reiterated, this is an encouragement. This is an encouragement for the private sector and a way we can involve people in very meaningful ways of the welfare of our communities yet have some incentive to encourage people in that end.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons I am so strongly in favor of this bill is that I think it is very important for America if we are going to reinvigorate our society, if we are going to bring young people out of the drug markets and into the public service markets, and if we are going to rekindle that spirit that John Kennedy kindled in America when he urged young people to bring their energy and their enthusiasm and their idealism into public service then we need national service. It was this kind of legislation that I think he had in mind. And I also think that this is the concept that President Reagan had in mind, and so many others have had in mind. We have seen in the last decade particularly in the latter part of the 1970's, a continuing focus on "me," a continuing focus on asking, "How is my life going to be better? How am I going to make more money?"

Quite frankly, I am in that crowd as well. I want everybody to know I am a very big fan of bettering one's self and being paid what one is worth. So I do not criticize any young person for wanting to maximize their income, maximize their ability to create for themselves and their families and provide good houses and a good standard of living. When John Kennedy said, "Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country," he was speaking to the very essence of what has made this country great.

This National Service Act of 1990 speaks to that objective. I frankly believe, as I am sure the chairman of the committee does, that perhaps there are other things we could do, but this is certainly a significant and an important step in this country, saying these things once again to young people, as we did when we adopted the Peace Corps. "Get involved in reaching out to peoples around the world," and as we did in 1965 when we adopted VISTA and said to young people, middle-aged and senior citizens, "Get involved and help your neighbors."

This is another way, another step, a timely step of saying, "Get involved. Help your neighbor, build your community, make America what we want it to be, the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth, a nation that cares about our communities."

I think we are going to win this drug war. We are not going to win it with all the rhetoric we hear on this floor, and we are not going to win it with all

the billions of dollars that we appropriate. Those things may be important, but we are going to win it in the communities.

In one of my communities we have the Glen Arden apartments, and they have reclaimed those apartments because about 10 or 15 tenants every night are on the street, walking the sidewalks and walking the streets and saying, "Drug users, drug possessors, drug sellers are not welcome in our community."

Mr. Chairman, this bill says to our young people in particular, "Get involved." It is an important piece of legislation, it is a strong piece of legislation. I strongly support it, and I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in very strong support of H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990. I would like to thank and commend the chairman and ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. HAWKINS and Mr. GOODLING for expeditiously bringing this important legislation to the floor.

I have been in support of national service programs for many years. I have long understood and recognized the value and benefit to the youth and older Americans who are given an opportunity they may not otherwise have, to perform community service and be compensated monetarily, educationally, and emotionally.

The National Service Act of 1990 is a comprehensive program which incorporates several areas of national service. It creates the Youth Service Corps which provides service in Government agencies, day care centers, nursing homes, and other nonprofit agencies with a need for service oriented skills.

The National Service Act would also create the American Conservation Corps. This Corps would perform services in the areas of park and recreational area improvement and urban revitalization. I am pleased to have recently had the opportunity to meet members of a conservation corps in my own State of Maryland.

These young people provide a full range of conservation services to the community and nonprofit organizations such as building bridges. In return, the corps members are paid an hourly wage, taught job skills, and are given a cash bonus or voucher to be used for higher education after completion of the program. I am very proud of the accomplishments that these corps members have made and I would like to see national and community service programs established throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, the National Service is a program whose time has come. The most important aspect of National Service is that it encourages Americans to serve their country and their fellow man which leads to greater civic consciousness and personal responsibility.

It is for these reasons that I wholeheartedly support the National Service Act of 1990 and urge all of my colleagues to join with me in supporting this much needed legislation.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAWKINS) there were—ayes 10, noes 6.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 329]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—406

Ackerman	Coyne	Hall (OH)
Alexander	Craig	Hall (TX)
Anderson	Crane	Hamilton
Andrews	Crockett	Hammerschmidt
Annuzio	Dannemeyer	Hancock
Anthony	Darden	Hansen
Applegate	Davis	Harris
Armey	de la Garza	Hastert
Aspin	DeLay	Hatcher
Atkins	Dellums	Hawkins
Baker	Derrick	Hayes (IL)
Ballenger	DeWine	Hayes (LA)
Bartlett	Dickinson	Hefley
Barton	Dicks	Hefner
Bateman	Dingell	Henry
Bates	Dixon	Herger
Bellenson	Donnelly	Hertel
Bennett	Dorgan (ND)	Hiler
Bentley	Dornan (CA)	Hoagland
Bereuter	Douglas	Hochbrueckner
Berman	Downey	Holloway
Bevill	Dreier	Hopkins
Bilbray	Duncan	Horton
Bilirakis	Durbin	Houghton
Bliley	Dwyer	Hoyer
Boehrlert	Dymally	Hubbard
Boggs	Dyson	Hughes
Bonior	Early	Hunter
Borski	Eckart	Hutto
Bosco	Edwards (CA)	Hyde
Boucher	Edwards (OK)	Inhofe
Brennan	Emerson	Ireland
Brooks	Engel	Jacobs
Broomfield	English	James
Browder	Erdreich	Jenkins
Brown (CA)	Espy	Johnson (CT)
Brown (CO)	Evans	Johnson (SD)
Bruce	Fascell	Johnston
Bryant	Fazio	Jones (GA)
Buechner	Feighan	Jones (NC)
Bunning	Fields	Jontz
Burton	Fish	Kanjorski
Bustamante	Flake	Kaptur
Byron	Flippo	Kasich
Callahan	Foglietta	Kastenmeier
Campbell (CA)	Ford (TN)	Kennedy
Campbell (CO)	Frost	Kennelly
Cardin	Galleghy	Kildee
Carper	Gallo	Klecza
Carr	Gaydos	Kolbe
Chandler	Gejdenson	Kolter
Chapman	Gekas	Kostmayer
Clarke	Geren	Kyl
Clay	Gibbons	LaFalce
Clement	Gillmor	Lagomarsino
Clinger	Gilman	Lancaster
Coble	Glickman	Lantos
Coleman (MO)	Gonzalez	Laughlin
Coleman (TX)	Goodling	Leach (IA)
Collins	Gordon	Leath (TX)
Combest	Goss	Lehman (CA)
Condit	Gradison	Lehman (FL)
Conyers	Grandy	Lent
Cooper	Grant	Levin (MI)
Costello	Gray	Levine (CA)
Coughlin	Green	Lewis (CA)
Courter	Guarini	Lewis (FL)
Cox	Gunderson	Lewis (GA)

Lightfoot	Paxon	Smith (FL)
Lipinski	Payne (NJ)	Smith (IA)
Livingston	Payne (VA)	Smith (NE)
Lloyd	Pease	Smith (NJ)
Long	Pelosi	Smith (TX)
Lowery (CA)	Penny	Smith (VT)
Lowey (NY)	Perkins	Smith, Robert (NH)
Lukens, Thomas	Petri	Smith, Robert (OR)
Lukens, Donald	Pickett	Snowe
Machtley	Pickle	Solarz
Madigan	Porter	Solomon
Manton	Poshard	Spence
Markey	Price	Spratt
Marlenee	Pursell	Staggers
Martin (NY)	Quillen	Stallings
Martinez	Rahall	Stangeland
Matsui	Rangel	Stark
Mavroules	Ravenel	Stearns
Mazzoli	Ray	Stenholm
McCandless	Regula	Stokes
McCloskey	Rhodes	Studds
McCollum	Richardson	Stump
McCrery	Ridge	Sundquist
McCurdy	Rinaldo	Swift
McDade	Ritter	Synar
McDermott	Roberts	Tallon
McEwen	Robinson	Tanner
McGrath	Roe	Tauke
McHugh	Rogers	Tauzin
McMillan (NC)	Rohrabacher	Taylor
McMillen (MD)	Ro-Lehtinen	Thomas (CA)
McNulty	Rose	Thomas (GA)
Meyers	Roth	Thomas (WY)
Mfume	Roukema	Torres
Miller (CA)	Rowland (CT)	Torricelli
Miller (WA)	Rowland (GA)	Towns
Mineta	Roybal	Traficant
Moakley	Russo	Traxler
Molinari	Sabo	Unsoeld
Mollohan	Salki	Upton
Montgomery	Sangmeister	Valentine
Moody	Sarpalius	Vander Jagt
Moorhead	Savage	Vento
Morella	Sawyer	Visclosky
Morrison (WA)	Saxton	Volkmer
Mrazek	Schaefer	Vucanovich
Murphy	Scheuer	Walgren
Murtha	Schiff	Walker
Myers	Schneider	Walsh
Natcher	Schroeder	Waxman
Natler	Schuette	Weber
Neal (MA)	Schulze	Weiss
Neal (NC)	Schumer	Weldon
Nelson	Sensenbrenner	Wheat
Nielsen	Serrano	Whittaker
Nowak	Sharp	Williams
Oakar	Shaw	Wilson
Oberstar	Shays	Wise
Obey	Shumway	Wolf
Olin	Shuster	Wolpe
Ortiz	Sikorski	Wyden
Owens (NY)	Siskaky	Wyllie
Owens (UT)	Skaggs	Yates
Oxley	Skeen	Yatron
Packard	Skelton	Young (AK)
Pallone	Slattery	Young (FL)
Parker	Slaughter (NY)	
Parris	Slaughter (VA)	
Pashayan		

□ 1429

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Four hundred and six Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the committee will resume its business.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed out of order for 1 minute to inquire of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] the nature of the schedule for tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for the purpose of telling the membership what the schedule for tomorrow may be.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, before I proceed, may I raise the point that I understand that we had a quorum call, and that there was a pending 5-minute vote. I do not want to preclude that vote being taken.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the gentleman. It will be brief, and the Chair will then move right ahead on the demand for a recorded vote.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding, to inform the House that the schedule previously announced has been modified. There will be a pro forma session only tomorrow. There will be no votes tomorrow.

The purpose of that, as all of us, I am sure, will understand, is to provide the best possible opportunity and time for the summiteers to reach conclusion as they labor in Prince Georges County, MD, at Andrews Air Force Base, thank you.

There will be two additional items on the schedule for the balance of the evening, but I think we expect to be able to get out of here by 6 o'clock.

We wanted to bring this to the attention of the Members early enough so that they could make arrangements for tomorrow, because it is a change in the schedule.

We will be meeting on Monday. There will be suspensions. We will go back to the defense bill. We expect to finish the defense bill on Monday, so expect a very late session or early morning session on Monday. We expect to finish the defense bill on Monday. There will, however, be no votes prior to 3 o'clock.

It may be a little later than that, but Members are held harmless, and there is agreement on both sides that there will be no votes before 3 o'clock.

So the balance of the day will be two additional pieces of legislation after this bill is completed, but no session on Friday.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] for a recorded vote. Five minutes will be allowed for the vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 212, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

AYES—200

Archer	Bliley	Chandler
Armey	Boehrlert	Clinger
Baker	Borski	Coble
Ballenger	Broomfield	Coleman (MO)
Bartlett	Brown (CO)	Combest
Barton	Buechner	Condit
Bateman	Bunning	Cooper
Bennett	Burton	Coughlin
Bentley	Byron	Courter
Bereuter	Callahan	Cox
Bilirakis	Campbell (CA)	Craig

Craze
Dannemeyer
Davis
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
Dorman (CA)
Dougherty
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Favell
Fields
Fish
Ford (TX)
Gallagher
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gibson
Glickman
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Grant
Green
Gusinski
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Hergert
Hill
Hoagland
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Hubbard
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Jensen
Johnson (CT)
Johnston
Kasich
Kolbe

Kyl
Lagomastro
Lambert
Leach (IA)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lingeman
Lowery (CA)
Lukens, Donald
Machley
Madigan
Marianne
Martin (NY)
McCardell
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Miller (WA)
Molinaro
Moorehead
Morris (WA)
Myers
Neal (NC)
Neuman
Nelson
Ollis
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Parris
Pashayan
Paxton
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Punnett
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)

Saki
Sarpal
Saxton
Schacter
Schiff
Schneider
Schuette
Schum
Semenov
Shaw
Shays
Shaw
Shuster
Sisk
Skeem
Stanton
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (VT)
Smith, Robert
(NE)
Smith, Robert
(OR)
Sorensen
Solomon
Spence
Stallings
Stangerland
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Syrar
Talia
Tauke
Taubin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weiden
Whitaker
Wilson
Wolf
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—212

Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
Barnard
Bates
Beckman
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Boggs
Bonior
Bosco
Boucher
Brennan
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brues
Bryant
Bustamante
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clarke
Clay
Clement
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conce
Conyers
Costello
Coyne

Crockett
Darden
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Earty
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Engle
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Faucett
Fazio
Feighan
Flake
Fleppa
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gonzales
Gordon
Gray
Hall (OH)
Hamilton

Harris
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Heiner
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Hoyer
Jacobs
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastineier
Kennedy
Kennedy
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken, Thomas
Manton
Markey
Martinez

Mata
Mavroules
Maxwell
McCahey
McCarthy
McDermott
McHugh
McMillan (MD)
McNulty
McNulty
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morella
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nowak
Oaker
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Payne (NJ)

Payne (VA)
Peele
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Richardson
Roe
Roe
Rowland (GA)
Russo
Sabo
Santolucito
Savage
Sawyer
Schauer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Sikorski
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)

Smith (GA)
Solari
Spratt
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Tanner
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traffant
Traxler
Udall
Unsoeld
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmann
Walgren
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yarman

NOT VOTING—20

AsCain
Boxer
DeFazio
Frenzel
Gehardt
Gilman
Gingrich

Huckaby
Martin (IL)
Michels
Miller (OH)
Morrison (CT)
Panetta
Patterson

Rostenkowski
Roybal
Smith, Dennis
(OR)
Washington
Watkins
Whitten

□ 1444

Messrs. WALGREN, BATES, and UDALL changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: Page 34, after line 13, insert the following new subsection (and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly):

(e) PROTECTION FROM TORT LIABILITY.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—For fiscal year 1993 and subsequent fiscal years, the Director may not make a grant under subsection (a) unless the State involved provides assurances satisfactory to the Director that the State provides by law as follows:

(A) That, except as provided in subparagraph (B) and paragraph (2), a volunteer of a nonprofit organization or governmental entity does not incur any personal financial liability for any tort claim alleging damage or injury from any act or omission of the volunteer on behalf of the organization or entity if—

(i) such individual was acting in good faith and within the scope of such individual's official functions and duties with the organization or entity; and

(ii) Such damage or injury was not caused by willful and wanton misconduct by such individual.

(B) That the law described in subparagraph (A) may not be construed to affect any civil action brought by any nonprofit organization or any governmental entity against any volunteer of such organization or entity.

(C) That the law described in subparagraph (A) may not be construed to affect the liability of any nonprofit organization or governmental entity with respect to injury caused by any person.

(2) CONSIDERATION BY STATES OF AUTHORITY REGARDING LIMITATIONS ON PROTECTION.—For fiscal year 1993 and subsequent fiscal years, the Director may not make a grant under subsection (a) unless the State involved provides assurances satisfactory to the Director that, with respect to protection from liability, the State has adequately addressed whether the conditions and exceptions described in paragraph (3) should apply in the State.

(3) AUTHORIZED LIMITATIONS ON PROTECTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State may impose one or more of the following conditions on and exceptions to the protection from liability provided by the law described in paragraph (1)(A):

(A) That the organization or entity must adhere to risk management procedures, including mandatory training of volunteers.

(B) That the organization or entity is liable for the acts or omissions of its volunteers to the same extent as an employer is liable, under the laws of that State, for the acts or omissions of its employees.

(C) That the protection from liability provided by the law described in paragraph (1)(A) does not apply if the volunteer was operating a motor vehicle or was operating a vessel, aircraft, or other vehicle for which a pilot's license is required.

(D) That the protection from liability provided by the law described in paragraph (1)(A) does not apply in the case of a suit brought by an appropriate officer of a State or local government to enforce a Federal, State, or local law.

(E) That the protection from liability provided by the law described in paragraph (1)(A) applies only if the organization or entity provides a financially secure source of recovery for individuals who suffer injury as a result of actions taken by a volunteer on behalf of the organization or entity.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i)—

(I) a financially secure source of recovery may be an insurance policy within specified limits, comparable coverage from a risk pooling mechanism, equivalent assets, or alternative arrangements that satisfy the State that the entity will be able to pay for losses up to a specified amount; and

(II) separate standards for different types of liability exposure may be specified.

Mr. PORTER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered addresses a serious problem in America, and that is the increasing unwillingness of volunteers to come forward and offer their services in the many ways that volunteers do in America today.

The amendment I am offering would take effect 2 years after the underlying legislation takes effect and would not allow the director to make a grant under subsection (a) unless the State involved provides assurances satisfactory to the Director that the State provides by its law that volunteers are immune from general negligence li-