

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 - October 16, 1990, Senate [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. 10/16/90 S.

Divider Title: _____

*Continuation of House Proceedings of October 15, 1990, Issue
No. 138; and Proceedings of October 16, 1990, Issue No. 139.*

Vol. 136

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1990

No. 139

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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With our objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the conference report, S. 1430, the national service bill, it be considered under the following time limitations, 5 minutes for Senator HATCH, 10 minutes for Senator KENNEDY, 5 minutes for Senator GRAHAM, 5 minutes for Senator DODD, 5 minutes for Senator NUERN, 5 minutes for Senator PELL, 5 minutes for Senator MIKULSKI, 5 minutes for Senator DOLE, the last 5 minutes before the vote for Senator MITCHELL, that no motions to recommend the conference report be in order, and that when all time is used or yielded back the Senate proceed to vote on the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object and I shall not object, I want to make certain. Let us see on that side then you would have, what, 40 minutes is that it, and we would have 15 minutes on this side? We have no problem with that. We do not want to have to wait 10 minutes for each speaker to come over. Could we agree on a total time, at the end of that time we would vote, or just vote at, say, 7?

Mr. HATCH. Let us make it 7:30.

Mr. DOLE. That would not give them enough time.

Mr. KENNEDY. No later than 8, quarter of 8.

Mr. DOLE. 7:45.

Mr. HATCH. 7:45.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask further the vote on this be at 7:45. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. The vote will be at 7:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is correct.

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on S. 1430 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1430) to enhance National and Community

Service and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report will be printed in the House proceedings of the Record.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield such time as I might use.

I would like to inform the Senate about where we are on the civil rights bill. We now have a time certain to vote on the Voluntary Service Act, which is a bipartisan effort, which now has the support of the administration. We will vote on that at 7:45 with the allocation of time as previously described. It is my hope by that time we will be able to have time definite to vote on the Dole motion and also a time definite to vote on the conference report.

There is still one Senator who desires to be able to be heard on the issue. We will attempt over the period of this time and the vote to try to accommodate his particular interests so that we will be able to at the end of the vote give hopefully a precise time as to when we will vote on the minority leader's motion as well as on the conference report. We are unable to do that at this moment, but we hope to be able to do it, or have the majority leader do it later in the course of the discussion of the voluntary service bill.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the conferees have reached a bipartisan agreement on the National and Community Service Act of 1990 that has the support of the President.

This legislation is a reaffirmation of our national commitment to lend a helping hand to our fellow citizens and our communities. It is also a hopeful sign that in spite of the divided government that plagues Congress and the administration, we have not lost the ability to work together on questions that deeply affect our future.

The challenges we face today are serious. But many of these are local, and will respond to local efforts. Crime, drug abuse, homelessness, illiteracy, and pollution are problems that confront all our communities. One way to deal with these problems more effectively is by rekindling the sense of service and commitment to others that has always been the hallmark of America at its best. Our greatest resource is our people, and it is time to ask them for their help.

This legislation is call to action for the nation. It will fund programs for students from kindergarten to college to serve their communities, and for older Americans to volunteer in the schools. It will expand the Nation's network of full-time youth corps programs, which bring young people together to address environmental and

human service needs. It will fund innovative programs offering educational scholarships and housing benefits for those who make a substantial commitment to service. And it will provide funding for the President's Points of Light Foundation, which will replicate and encourage the Nation's best volunteer efforts. The legislation encourages all of these streams of service at a cost of only \$62 million in fiscal year 1991, \$105 million in fiscal year 1992, and \$120 million in fiscal year 1993.

The National and Community Service Act of 1990 is an investment that will reap benefits well beyond its modest cost. The volunteer service that it can generate will help revitalize our cities and rural areas, and provide assistance to those in society who need our help the most.

This measure will remind Americans of all ages of the responsibilities of citizenship, but its most important result may well be its effect on young citizens in the earliest grades. No age is too young to begin meeting the needs of the community. By teaching young school children to help others, we will also be establishing the values that will keep America strong for generations to come.

About a year and a half ago at the time we had the 25th anniversary of the Peace Corps, I had an opportunity to attend a luncheon with the first volunteers for the Peace Corps. I asked all of the young people at the table why they volunteered. Each of them gave essentially the same answer—it was the first time any of them had been asked to do anything for anyone else.

That ringing response, Mr. President, shows the importance of the Peace Corps, the Action programs, the Literacy Corps, and other kinds of service programs that have reached out to young people and old people in this country.

I think most of us would believe that voluntarism starts at home, and second in the church, and third in the community. One thing that has really been lacking, however, is national challenge to the young people of this country to give something back to their community and to America for all it has given to them. So I commend all of my colleagues. I know all of them will speak during the course of this brief debate. Even though the time for debate is short, the significance of this legislation will echo in our country for years to come.

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of my colleagues who made this legislation possible. First, Senator PELL, who deserves great credit for being one of the first to propose legislation in this area; Senator MIKULSKI, who has been long involved in community service, and has a very active and important role in the shaping of the legislation; Senator DODD, for the youth corps proposal; Senator NUERN,

who offered a very innovative and creative program close to 3 years ago.

Senator BROWDER, Senator GAGAN, and Senator ROSS also contributed to the proposal, and, of course, Senator HATCH and Senator DURESSER were enormously important and invaluable in helping shape this whole program in our committee. Senator HATCH, in particular, worked hard to ensure that we had a bipartisan effort here on the floor of the U.S. Senate which carried overwhelmingly and was instrumental in bringing the administration aboard.

I think all of us tonight when we take action on this should take our hats off to Senator HATCH for the extraordinary effort and work that he was involved in in terms of moving the administration in support of this program.

Very briefly, Mr. President, what we have tried to do is take the half a dozen different approaches that have been suggested by the members that I have mentioned here and others. Most of those recommendations were proposed in independent pieces of legislation.

What we have tried to do in the Human Resources Committee is bring those elements together into one program. And work with the House to develop a similar program. The purpose was to try to put these programs into place, and then to do an evaluation of these programs in 3 years to find out which are the most successful, which have been able to challenge young and old people alike, and which have been able to return to the community the kind of initiative and idealism which we hope to attract.

One particular aspect of the program which I favored was a school-based program, kindergarten through college. We have an example of this in Springfield, MA. In Springfield, the first graders and kindergarten students fold napkins that are used for feeding programs for the homeless; the fourth graders adopt individuals in nursing homes, and every single day they spend 5 minutes calling the individual that they adopted, visiting that individual in the nursing home on their birthday and also on Valentine's Day; seventh graders develop pantomimes which they bring around to all of the programs for elderly people—a wide variety of different programs developed by the young people themselves.

The programs have an education component, and involve meaningful service to the community. Those are the criteria included in our legislation for the school-based program, which was originally proposed based on programs in our own State which have had extraordinary success.

It is my fundamental belief that once you begin to get individuals started in volunteerism—give them that opportunity to go through the school process—it will become part of their lives, and they will continue to help

others long after they are out of the educational system.

Mr. President, I again thank our colleagues. I think this is a balanced program. It includes the elements proposed by many of us who have been involved in this concept of volunteerism.

It includes the President's Points of Light Foundation. We have acknowledged the leadership that President Bush provided when he spoke about volunteerism in the course of his national campaign. We have attempted over the last year to work with President Bush and the administration in trying to develop this program. I am delighted, I think all of us are, that we have been able to gain the support of the President for this particular approach.

Mr. President, I hope we will pass this with an overwhelming vote, and I am grateful to all of those who have been a part of this innovative legislation. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am also pleased to join with Senator KENNEDY and all of these other Senators who have worked so hard on this conference report, the "National Community Services Act of 1990."

I want to compliment all of them because they have all worked on this bill to make it a strong bipartisan bill and one which the White House can accept and support.

I feel very good about that. America does have a strong history of people helping people. I salute that spirit here today. This legislation represents and promotes that spirit.

President Bush has recognized the importance of volunteers to our communities and the contributions they make every day to the quality of life we have here in America. The Thousand Points of Light is not just a cliché. Volunteers make a difference. We see the good effects of their efforts every day.

I want to commend President Bush for his support of this legislation and for his efforts to ensure a package that will allow State leaders a chance to accept the President's challenge to invigorate our State and local communities to the call of national service.

The conference report before us today includes the President's Points of Light Foundation, which will inspire individuals and institutions to engage in community service, identify successful volunteer efforts, reward and duplicate their successful programs elsewhere, and discover, develop, and encourage new leaders for volunteer and community service.

Another part of this legislation calls for more volunteerism at the State level. This State grant program represents the best structure for these volunteer programs. I am pleased that the House was willing to accept the Senate structure which will permit every State in the Union to participate in a national service program and to

promote volunteerism in its own way. Flexibility is given to States to choose a volunteer program that addresses their specific needs. The selection includes community-based and school-based volunteer programs; a youth service and conservation corps; a full- or part-time volunteer corps; or the development of their own innovative programs that address their specific needs. In Utah, the legislature has passed a bill which sets up a Youth Conservation Corps. This program for high-risk youth will help perform the immense task of maintaining and improving the vast amount of urban and rural land in our State while educating our youth about the value and satisfaction of hard work at the same time. I recognize, however, that every State may not want this specific approach and would prefer to develop different programs. States should have that flexibility.

Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague, Senator KENNEDY, for all of his efforts in putting this legislation together. His commitment to this legislation has been the impetus for bringing all sides together to develop a consensus bill that now enjoys wide support. It is indeed a tribute to his brother that this new effort comes 30 years after his call for volunteer spirit through the Peace Corps and other successful national volunteer programs like VISTA and Foster Grandparents. These are legacies for all Americans. Today's efforts, I hope, will be viewed 30 years from now as a success and a tribute to the bipartisan work of President Bush and President Kennedy, and Senator KENNEDY.

I also appreciate the hard work of Representatives HAWKINS and GOODLING and all of the House and Senate conferees and their staff members. In particular, I want to thank Shirley Sagawa, Nick Littlefield, Gene Sofer, and Kathy Marshall, and, of course, Nancy Taylor of my staff. This legislation has taken a lot of effort, but will be helpful in providing another outlet for volunteers across this Nation.

Mr. President, this legislation will not by itself make America a better place to live. The Points of Light Foundation will not by itself beam light around the country. But, we can, by enacting this bill, take a position in support of volunteers. And, that, we ought to do. A vote for passage of this bill sends a supportive message to American volunteers, you matter, you are important, and you make a difference in the lives of all Americans.

Mr. President, I urge the support of all of my colleagues for passage of this conference report.

Mr. President, again, I thank my colleagues, particularly, Senator KENNEDY, Senator DURESSER, Senator PELL, Senator DONA, Senator MIKULSKI, and, of course, Senator DOLE who played a big role in this, Senator GRAHAM, and others; Senator MITCHELL as well; and above all, the White

House who put it all together, helped us put it together, and helped us to bring this to pass.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Ms. MIKULSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROSS). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise today to urge my fellow Senators to support the National and Community Service Act of 1990.

I want to thank Senators KENNEDY, NUNN, PELL, DODD, HATCH, and other people on the other side of the aisle, you, Mr. President, for helping formulate this legislation.

Mr. President, we have a very historic opportunity. We are about to pass a legislative framework that really creates a continuum of national and community service. But most of all, it cultivates the habits of the heart, from primary grades all the way through life.

And it instills the most basic value in our society of neighbor helping neighbor. The National Community Service Act brings dreams within reach.

Invest in our young people by investing in our communities. It puts full- and part-time volunteers to work in their own communities, delivering meals on wheels, weekend meals on wheels, helping the illiterate, building habitats for humanity. It turns away from Wall Street and the Wall Street values of excess that left our Nation on the verge of financial bankruptcy. It turns back to the values of Main Street.

When we talk about the habits of the heart, it does mean neighbor being concerned about neighbor.

Senator KENNEDY outlined how this bill provides this continuum. Let me focus on my part of the legislation.

Mr. President, in a time when people question the efficacy of Government programs, they have every right to question why a new program. Well, Mr. President, this does not create more government; it creates more opportunity, and it creates more earned opportunity. It gives our young people a chance, that through their own work and own sweat equity, they can earn a voucher, by doing community service that they can use to reduce either student debt, or hold as a nest egg toward home ownership, first-time home ownership.

Mr. President, what this means is that we are not talking about a giveaway program. We are not talking about another program with big, bloated bureaucracy. We are talking about a program run by the States, under efficient administration by Governors, and by which young people, in my part of the bill, would offer their services to work two weekends a month, or other time equivalent, delivering those weekend meals on wheels, building habitats for humanity, running gifted and talented programs in

inner city neighborhoods. And out of that they would earn a \$2,000 voucher that they could use to reduce their student debt or hold for their first-time home ownership.

This meets certain needs within our society. When I travel around our State, my kids and their moms and dads tell me their families are either tuition poor or mortgage poor. What this does is give our kids the opportunity to deal with each one of those.

The other issue that it deals with, is that we need more volunteers, particularly on weekends, to do those services that Government cannot provide and should not provide.

Mr. President, what it does is limit the voucher program to a beneficiary to 3 years. Hopefully, at the end of 3 years of being a volunteer firefighter, or doing the services that I described, young people will want to keep on doing them all of their lives. So our kids get a break for their own future, doing important volunteer services, and at the same time learn the habits that maybe you do not learn by reading glitzy magazines, but you learn about it by reading the history of the United States.

So, Mr. President, I hope we adopt this legislation. I thank all who made it possible. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I come here with the feeling of the Biblical story of the prodigal son. There is a good son in this bill, many good sons, that are going to make a significant contribution toward the sense of voluntary action and direct participation in our country. I take particular pride in some provisions that relate to encouraging voluntary action, particularly among older Americans, in our schools. Many States have seen the positive impact which that can have in education.

I believe that this national focus and a national clearinghouse of information on school volunteer programs and partnerships will accelerate that movement. Those are very desirable children contained in this legislation.

However, Mr. President, tucked deep in the back of a bill which is 154 pages, beginning at page 150, we come to the prodigal son. Under title VI, miscellaneous provisions, in a bill entitled National and Community Service Act of 1990, we are surprised to find section 601, which is Amtrak waste disposal. Quite a jolting—no pun intended—divergence from the focus of this legislation.

Let me give you a little background as to how this provision happens to be before us tonight, and then I would like to ask the Senator from Utah if he would enter into a brief colloquy in order to put on the Record some of the rationale of the provisions.

In the mid-1970's, when the Public Health Service Act, which is now 42 U.S.C. 264 was adopted, there was an

exception to the law applicable to Amtrak. Specifically, it said, "shall not apply"—that is the Public Health Service Act—"to waste disposal from railroad conveyances operated in inner city rail passenger service."

It is an anomaly, Mr. President, that here we are, the Federal Government, imposing standards for buses, airplanes, for recreational vehicles, and virtually every other form of transportation known to man. Yet, the one system which is operated by the Federal Government, Amtrak inner-city railroad services, is exempt.

What has happened with this exemption over the last 15-plus years? What happened, Mr. President, is a distressing series of blatant violations of State and local environmental laws and violations of the Federal law, but for the fact of this exemption.

In fact, at the present time, Mr. President, the following States either have litigation under way or have lodged complaints with Amtrak due to their practice of dumping human waste in other than approved sanitary facilities. These States include: Arkansas, California, Idaho, Louisiana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and my State of Florida.

Speaking specifically to Florida, approximately 2 years ago an Amtrak train going across one of the beautiful rivers of our State, the St. Johns River in Putnam County, unloaded; unfortunately, below the train at that particular time were a group of fishermen in the St. Johns River who were unloaded upon. That led that local State's attorney to bring action against Amtrak under State and local environmental antipollution laws, and the case was won at the State level.

It was subsequently appealed by Amtrak to a Federal court, where it is now, I believe, in the form of an injunction against enforcement, until this issue of the validity of the exemption can be litigated.

It was that instance which, frankly, brought to my attention for the first time, Mr. President, that there was such an exemption for Amtrak. I was shocked, stunned, to find that we would have such a blatant exemption for a Federal facility from a Federal antipollution and health law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am delighted that we have reached agreement on the legislation before us. It is a good bill that brings together many fine ideas on how best to renew the ethic of service among our Nation's citizens.

I am, of course, particularly pleased that my own idea of creating a full-time demonstration program with educational benefits is a part of this pack-

age. This provision would create a 3-year national service demonstration program. Individuals who volunteer 1 or 2 years in an established community service program will be eligible to receive up to \$5,000 in educational vouchers for each year of service. These may be utilized to cover costs a student may incur while enrolled in a college or career apprenticeship program.

It has always been my belief in that every citizen, rich and poor, should serve our Nation in some way—whether in a military or civilian capacity. The legislation before us makes civilian service possible for people from all walks of life.

National service should be a noble calling, and for successful completion of that calling, there should be a just reward. Nothing, to my mind is more noble than the opportunity to expand and improve one's mind. And no pursuit is more ennobling than education.

Mr. President, I look forward to seeing the wonderful benefits this program will bring to our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to express my strong support for the conference report on the National and Community Service Act of 1990. The measure, as you now have heard, Mr. President, is an omnibus package of service initiatives which through joint Federal-State efforts will offer American citizens of all ages an opportunity to serve their community.

As has already been expressed, I join in my commendation for the chairman of the committee, Senator KENNEDY. A variety of service initiatives were introduced by him, but also by Senators PELL of Rhode Island, MIKULSKI, NUNN of Georgia and myself. We have tried to bring together here in a modified block grant program, this variety of initiatives to try and encourage broader voluntary service in this country.

The measure enjoys, as we know, strong bipartisan support and will in all likelihood enjoy the President's signature.

The bill requires no one to serve. That was a concern of many. It does, however, provide Federal assistance to States choosing to establish or expand service opportunities. A commission on national service will have the authority to receive applications from States to establish service opportunities that range from school-aged programs, to conservation or youth service corps, to full- or part-time service opportunities for adults. Furthermore, the measure provides for in-service and postservice benefits to ensure that Americans of all ages, and from all economic levels, have the opportunity to serve in full-time programs.

These new service opportunities will help to bolster the efforts of our States and communities to tackle the myriad of unmet human and environmental needs. For 25 years Americans have joined the Peace Corps and VISTA to make a difference in communities here at home, and around the globe. However, the opportunities to serve are few in contrast with the need and the interest that exists in this country. Moreover, I strongly believe that the interest to serve would be even greater if we only asked. President Kennedy, more than a quarter of a century ago, asked Americans to serve and they responded. I believe, Mr. President, they would do so again.

Now more than ever before we need to call Americans to contribute to this country. We need to reinvigorate the service ethic for youth and for the betterment of our Nation. We need to make up the ground lost during the 1980's and restore the balance between private citizen and public responsibility. We need the young and old alike to join us in the fights against poverty, illiteracy, homelessness, drug abuse, the destruction of our environment and a variety of other problems facing our Nation.

We need young Americans to know that they can make a difference in their communities. And the opportunity to serve will do just that. The opportunity to serve will provide young people with a sense of accomplishment and pride which many of them desperately need. Where service opportunities exist, youth talk openly about their contributions and personal growth.

Today, at the State and local level, over 50,000 young people have participated in Youth and Conservation Corps programs. The young people have worked in teams with crew leaders to tackle the challenges of their communities. These programs have not only proved to be vital to their communities, they have provided the youth with invaluable training and personal experiences. The Conservation and Youth Service Corps component of S. 1430, which I first introduced on February 2, 1989, as S. 322, will enable States to use the existing model programs to provide similar service opportunities to many more young people.

The language of S. 322, the American Conservation and Youth Service Corps Act of 1989, was modified and incorporated into the omnibus national service package last year. The service opportunity would be limited to youth ranging in age from 16 to 25 for the full-time programs and 15 to 21 for the summer programs. States would be able to apply to the commission to establish or expand Conservation and Youth Corps. Participants would benefit from in-service education and training opportunities while they work full-time in the corps on conservation or human service projects. Participants would also receive vouchers for post-

service education and training opportunities for each year of service.

Mr. President, the Conservation and Youth Corps provisions get to the heart of the purpose of our Federal initiatives. There are unmet societal and environmental needs that would greatly benefit from an increased commitment to service on the part of all Americans. There is a willingness by Americans to serve if the opportunities are available. There are programs already in place to serve as models for new or expanded opportunities. And there is proof that participants in service opportunities not only benefit their communities; they benefit themselves.

Mr. President, before concluding my remarks, I thank Senator KENNEDY, Senator PELL, and Senator HATCH, as well as Senator MIKULSKI, and their staff for their leadership on this initiative. National service is not a new concept, but it is one that has waned since the Presidency of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. This measure reflects the renewed commitment on our part to inspire Americans to serve. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the conference report on National and Community Service Act of 1990.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Chair recognizes the Republican leader, Mr. DOLE.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think I will take about 1 minute, the remainder to be yielded to Senator DURENBERGER of Minnesota.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference report to the National and Community Service Act of 1990. We Americans have a long tradition of helping others, and this legislation represents a continuation of that tradition.

Certainly, no one has provided more leadership on the issue of community service and volunteerism than President Bush. The American public has taken to heart a thousand points of light. By enacting this legislation, we can do much to brighten those lights.

The conference report is a good agreement. It authorizes \$287 million over the next 3 years for a number of programs, including the President's points of light foundation, which will recognize model community service programs and encourage individuals and institutions to identify and address their community problems.

I support the decision of the conference to accept the Senate's structure for the administration of program funds. States will receive funds in the form of block grants, which can be used for a variety of program options. These options include school- and community-based service initiatives, youth corps, full- or part-time service programs, or innovative, individually designed projects. Community problems and needs vary all across the Nation—because of this diversity, serv-

ice projects should not be determined by Washington bureaucrats, but rather, at the State and local level. This provision gives the States and communities needed flexibility and, at the same time, does not undermine volunteer service programs already underway.

I am also pleased to see that two amendments I proposed during Senate floor debate on this bill have been accepted by the conferees. The first ensures that people with disabilities are able to take part in volunteer and service programs. We all know that the disabled have been the beneficiaries of many assistance programs.

However, people with disabilities also have plenty to contribute to volunteer service—my amendment will help to unleash that energy which has for so long been underutilized.

My other amendment establishes a fellowship exchange program with the nations of Eastern Europe. These programs, which have involved over 170,000 individuals, have allowed the exchange of much needed information, but they need to be expanded. Those persons in other diverse fields, such as private business, trade associations, unions, chambers of commerce, as well as those in the local, State, and Federal Governments will be involved in these new exchanges.

This program will help in the democratization of the formerly totalitarian world.

Coming in an epochal year in post-war history, the exchanges will involve many diverse Americans in a world that has changed so much in a short time. Therefore I both thank and congratulate the conferees on this bill.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining 3 minutes and 41 seconds of the Republican leader are reserved.

Who seeks recognition?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I add my voice to those who support this conference agreement on the national service demonstration program. At a time when we are deeply involved in a struggle over how to do more with less in this country, I think it is fitting that we are taking up this particular piece of legislation. The National and Community Service Act of 1990 recognizes a resource we often overlook, the energy and talents of our on people particularly but not limited to our young people. With a modest Federal investment, it provides a variety of ways for Americans to channel energy and talents into productive community service. Our investment, I am convinced, will be returned many times over.

I am pleased that the Chair has been occupied by the Senator from Virginia, who has been such an important part of this proposal. He and I introduced a bill called S. 3 about a year

and a half ago, and although this is a much reduced version of that legislation, I think it is a very important step.

I want to thank the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Virginia. I want to thank Senator KENNEDY for his long work on this; it took an awful lot of work, a lot of negotiation. I want to thank the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] who has done a tremendous job on this legislation. And I want to thank Senator HATCH and others as well as those who have offered part of this legislation, including the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DONN], also the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has had a longstanding and very dedicated interest in education in general and in service in particular. I thank Senator PELL for his work.

I am particularly pleased that the conference committee has included in the final bill a demonstration program based, in part, on a concept which CHUCK ROSS and I put forth last year as S. 3, the Citizenship and National Service Act.

Senator PELL and Senator MIKULSKI also played major roles in the formation of a demonstration program to test key elements of S. 3. Senator PELL has been a long-time advocate of national service and was an early proponent of a pilot program, while Senator MIKULSKI was the original proponent of the part-time approach incorporated in this bill, an approach which Senator ROSS and I always considered an essential complement to S. 3's full-time program. I appreciate their hard work in ensuring that this modest test will be conducted.

I also want to thank House Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman SONNY MONTGOMERY for his cooperation with this effort. For many years, Congressman MONTGOMERY has worked to provide those who have served America in the Armed Forces with enhanced educational benefits. He has expressed in the last year or so very legitimate concerns about the possible effect on military recruitment of providing similar benefits to civilian volunteers through this type of national service program. We have discussed these concerns thoroughly. I have discussed them with him several times in the last few weeks. One of the issues the demonstration program we are passing, hopefully tonight, will test is any possible effect on military recruitment.

We must place military recruitment as a very high priority. We have to continue to get quality people involved in the military service.

It should be obvious that this legislation is a first step. It is only a first step toward a national commitment to national service, but it is a very important first step.

I also think right at the top of the list of those who have been helpful in drawing up this whole concept is the

preeminent military sociologist in America today, in my view, Hon. Charlie Mosher, who has worked long and hard on this whole area of national service; indeed, he has written a book on the subject.

At the conclusion of the demonstration period, we should be prepared to make a decision on the kind of permanent national service options the American people desire. That means the debate over national service must continue even as demonstration programs are developed and implemented by the States.

I want to restate my personal commitment to the kind of national service program represented by S. 3—a full-fledged Citizens Corps that would offer all Americans the opportunity to serve their country in a civilian or military capacity, and earn the kind of substantial education, training or housing benefits they need to gain a stake in the American dream. The chronic fiscal crisis we face today should convince us how urgently we need to find an alternative way to finance services that are necessary but today those services are so excessive that we have a hard time expanding them so that we can find ways to improve our human capital and our ability to compete in a global economy. The crisis of public confidence in Government that we face today should convince us even more of the urgent need to reforge the links of mutual obligation that makes for good citizens and good Government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would remind the Senator that it would require unanimous consent for additional time.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, as indicated earlier, I would like these remarks to be a continuation of those which were interrupted earlier so that my colleagues could speak.

The consequence of this outcry by over a dozen States, the activities of Amtrak, was introduction of legislation to remove the special exemption which Amtrak has had from the Public Health Services Act. Unfortunately, that good objective was perverted in the conference discussion leading up to this bill, and in the Amtrak waste disposal a rather swampy compromise was reached. The compromise is essentially as follows, Mr. President:

First, not only is Amtrak exempted from the Federal Public Health Services Act, it is now exempted from any other Federal, State or local laws. So Amtrak, unique among all transportation systems in America, now has an all-purpose exemption.

Second, that exemption is extended back to February 6, 1976, so that any

litigation, such as that in the States that I listed, is rendered by this legislation to be a nullity. The trade for all that is a commitment by Amtrak, beginning on October 15 of this year, to build into any of its new cars appropriate facilities for the discharge of human waste only at servicing facilities and to begin a process of retrofitting its existing cars.

The difficulty with that is that this program is subject to the appropriation funds, assumedly funds for that specific purpose. My concern is, Mr. President, that we are going to get the worst of both deals; that we are going to have no protection at the Federal, State, or local level from this odious activity and we are going to have difficulty in these very tight fiscal times securing the necessary appropriations, so we will not accomplish the objective which is to have Amtrak clean up its act by retrofitting its cars.

Mr. President, I support the National Service Act and commend the conferees for their diligent work on this bill.

I am particularly grateful to the chairman of the committee for including many components of S. 382, the Business and Citizens School Volunteers Act, which I introduced on February 8, 1989. The conference report before us provides important incentives for the creation and expansion of school volunteer and partnership programs nationwide. Also, it provides the opportunity to establish a clearinghouse that will support school volunteer and partnership programs in every State.

However, I am compelled to speak against the provisions of the conference report dealing with the National Railroad Passenger Corporation [Amtrak]. For in passing this measure, we will also be passing provisions regarding Amtrak waste disposal that are inadequate.

The provisions set up a program under which Amtrak will after 6 years complete retrofitting the waste disposal systems on trains with full retentions systems and remove from service those trains that cannot be retrofitted.

The provisions, however, do not provide any assurances that Amtrak will meet the objectives of this program. For example, if appropriations are not available for the modernizing program, then Amtrak is not obligated to move forward.

The provisions do require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to mitigate the impact of the discharge of human waste from railroad passenger cars on areas which may be considered environmentally sensitive. But there is an absence of enforcement.

The people living along the St. Johns River in Florida asked that Amtrak stop dumping human waste into the waters and onto the people living below the bridges crossing at Buffalo Bluff and over Rice Creek. Amtrak did not stop their practices

and on July 10, 1989, the State Attorney for Putnam County, John Tanner, filed two counts of commercial littering. On December 1, 1989, the jury returned a verdict of guilty as charged on all four counts of commercial littering. The State has been enjoined by a Federal court and is appealing the injunction.

What is most disappointing is the Rail Passenger Service Corporation provision included in the conference report which exempts Amtrak's waste disposals practices retroactively back to 1976 from the Public Service Act and other Federal, State, and local laws.

This 14-year retroactive exemption will void the pending court cases brought against Amtrak.

This is not an issue peculiar to Florida. Officials from other States: Arkansas, California, Idaho, Louisiana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, submitted comments at congressional hearings in opposition to Amtrak's waste disposal practices.

How can these States be assured that Amtrak will keep to the schedule outlined in this conference report?

Mr. President, it is my hope that Amtrak is sincere in their commitment to eliminate the discharge of human waste along the right-of-way, in our towns, and in our waters.

The practice of indiscriminate waste discharge which dates back to the mid-19 century is clearly long past the time it is acceptable as we approach the 21st century.

Rest assured that we will be watching closely to ensure Amtrak warrants the extreme display of confidence that has been placed in it by granting judicial relief and continuing for 6 years its exemption from all laws that govern the discharge of human waste.

We look forward to Amtrak completing the retrofit program well in advance of the 6 years it has been accorded.

I also, Mr. President, would like to engage in a colloquy with the ranking member of the committee, Senator HATCH, who had particular responsibility for this provision on behalf of the Senate during the conference committee.

Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask if the remainder of my time could be withheld pending the return on the Senate floor of the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator's remaining 1 minute 37 seconds will be retained.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to proceed for 1 minute.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this was an extraordinarily complicated melding of different programs. I think all of us are grateful for the staff help

and support on any piece of legislation. But those that were involved in serving the Members did an extraordinary job. I would like to mention on my own staff, Shirley Sagawa, Michael Epp, Nick Littlefield, Rusty Barbour, Terry Hartle, David Stark, Adele Robinson, Amy Lowrey and Peter Battaglia; from Senator HATCH's staff, Nancy Taylor and Carrie Hillyard; from Senator MIKULSKI's staff, Glenn Roberts; from Senator FEEL's staff, Sarah Flanagan; from Senator NUUN's staff, Julie Abbot Murphy; from Senator DODD's staff, Joan Hogan-Gillman; from Senator BUMPER's staff, Chuck Ludlam; and from legislative counsel, Bill Baird, who worked heroically to draft the legislation on many a short deadline.

All of them did an extraordinary job in bringing this together, and the Senate record should reflect their very extraordinary efforts.

In addition to the Senate staff, and the Senators I mentioned earlier, many people outside the Senate also played essential roles in the movement of this legislation. Congressman AUGUSTUS HAWKINS and his staff, Gene Sofer, were instrumental in moving this bill through the House through their dedication and excellent work on its behalf. Also in the House, Representatives BILL FORD, MATTHEW MARTINEZ, LEON PANETTA, DALE KILDEE, PAT WILLIAMS, CONNIE MORELLA, RICHARD NEAL, DAVID BONIOR, DAVE MCCURDY, and PETER SMITH all contributed to the legislation.

Many organizations have also played leadership roles in the area of national service and should be recognized for their work including People for the American Way, the National Association of Service & Conservation Corps, Youth Service America, AFSCME, AFT, Campus Compact, City Year, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Families, USA, the Girl Scouts, the Thomas Jefferson Forum, the Children's Defense Fund and the Child Welfare League of America.

Finally, I commend President Bush for joining in this effort. It is his Thousand Points of Light that has captured the imagination of the Nation. Our goal with this initiative is to enable them to shine more brightly.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, in January 1989, I set forth what I hoped would be the Senate's domestic and foreign policy agendas in this Congress.

On domestic policy, I said that Senate Democrats sought a national community whose members shared fairly in prosperity and freedom and who in return did their part to help build prosperity and preserve freedom.

I said the Senate would consider legislation to reestablish national service on a voluntary basis—to ask citizens to help shape this country's future by reactivating our national idealism and

the traditional American commitment of giving a helping hand.

That effort reaches fulfillment today as the conference report on S. 1430, the National and Community Service Act is acted upon by the Members of the Senate.

Detractors of national service often say, "We shouldn't pay people to volunteer. The rewards of volunteer service should be of itself enough inducement."

Detractors say Government should not play a role in encouraging volunteer service. That is better left to individuals and the private sector.

But this legislation asks our young people for more than an hour or two once in a while. We are asking young people to make a consistent, dependable, rigorous commitment over a sustained period.

The fact of the matter is that this Nation has been encouraging volunteer service for decades. But to enable a broad array of young people to participate in service in their communities, we need to do more than simply encourage them. We need to recognize the constraints that keep young people from community service.

Many moderate income and low income young people today need to work so that they may attend college. Some need to work to help their families pay bills. Others are on their own and need to work simply to survive.

In order for a broad array of young people to participate in service in their communities, we need to do more than simply encourage them. We need to help overcome or remove the constraints that keep young people from community service.

S. 1430 is designed to enable young people from all walks of life to participate in community service, not merely young people from wealthy families.

The voluntary national service program, youth service corps, school-based programs, the higher education innovative projects and other provisions in S. 1430 are good ways to channel the idealism of American citizens, especially young people, while providing a broader opportunity for upward mobility to more of our citizens.

I commend all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle for their dedication and hard work in putting this legislation together.

Particularly I want to note the contributions of Senator KENNEDY, Senator NUNN, Senator PELL, Senator MIKULSKI, and Senator DOMB. Without their personal involvement we would not have this conference report before us today.

And, Mr. President, although many Democrats support national service and have spoken about its virtues, I want to emphasize that support for voluntary service to one's community is not a Democratic idea.

In his words and deeds, as a candidate and since his election, President Bush has shown he understands the value of community service. And it is

because of the work of a number of interested Republican Senators, in particular Senator HATCH, that we are at this juncture today.

The homeless, the elderly, the poor, and the mentally handicapped are waiting for service volunteers. Communities across the country face shortages of tutors, counselors and health care assistants. Conservation work in our Nation's forests, parks recreation areas, and farmlands goes undone.

I believe the National and Community Service Act will enable young Americans to give something back to the society that has given them so much.

I recommend to my colleagues for their support, S. 1430, the National and Community Service Act, legislation that is crafted to meet the needs of this country, offers Americans from all walks of life and all ages a worthwhile and challenging opportunity to serve, and which passes the test of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference report on Serve America: the National Community and Service Learning Act of 1990. As I look at the things that make this country great, I note that it does not lie in the number of cars we can produce or the designer suits we wear, simply what makes this country great lies in the character of the American people and their willingness to stand up for democracy and for the good of others.

This legislation will provide those opportunities for all Americans by encouraging service early in life so that it will be sustained through one's life. There are many reasons for supporting this legislation, but I would like to point out just a few. First is the role community service can play in improving education in this country. The opportunity to gain hands-on experience can greatly enhance classroom learning. It can also provide exposure to possible future careers and give kids valuable skills needed in the workplace. This legislation will begin to establish that link by establishing what I have called experienced-based learning opportunities.

Second, is the positive effect community service can have on building future generations of American citizens. Voluntarism can lead to an increased sense of self esteem, especially for those who normally are on the receiving end of these services. Young people today need to feel wanted and appreciated. They need outlets for the positive contributions they can make to society. And they need recognition for these contributions. This legislation will provide new opportunities for all Americans to serve.

Third, community service can offer an outlet for young people to use their time in a positive manner. Today's young people face a range of temptations and have numerous competing demands on their time. Expanding service opportunities for young people

is an integral part of the Nation's efforts to curb the influence of drugs, violence and other negative lures on our Nation's children.

Although initial funding levels were reduced in order to get the President's support, there are a number of important provisions in the compromise bill from Minnesota's perspective.

First, the legislation creates a new Commission on National Service to administer grants. That is very important in focusing visibility and accountability for national service programs in an agency that has a broad purpose.

Second, the legislation retains Senate language emphasizing broad-based community collaboration in designing and running service learning projects aimed at K-12 age young people.

Third, the legislation earmarks funds for up to four regional clearinghouses on youth service.

Fourth, the legislation includes funding authority for the full-range of service programs included in the original Senate bill—K-12 and postsecondary service learning, youth corps, and post-secondary demonstrations.

Fifth, the legislation includes funding authority for the President's Points of Light Foundation—helping to assure greater Bush administration support and interest in funding and implementing the legislation.

Sixth, the legislation authorizes funding for 3 years—giving a greater sense of permanency to this initiative. Over the 3 years, a total of \$287 million is authorized.

And, seventh, and most important, the compromise legislation is now being supported by the Bush administration.

We have all seen first hand over the past few weeks what can happen when times are good. It is easy for a nation to lose sight of the individual responsibilities we have to others and the civil duty we have as part of a democracy. So I want to thank my good friend from Massachusetts for all the work he has done on this legislation to remind us of the service opportunities and responsibilities we have to this country. He has worked tirelessly to address the issues raised by the administration and put together a bipartisan package that will meet our Nation's needs and our children's needs by providing valuable opportunities for service. I would also like to thank my friend and colleague from Utah who provided the link to bring together the compromise that enabled this legislation to move forward. Finally, I would like to thank the Minnesota working group on community service who helped me on this legislation and contributed to the establishment of the four regional clearinghouses.

Thirty years ago, President John F. Kennedy called a nation to service and our Nation responded. Today, Senator KENNEDY carries on that tradition by

opening new opportunities for service. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) is recognized for up to 1 minute.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to use that time to ask a few questions in colloquy with the Senator from Utah.

Why does Amtrak need to be exempt from all Federal, State, and local laws regarding the discharge of human waste?

Mr. HATCH. The reason is because Amtrak needs to have only one set of rules to play by. The Senator is aware that Amtrak is currently being sued for dumping in areas which may violate State or local ordinances. I would remind my colleague that the state of the existing waste disposal technology makes it very difficult for Amtrak to control when and where this waste is discharged. Amtrak, and our House colleagues, believe that if they continue to be subject to many layers of regulation, it is almost inevitable that Amtrak will be forced to suspend service to some of these States. Unfortunately, when service is suspended to Florida, it makes service to other States in the Southeast much less profitable.

Mr. GRAHAM. Why is it necessary to have a retroactive exemption to these laws?

Mr. HATCH. I understand the Senator's concern with this matter. I have always been a supporter of States' rights, and I would be upset if a Utah court were being required to drop a suit which the State believes is important. I want my colleague to know that I fought hard for a provision that would have allowed existing cases to be pursued. However, our House colleagues would not budge on this point. I must admit that I find their logic difficult to dispute. They argue that the States which have filed want Amtrak to stop dumping. This legislation requires Amtrak to stop dumping. Why then do the States want to pursue these cases. If existing cases are not rendered moot, we still face the possibility that a court could rule against Amtrak, and Amtrak might have to suspend service to those States.

Mr. GRAHAM. What impact will this retroactive exemption have on pending cases against Amtrak?

Mr. HATCH. I believe that pending cases will have to be dropped as a result of this exemption. However, the Federal courts should decide what this exemption provides for.

Mr. GRAHAM. The language "subject to the appropriation of funds" in section 1(b) provides Amtrak a loophole. What will ensure the States that Amtrak will meet the retrofitting schedule outlined in this bill? That is, that the retrofitting will be completed within 6 years of enactment.

Senator, I am concerned about the requirement that this be an appropriation for Amtrak to be obligated to

meet the 1996 date for completion of its retrofit. Would you consider this to be a high priority, in terms of the allocation of resources for Amtrak?

Mr. HATCH. Well, Mr. President, of course the Senator is correct that we are currently facing a serious budget shortfall, and that means that the funding for this program will be hard to come by. I have traditionally been an opponent of Amtrak subsidies, but the Senator can count on my help in obtaining this funding to complete the retrofitting process.

Amtrak is doing its part. Amtrak tells me that toilets are the single largest source of customer complaints. The current systems do not work and Amtrak wants to replace them. The Senator knows that Amtrak has engaged in an aggressive research and development effort to develop a retention system that will work. Nine companies have submitted prototypes for this system and these prototypes are currently undergoing inservice testing. Amtrak has gone to the private credit markets to borrow money to replace these older cars with new cars with retention capability. They plan to borrow \$500 million which is half the cost of the retrofit anti-new-acquisition program. This program of acquiring new cars is progressing.

Amtrak plans to let a contract later this month to acquire 79 new superliner cars with an option for 100 more. By the language of this measure, these cars are required to be equipped with this new retention technology. However, my understanding of the law governing Amtrak's operation is that Congress agrees to subsidize those fiscal requirements which Amtrak cannot cover at the fare box. The other half of this program is just such an expense. Amtrak must make an effort to use all of its available private resources on this project. It must be a top priority. Unfortunately, Congress will have to come up with some funds. I hate to keep harping on this, but if we force Amtrak to withdraw cars from service, when we have not provided them with funds to retrofit them then service will have to be curtailed. No one wants service to be curtailed. We just want them to stop dumping human waste on the right-of-way.

Mr. GRAHAM. During the 6-year retrofitting period, what will ensure the States that Amtrak will stop dumping human waste in their towns and waterways?

Mr. HATCH. The amendment requires the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations governing dumping in the interim period. The Secretary is expressly charged to consult with EPA, the Public Health Service, and State and local governments, as well as Amtrak before issuing these regulations. The Secretary of Transportation is the logical choice because all of the expertise on the technology for discharging waste resides in his Department. The Secretary is also di-

rected to issue regulations requiring Amtrak to make appropriate announcements regarding when to use toilets to passengers.

Mr. GRAHAM. What impact do you perceive the required regulations of the Secretary of Transportation to have on Amtrak's current waste discharge practices?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is aware that the Department of Transportation has been regulating all aspects of railroad operation and safety for years. I believe that they have done a good job up till now in these areas, and I feel confident that they can regulate the discharge of human waste from trains equally well.

The Senator is aware that there are several options which are available to the Secretary now. We could order alterations of routes, order trains to travel more slowly in certain areas which should prevent the retention/dump equipment from discharging in those areas, or prescribe an interim technological fix which would give Amtrak more control over when and where waste is discharged. These are options available to the Secretary right now, there may be others that the experts at the Department of Transportation can come up with.

Mr. GRAHAM. What does environmentally sensitive mean? Does it include areas of human activity that are adversely impacted by discharge of human waste?

Mr. HATCH. Environmentally sensitive areas should include waterways, watersheds, wildlife habitats, and other natural areas. Homes, towns, and cities would also be included within the definition of this term. Of course, the Senator is aware that the language of the amendment specifically mentions several areas of human activity, including stations and railroad yards, to which the regulations promulgated by the Secretary are to apply.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, the target date for completion of this process is October 15, 1996. Would the Senator be inclined to support at an appropriate future date, an amendment which would eliminate the exemption which will now be extended from the Public Health Service Act to any other Federal, State, and local government for Amtrak effective October 15, 1996?

Mr. HATCH. I do not think I could support that. I think what it is going to take is about 6 years, from what I understand, to retrofit the appropriate number of trains to be able to handle this problem. It is a problem. There are 44 different States. That is why, because of the efforts in both Houses to try to resolve this problem, we have come this far.

But I do not think we can change that because the amendment requires the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations governing dumping in this interim period. I think the Sec-

retary is expressly charged to consult with EPA, Public Health Service and the State and local governments as well as Amtrak before issuing those regulations. I think that is the logical choice. So I do not think I would be willing to reduce that time, because I think that is the time that is going to be necessary, with the tremendous amount of expenditure we are going to be making, that Amtrak is already making to do the job.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Senator may not have heard my question. The date I cited is the date which is in the time statute, which is October 15, 1996.

Mr. HATCH. That is right.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the National and Community Service Act of 1990. This day has been a long time in coming, and a great deal of credit is due to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the junior Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] for their able tending of this bill in conference.

The varied programs that will be sponsored by this bill will enable us to get a sense of what kinds of things work best as we seek to instill in our young people the habit of "giving back" to the community.

In giving back, I trust that many students will find that they gain a great deal as well.

And, in these days, as we are trying to come to grips with our financial crisis, a bill like this one reminds us that we do have tremendous resources, human resources, in this country. Human resources alone cannot address our fiscal crisis. But we should take heart in the fact that Americans are a strong and generous people, and willing to make sacrifices if someone can show them why they should do so.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report, to ask our young people to give something back, and to help them see that they can be part of the solution to many of our Nation's problems.

EISENHOWER EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Republican leader, is his amendment on foreign exchanges related to the Eisenhower exchange proposal?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this is a separate program. It is intended to promote the exchange of views between officials in government, business, labor and others between the United States and emerging democratic countries. The Eisenhower Exchange Program is targeted to students, and is in no way, related to this program.

VOLUNTARY COMMUNITY SERVICE: THE HIGHLIGHTS POINT OF LIGHT

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I am disappointed that the loan cancellation proposals that I sponsored have been deleted by the conference committee. The conference felt that it did not make sense to amend the Higher Education Act this year to provide for

loan cancellation, because the Higher Education Act is due to be reauthorized next year.

Accordingly, I will be reintroducing my loan cancellation proposals early in the next Congress to be included in the Higher Education Act amendments of 1991. I look forward to working with Senator KENNEDY, chairman of the Senate Labor and Human Services Committee, and Senator FEEL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, to secure their enactment. I appreciate their strong support this year, and regret that they were not able to persuade the Bush administration to accept these loan cancellation provisions in the National Service bill.

My loan cancellation proposals would move the Government out of the way, so that our young people would be able to provide voluntary service to their community and to the Nation by reducing the pressure that these young people feel from their student loan debt burden. The legislation would reduce this debt burden pressure for students when they serve their community in full-time, low-paid voluntary jobs as employees of non-profit community service organizations. This is the type of service that epitomizes the American spirit and this is what the national service legislation is all about.

STUDENT LOAN INDENTEDNESS

Young people are willing to devote themselves to serving these needs, but many of our college graduates believe that they are unable to do so, due to the debts they have accumulated in order to attend college. With these enormous debts they simply feel that community service is not a realistic option for them.

In fact, in several surveys the most frequently cited reason of students on why they do not perform a period of service to the community, is their loans debts.

With these debts, it is not surprising that upon graduation their first priority is to secure a high paying job, so that they can earn the money to begin to repay their loans. This focus is a function of reality, not selfishness.

We should applaud this sense of responsibility in wanting to repay their debts. We are burdened by some who don't repay their student loans. We want our students to feel responsible for repaying their loans.

The problem is that once a student takes that first high paying job, he or she has passed by a major opportunity to provide service to the community. The first few years are a perfect time for young people to take off a year or more to provide service. They are less likely to be burdened with other responsibilities, such as children, mortgages and job ladders. When they do not take this time to provide some service, it then becomes quite unlikely that they will ever perform full-time service to their community.

The legislation I have introduced says, "take this time to provide a year

or more of service to the community. You may never have an opportunity to do so again."

It says, "The Government will not require you to immediately repay your student loan debts if you serve the community."

The legislation says, "The Government will even partially cancel your obligation to repay your loans if you serve the community."

The legislation says, "you will never regret serving your community." It says, "your service to the community is important to the Federal Government, as well as to the community you serve."

The legislation would permit young people to consider community service and not to worry about their debts while they serve.

The legislation would take away most commonly heard excuse about why young people are not willing to serve.

Young people may still conclude that they don't want to serve. They may have other excuses. They may place a higher priority on material possessions. They may be more interested in a fancy car than in helping their fellow citizens. They may not want to be near homeless persons or mentally retarded persons or sick persons.

But, with this legislation in place, they will have to find an excuse other than student loan debts. They will have to consider the issue on the merits and they will have real choices to make.

PEACE CORPS MODEL

The legislation I sponsored is based on the model of community service provided by the Peace Corps and VISTA.

What my proposals attempt to do is extend the Peace Corps and VISTA models of service into the private sector.

What they do, is encourage private sector non-profit organizations to set up their own Peace Corps and VISTA programs, with the Federal voluntary service programs serving as the model.

What my legislation would do is seek to create an un-peace corps or a "decentralized peace corps."

The legislation would not compete with the Peace Corps or VISTA in any way. My legislation would build on the idea that service involves some material sacrifice. It is premised on the idea that service involves commitment. It recognizes the principal reward for service should be the sense of satisfaction and accomplishment that comes with the service.

My legislation is the direct descendant of the Peace Corps and VISTA. It is the logical next step in furthering the goals of the Peace Corps and VISTA.

NON-PROFIT SECTOR

I believe that the Federal Government does not have to organize many service opportunities for young people.

The Peace Corps and VISTA are excellent programs, but I do not believe that they can or should be duplicated with many other new Federal Government service programs. Fortunately, this country is blessed with a multitude of tax-exempt charitable organizations that is unique and they can and should, take the lead in organizing community service.

These tax-exempt charitable organizations provide service to those in great need. They do so efficiently and fairly. They show immense creativity and imagination in providing service.

The Government doesn't need to find placements for the students who want to serve. The opportunities for service are all around us with non-profit community service organizations and there are volunteer clearing-house in many communities.

The Government would probably find that additional young people are willing to serve if the Government organizes and funds the service.

What I am saying, however, is that the Government can accomplish much of its objective simply by removing a major barrier to service, namely the obligation students feel immediately to begin repaying their student loan debts, and encouraging young people to serve in the private sector with existing tax-exempt community service organizations.

This approach is simple, effective, inexpensive, and involves none of the controversy which may arise with some of the other national service proposals.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

I first introduced legislation promoting voluntary community service in 1987, S. 759 and S. 760. 133 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at S3264-68 (March 17, 1987). I just missed the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 1986.

In 1987, I testified on these bills before the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Voluntary National Youth Service Act, hearings of April 29, 1987. Congressman GERRY SIKORSKI, chairman of that subcommittee, has been the lead House sponsor for the student community service legislation.

In December of 1987, I authored a directive to the Department of Education regarding implementation of the current deferment in the Department's appropriations bill. 133 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at S 17943-44 (December 11, 1987). Unfortunately this directive was completely ignored.

In September of 1988 the Senate adopted the substance of S. 760 as an amendment to the Stafford Student Loan Default Prevention and Management Act of 1988, S. 2647. 134 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at S12541-42 (September 15, 1988). Last year the Senate again adopted the substance of the deferment-implementation bill—this year S. 539—as an amendment to the

same legislation. 135 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at S3202 (March 17, 1989).

I reintroduced my proposals last year as S. 539, S. 540 and S. 541. 135 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD S2354 (March 8, 1989). I also testified before the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee on March 9, 1989, when it held its hearings on the national service legislation.

When Senator KENNEDY introduced S. 1430, he included all three of my bills, and I submitted a statement for the RECORD explaining the history and terms of the provisions that I had authored. 135 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at S9017-9021 (July 27, 1989).

The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee included all three of my proposals in S. 1430 when it reported the bill to the full Senate. My proposals appeared as sections 141-144, 151-152 and 161-162. During the Senate debate I spoke on the bill and on an amendment changing the effective date for the loan cancellation provision (136 Cong. Rec. S1599-1600 (February 26, 1990) and 136 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD S1718-1719 (February 27, 1990)).

The Senate adopted S. 1430 on March 1, 1990, and sections 230-233, 240-241, and 250-251 of the Senate passed bill are taken from legislation introduced by Senator DALE BUMPERS.

The House took up the national service issue and reported its national service bill, H.R. 4330, on August 15, 1990. Two of my three proposals were included in the House bill as sections 176-177 and 181-183. During the House debate on the bill, there was an amendment to strike all of the loan cancellation provisions, but it was defeated.

POLITICAL REALITY

My proposals are effective ways to promote voluntary community service and equally important, they are politically realistic. In closing, let me summarize the key advantages of my community service proposals, and why I will be pursuing them next year with the Higher Education Act reauthorization.

With the Bumpers proposal the Government does not need to experiment with novel, controversial and expensive new Government community service programs. It can build on the proven model of service provided by the Peace Corps and VISTA and rely on the nonprofit community service organizations in the private sector to initiate, organize and manage service programs based on this model.

The Bumpers proposal is directly related to the financial need of the young person. It is only available to young persons who have student Government loan debts. These debts are the most frequently cited reason given by young persons on why they are unable to perform a period of community service. Relieving this debt burden reduces this barrier to service.

It reduces a barrier to service for those who are already inclined to

serve, rather than seeks to buy an interest in service on those not inclined to serve.

The young persons with the greatest student loan debt burdens and the greatest incentive to serve under the terms of the Bumpers bill—doctors, lawyers and other professionals—have the greatest skills to lend to non-profit community service organizations and to the communities in which they serve.

The young person is encouraged first to complete his or her college education, and graduate school education, and then to perform community service. Completion of the student's higher education should come first, and not be delayed by the need to perform community service first. Young persons, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, tend not to attend college if they do not so immediately after high school.

The young person must make a major commitment to community service to qualify for the loan cancellation. The loan cancellation program requires real sacrifice. Students who are willing to serve full-time for at least a year at the minimum wage deserve a break on their student loans.

All of the community service is performed in the private sector with non-profit community service organizations. There is no displacement of Federal, State or local government agency employees. Because it requires the young person to serve at a rate of pay that does not exceed the minimum wage, it also would not tend to displace the current employees of non-profit community organizations or impose an unreasonable financial burden on these organizations.

Because it requires full-time service with a private sector non-profit organization, the young people who participate will develop the skills and training they need to be hired for other full-time positions upon completion of their community service. Because the decision to hire the young person is entirely that of the non-profit organization, and because the service must be for at least a year, the employer has a strong self interest in providing training to the young person. As a full-time employee of the organization, the young person would be entitled to all fringe benefits available to other full-time employees.

It is much more efficient for community service organizations to obtain the services of a young person who will work full-time and for at least a year. This reduces the expenses for training and supervision and the young person is better able to provide effective service to the community.

No new Government agency needs to be created to implement the Bumpers loan cancellation program. The Department of Education already administers a variety of loan cancellation programs and already has sufficient

staff and expertise to process the loan cancellation forms.

Hardly any bureaucracy or paperwork is involved for the young person or the Federal Government to implement the loan cancellation program. Young people must file a sworn certification that they qualify for the loan cancellation, just as Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers already do. It is easy for the Government to audit whether the young person has performed the appropriate service.

The incentive for full-time service upon graduation ties in with the existing college work study and State incentive grant programs which encourage students to perform part-time community service while attending school. The Bumpers provisions permit these students upon graduation to work full-time with the same organizations with which they volunteered on a part-time basis.

The incentive costs the Federal Government only about \$3 million per year. The Congressional Budget Office assumes that not many young persons will serve under the required terms—a conclusion that Senator BUMPERS disagrees with, but he is happy to have the low CBO estimate. The proposal does not raise false expectations by authorizing large sums that will never be appropriated.

The provision will not undermine recruiting for the Peace Corps and VISTA, as the incentive provided is the same as is now provided to Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers. It is a matter of simple equity to provide this incentive to young persons who perform service with a nonprofit organization that is comparable to the service of a Peace Corps or VISTA volunteer.

The provision applies both to community service in the United States and to community service in foreign countries, as long as the organization managing the service is U.S.-based nonprofit.

The Federal Government is not responsible for placing the young persons, training them, or supervising them. It is not responsible for the activities of the private sector nonprofit organization which employs the young person. This reduces the potential for embarrassing scandals associated with the program.

Under the Bumpers proposal the Federal Government provides no stipends to the young person or grants to the private sector organization employing the young person. This minimizes the intrusion of the Federal Government into the decisions of the organizations that are managing the service program and employing the young people. There is no need for the Federal Government to issue detailed regulations about the nature and terms of the service program or to pick and choose among the organizations which are applying for grants. No organization is forced or encouraged to

change its current service program in order to qualify for a grant.

In short, my proposals encourage community service in the private sector, they rely on the creativity of the private sector to create the service programs, and they involve virtually no government bureaucracy to manage it. The service that is to be performed will be motivated by altruism. And the whole program carries a very low price to the Government.

This is an American model of voluntary service. It is a bottom-up, not a top-down approach. It taps the diversity and energy of America's unique and independent non-profit sector.

I know that my proposals are sound and I will continue to work to see that they are enacted next year.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I share my colleagues' belief that when Americans are asked to serve others and are given the opportunity, they come forward. But we have not been sending a strong and clear enough message from the Federal level about the importance of serving. And we have not been providing the assistance that makes it possible for Americans of all ages and walks of life to give such service. The National and Community Service Act of 1990 sends a clear message and provides those opportunities.

I commend our Labor and Human Resources chairman, Senator KENNEDY, for his efforts on this legislation. I am pleased to note in the conference report the retention of a number of amendments I recommended during the bill's consideration in the Senate. These amendments give greater attention to basic skills needs and illiteracy among both the volunteers and program recipients, and provide testing and services to those who may have learning disabilities. I am also pleased that this conference report includes the close attention to the inclusion of individuals with disabilities in all of the programs that was intended in the Senate bill.

I support this bill and its intent to expand service opportunities to persons of all ages and all walks of life. It is needed and will benefit both communities and the volunteers themselves. I do have one major concern, however, over what I believe is an inequity for the VISTA and Peace Corps Programs as a result of the difference between postservice benefits available to these volunteers and to volunteers who serve under the programs in this bill.

I have long believed that the VISTA and Peace Corps Programs are the models on which national service programs should be based. I want to point out to my colleagues that VISTA volunteers, who must serve at least 1 year and be on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, currently receive a stipend at the end of their year of service of only \$75 a month. That is only a \$900 reward for their 1 year of service. That figure will go up to \$90 a month next year and to \$95 a month in the

following year. At the maximum, in 1992, it will result in a stipend of only \$1,140 per year. This is in comparison to the postservice benefits of up to \$100 per week or \$5,000 a year for participants in the Youth Corps Program and postservice benefits of \$2,500 a year for full-time participants in the National and Community Service Program.

Since a large percentage of VISTA volunteers are economically disadvantaged, the national service voucher may be of far more usefulness to these volunteers than is the loan forgiveness provision that is extended to them. There is also a real possibility that this disparity in regard to VISTA volunteers, who may work side by side with national service volunteers, may negatively affect recruitment for this specifically antipoverty directed program.

I would like to make sure that VISTA volunteers who may be working side by side with national service volunteers in the same antipoverty project will not feel they are less valued by those of us who design these programs. When each VISTA literacy corps volunteer recruits and trains from 100 to 200 community volunteers in literacy each year, as they are doing in Chicago and throughout Illinois today, we should be doing all we can to let them know their magnificent efforts are recognized and appreciated. And we should be encouraging more people to sign on as VISTA's. VISTA has a 25-year record of service that few programs can match.

I also want to make sure that Peace Corps volunteers are not denigrated by being considered less valuable to their country than those who serve in communities here at home. These volunteers have postservice benefits a little more generous than VISTA's: \$2,400 a year for up to 2 years of service—still not the amount that will be available to the national service volunteers.

I recognize that we are not going to solve this problem at this point, but I hope this is a situation we can remedy in the near future, particularly if there is any evidence that these programs are affecting recruitment for the VISTA or Peace Corps Programs. I believe the level of national service benefits could and should be made an option for these volunteers—not on top of their existing benefits or the new loan forgiveness benefits, but as an alternative option for these volunteers who live and work among the poorest of the poor in this country and countries around the world, and who generally have more stringent service requirements than will be required of national service volunteers.

THE TRUE MEANING OF NATIONAL SERVICE

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I strongly believe in the concept of national service. I believe that every young man and woman in this country owes this Nation a debt, and I believe

that freedom can only be maintained and defended, if all our Nation's citizens understand that what they receive from their country has to be won by sacrifice. I believe that we cannot simply ask what our country can do for us, and that we must ask what we can do for our country.

National service, however, does not consist of token service for educational benefits. It is not a form of welfare. It is not a way of subsidizing volunteers, or disguising the need for effective solutions to the social problems of the poor or disadvantaged ethnic groups.

National service consists of asking men and women from all walks of life, and from all classes and groups in society, to make sacrifices for their country. For some—those who make the greatest sacrifice—it means defending the freedom of their country and that of other nations throughout the world. For others, it means giving up material rewards and comfort to serve the ill, the poor, and the disadvantaged throughout the world.

I believe that the program we debate tonight misses all these points. It is a subsidy program that affects a relatively small group of Americans who lack the wealth or family support to obtain an education without some form of service. It is not a true national program, and it asks very little sacrifice. In fact, it risks being little more than tokenism.

It is also a program that ignores the kind of sacrifice that some 200,000 volunteers are making in defending freedom in Operation Desert Shield, and that rewards limited service with substantial payments at a time when our military and underpaid, earn far less than their civilian counterparts, and will receive a pay raise that does not even equal the annual rate of inflation.

Mr. President, on April 13, 1989, I introduced S. 781, the National Service Act of 1989. In this legislation, which was also introduced in the House of Representatives by my good friend from Illinois, Mr. JOHN PORTER, we attempted to draft legislation that was balanced and fair. A bill that looked into the future and tried to address the question of national service from the standpoint that we, as a nation, and those of us in the Congress, have as a primary responsibility the defense of the nation.

At the same time, we believed that the idea of national service could include certain forms of community service. The basis of our legislation was that every citizen has a responsibility of service to the Nation.

S. 781 called for the President to transmit to the Congress by February 15, 1991, a plan that would implement a comprehensive national service program. The program that the President recommended was to include a plan that had: a military service component and a part-time and full-time community service component; applied to young people between the ages of 16

and 26; included provisions to encourage national service by retired persons and was to be consistent with the following findings:

First, that the principal responsibility of the Federal Government is to provide for the defense of the United States;

Second, that an obligation of citizenship in a democracy is service to the Nation;

Third, that while most citizens of the United States view national service as membership in the Armed Forces, national service also includes community service;

Fourth, that the obligation of national service, whether military or community service, should be shared equally by the citizens of the United States regardless of race, creed, ethnic origin, or socioeconomic status;

Fifth, that the recent high quality of volunteers for the Armed Forces should not be allowed to diminish as a result of demographic declines or economic upturns; and

Sixth, that service in the active or reserve components of the Armed Forces or in full-time or part-time community service should be considered as necessary to fulfill the national service obligation.

As you can see, Mr. President, I strongly believe that a national service program is necessary, but I also strongly believe that it is imperative that we maintain a proper balance between the recognition of service in the military and the benefit of community service.

Mr. President, the differential in postservice benefit between military service and community service must be fair, it must be equitable. We must properly recognize the greater sacrifices of those who serve in the military. This legislation, however, will not only affect a small number of Americans, it will make the postservice benefits no greater for national service than that for the Montgomery GI bill recipient.

Mr. President, I realize that some who favor this legislation would like to compare military service with national service. They try to show how much more compensation a military service man or woman makes than a national service volunteer. They want to some how equate the two. Apparently, they do not understand what the country asks of our military forces.

When a person enlists in the military, they sign a binding contract for service in the defense of the Nation.

They have their background scrutinized to ensure that they are of the quality required in the military;

They are required to serve in remote tours away from their family for extended periods of time;

They are uprooted from their home and community every 2 to 3 years, their children are pulled out of school, and sent to wherever the military wants to send them;

They perform peacekeeping duty in the Sinai Desert or with the UNIFIL contingent in Lebanon.

They stand guard duty at the stark, critical outposts along the Korean DMZ;

They are deployed on board ships for 6 months at a time;

They stand midwatch on the fan tail of a destroyer in 50-knot winds and 30-foot seas;

They conduct interdiction operations against a murderous drug cartel;

They do night recovery operations on board an aircraft carrier;

They are required to be on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week;

They are trained and ready for combat;

They wait in Saudi Arabia and they are aware that they could be in combat in a matter of hours.

Mr. President, the mothers and fathers, the wives, the husbands and the children of those who serve in the military know the sacrifices I am speaking of. They know that their son or husband, their brother or father may well be asked to give his life in the defense of our Nation.

Like Senator NUNN, I hope that this legislation may someday be a first step towards true national service. But, Mr. President, I fear that it will not be. I fear it is a prelude to ignoring the need to serve in our Nation's military forces. I fear that it is only the prelude to a new form of entitlement program, and to the shell of national service—rather than the substance.

The test will ultimately be whether we ask all the Nation to serve the Nation, or a small and less advantaged part. It will be whether we recognize that freedom is the responsibility of all Americans or only a small fraction. It will be whether we clearly distinguish the need to reward those who risk their lives more than those who do not. It will be whether we recognize that real national service consists of the courage of the men and women who serve in Desert Shield, and not simply a desire to earn the kind of higher education that other Americans expect as a matter of more fortunate birth.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the conference report on the National and Community Service Act and wish to commend the distinguished floor managers for their efforts on this important legislation.

Mr. President, one of the greatest attributes of the American people is their willingness to give so generously of themselves, of their time, of their resources in times of need.

Beginning back in 1787 when 55 statesmen volunteered to draft the U.S. Constitution to recent herculean volunteer efforts in the aftermath of the Loma Prieta quake in California; from the El Virita Lewis Foundation's program which brings senior citizen volunteers into our day care centers to

the thousands of parents nationwide who volunteer in our Nation's schools.

All represent one of America's oldest and finest traditions, volunteerism.

Today, the Senate is taking final action on legislation which carries this tradition forward. It sends a basic message across the land: reach out and help each other. The rewards both in terms of personal satisfaction and experience gained rarely will be exceeded by any other activities one might undertake in one's lifetime.

President Bush rightfully has focused the Nation's attention on the Thousand Points of Light, an army of volunteers standing ready, willing, and able to help America. The President's words and leadership on this critical issue have served as an impetus to developing a national youth and community service policy.

S. 1430, the National and Community Service Act, builds upon the President's initiatives. Indeed, the final conference report incorporates several of the Bush administration's proposals.

It would establish the Points of Light Initiative Foundation to administer our Nation's community service programs but more important, to encourage every American and every American institution to volunteer their time, energy, and services through community service programs.

In addition, several important amendments which were passed during the Senate's consideration of S. 1430 earlier this year were included in the final conference report.

In California we have had considerable success in bringing promising honors students into the classroom to tutor younger children. Not only do these volunteers gain experience in teaching and serve as role models to their younger counterparts, they also greatly assist our Nation's teachers in providing the individual attention, caring, and guidance which can positively influence young attitudes and young lives.

Mr. President, I am pleased to report that the conferees have accepted language from the Senate bill to ensure that school volunteer programs which place tutors in the classroom to assist teachers would be eligible for Federal support.

The second concern I had which the committee has addressed is to ensure that programs which seek to bring parents into the classroom receive funding under the School and Community Based Volunteer Program.

Without the support of our Nation's parents to provide children with sufficient motivation and self-esteem to learn, the level of education funding or the number of national education goals we set will become increasingly less important.

There is no better stimulant to good learning than parental interest. Every study to date demonstrates that parents can make the real difference.

Therefore, it would seem to me that we should take every action to encourage parental involvement. The conference committee accepted language in the Senate bill will add to the list of priorities those school volunteer programs which utilize parents in the classroom.

Finally, I also would like to point out that the original Senate-passed version of S. 1430 contained specific language I authored to recognize public safety services with the U.S. border patrol as an authorized type of national service activity. Although the conferees have decided that specific references to authorized activities are unnecessary, it is my understanding that the conference agreement would not preclude public safety services such as volunteer service in the U.S. border patrol.

As I stated at the time of the Senate's first consideration of S. 1430, the border patrol has the critical task of intercepting undocumented aliens and stemming the illegal flow of drugs across our borders. All too often, however, the border patrol is called into service for search and rescue, interpreter, and other important nonlaw-enforcement tasks, tasks which could be performed by volunteers.

I also wish to indicate the proposed use of volunteers excludes the use of volunteers in law enforcement or other critical border patrol activities and should not allow authorities to displace or replace paid Federal border patrol personnel. Rather, its purpose is to enhance the effectiveness or border patrol personnel by allowing them to concentrate on their important law enforcement mission.

Mr. President, every individual who volunteers to serve our country, whether in the schools, at youth shelters, in the armed services, at child care centers, in nursing homes, deserves our applause. A national community and youth service policy will turn that applause into a standing ovation across the land.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, while I will not stand in the way of Senate adoption of the conference report on S. 1430, the National and Community Service Act, there are several points of concern I would like to raise.

First of all, the conference committee report was not filed, and thus not available for Senators and their staffs. A copy of the bill was provided to my office just at noon today, and a copy of the managers' explanatory language was provided about an hour later.

I am frustrated that the conference did not conclude its work until so shortly before adjournment and gave Members just a few hours to analyze the bill as reported. While I appreciate the necessity of the conference committee to take sufficient time to negotiate the bill, I think the conference committee should also appreciate the importance of allowing Members who

do not serve on the conference committee ample time to review the bill. This is a 150-page bill, Mr. President, one which the Senate debated at length in February and for which many amendments were considered.

As to the contents of the bill itself, I have some significant concerns about the national service concept as embodied in this legislation. I understand that the merits of the bill sprang out of the desire for greater citizen involvement in charitable activities and public service. I don't understand, however, the concept of paying people for service and for being good Samaritans.

Further, I am even more concerned about such initiatives coming from the Federal Government. It seems to me that volunteer service is a private decision between an individual and the agency he or she wishes to serve. I suspect, Mr. President, that many of the charitable organizations which rely on volunteers will realize little or no benefit from this bill. Instead, many hard working volunteers will likely look at this bill as only another Federal make work program to further drain their tax dollars.

In these final hours of the Congress, as yet another Government shutdown looms over the weekend if we cannot devise a method of meeting our own budgetary boundaries, I believe it is irresponsible to authorize further expenditures for another unnecessary Federal program.

I agree that public service should be encouraged. I agree even more heartily that volunteerism and charitable contributions of time and money should be encouraged. I disagree, however, that Federal infusions of cash and Federal layers of bureaucracy are the best way to achieve these ends.

While I have problems with the general approach of this bill, there are also several specific provisions which concern me. Participants in the conservation and youth corps will be paid a stipend equal to 100 percent of the Federal poverty level for a family of two. It does not account for distinctions in the size of family, whether someone has three dependents or no dependents. In addition to this stipend, participants will receive a post-service benefit of \$5,000.

During Senate debate of this matter 6 months ago an amendment of mine was adopted to expand the use of the vouchers provided in the national community service demonstration projects. I added the purchase of a farm or small business as an acceptable purpose for the voucher, in addition to the purchase of a house or college tuition. I regret that this provision was omitted from the final version of the bill.

The committee has made many concessions; I recognize those. Putting the service structure in the context of block grants to States is possibly the best improvement. I also support the

change made by the conference committee to defer student loans, rather than forgive debt when students volunteer for a tax-exempt organization. I also appreciate the reduction in authorization levels.

Most importantly, I appreciate the goal of the committee to encourage people, young and old, to develop a broader and deeper understanding of their neighbors, rich and poor. But this attitude cannot be legislated. These activities cannot be federally regulated, and thus, I cannot vote for the bill.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1990— CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there be 30 minutes equally divided on both the Dole motion to recommit and the conference report on S. 2104, the civil rights bill, with the time to be under the control of the two leaders, and that when all time is used or yielded back, the Senate proceed without any intervening action to vote on the motion to recommit; and if defeated, vote immediately on the conference report itself with no other motions in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORTON. Reserving the right to object. The majority leader went through that very rapidly. Is he asking unanimous consent we vote on the conference report immediately after the vote on the motion to recommit?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, if the motion to recommit is defeated. I am advised this has been cleared.

Mr. GORTON. I regret to state I object to that motion. I wish the opportunity to speak after the motion to recommit is dealt with and before this is brought up on final passage of the conference report.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I inquire through the Chair of the Senator from Washington, how long he would like to speak?

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I had not even thought of that. I had assumed there would be at least a modest amount of debate on final passage before such motion was made. I am prepared to vote now on the motion—or immediately after this next vote—on the motion to recommit. I felt debate had been completed on that. But that is a different question from final passage. I am simply going to object to that unanimous-consent agreement until I determine who else may want to speak on the conference report. I am not prepared to enter into a time agreement.

Mr. MITCHELL. I had advised this had been cleared by the Republican leader and Senator Specter and Senator Hatch.

Mr. GORTON. They did not clear it with me.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask the Senator, would 1 hour equally divided, be satisfactory? I am trying to bring to this to a conclusion. I would be pleased with whatever time the Senator would like to suggest.

Mr. HATCH. Will be Senator yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. We were going to have a half hour before the motion to recommit and then a half hour before the final passage of the bill. I think everybody is prepared to move right to the vote on the motion to recommit. We do not have to have anytime for that. Can we work out the time?

Mr. GORTON. That will be entirely satisfactory. I will agree to that right away and an hour will be more than enough.

Mr. HATCH. I want to be assured of an hour to our colleagues. I will be managing the time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I modify the request. I think I understood the exchange between the two Senators, but let me modify the request. If I misunderstood it, I am sure objection will be heard.

I modify my request to ask that following the disposition of the pending matter, that the Senate proceed to vote on the Dole motion to recommit; and that if that motion is defeated, there then be 1 hour for debate on the conference report on the civil rights bill with that time to be under the control of the two leaders and equally divided; and that when that time is used or yielded back the Senate then proceed, without any intervening action, to vote on the conference report on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GORTON. That is entirely satisfactory to this Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be the order of the Senate.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank my colleagues. Senators should be aware then we will now vote on the national service bill conference report and then vote on the Dole motion to recommit, and then there will be 1 hour of debate and a vote on final passage of the civil rights conference report. I thank the Senator from Utah for his usual constructive participation and assistance.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired on the debate on the conference report to Senate bill 1430. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on S. 1430, the National and Community Service Act of 1990. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATCHFIELD] and Senator from Alabama [Mr. STEVENS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATCHFIELD] would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 21, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 274 Leg.)

YEAS—75

Adams	Dodd	McConnell
Akaka	Dole	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Domenici	Mikulski
Bentsen	Durenberger	Mitchell
Biden	Ford	Moynihan
Bingaman	Fowler	Murkowski
Bond	Gleason	Nunn
Boren	Gore	Packwood
Bradley	Graham	Pell
Breaux	Harkin	Presler
Bryant	Hatch	Pryor
Bumpers	Heflin	Reid
Burdick	Helms	Riesle
Burns	Hollings	Robb
Byrd	Inouye	Rockefeller
Chafee	Jeffords	Sanford
Cochran	Johnston	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kasten	Sasser
Conrad	Kennedy	Shelby
Cranston	Kohl	Simon
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Simpson
Danforth	Leahy	Spencer
Daschle	Levin	Warner
DeConcini	Leiberman	Wilson
Dixon	Long	Wirth

NAYS—21

Armstrong	Helms	McClure
Bochwin	Humphrey	Nickles
Coats	Kassebaum	Roth
Corn	Kerrey	Rudman
Gorton	Lott	Symms
Grassm	Mack	Thurmond
Grassley	McCain	Wallops

NOT VOTING—4

Exon	Kerry
Hatchfield	Stevens

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1990— CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question now occurs on the motion to recommit with instructions, offered by the Republican leader for the conference report on S. 2104, the Civil Rights Act of 1990. The yeas and nays are ordered on the resolution. The clerk will call the roll.