

and creativity—a world in which economic activity and the natural environment support and sustain one another.

This is the vision that Jackson, Muskie, and Dingell articulated more than two decades ago when they wrote in the National Environmental Policy Act that we should strive to live in productive harmony with nature and seek to fulfill the social and economic needs of future generations. We share a common responsibility to see beyond the urgent pressures of today and think of the future. We share a common responsibility to speak for our children, so that they inherit a world filled with the same opportunity that we had. This is the vision for which we work today and the guiding principle behind my Administration's environmental policies.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 6, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of remarks.]

HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE NEEDED IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I take the well tonight to talk about student loans and what is happening with our young people. We have had several events in my district on student loans. When you look at the numbers in the State of Colorado, over 90,000 young people are receiving student loans. They are very concerned about having to start paying interest from the minute they get that loan while they are in school, because it will really increase the price.

We have also had a lot of the direct lending going on in Colorado, and that makes a tremendous amount of sense, because it cuts out the middleman and gives you more money for loans, and it also means that the school is much more involved with the young person and the young person is not as apt to take the money and go spend it for something other than school. If the school is doing the lending, the school is going to be much more certain that the student comes and the student goes to class. If they are not and they bought a pickup with it or something instead, they will know.

I think the most moving thing that happened at our very first student loan meeting in Colorado was that Dikembe Mutombo came. Maybe many of you do not know him, but he is a very prominent basketball player for the Denver Nuggets. He got off the plane, went to the meeting, and went immediately

back to the airport to meet his next game.

He said he knew personally how very, very, very much government aid can help in getting an education; that he would not have gotten even his education if it had not been for the U.S. Government helping him and Georgetown helping him, and he could not possibly believe we would be doing anything to make this more difficult in this country.

You see, today we had a vote on the tax cuts, and people said well, that is the crown jewel of the contract. Let me tell you, I think the crown jewels of this country are our kids, and we have seen a tremendous war on kids I think these last 100 days. Whether you are talking about knocking out Big Bird and Bert and Ernie, about the only decent things left to watch on TV, whether you are talking about cutting back on the nutrition programs, whether you are talking about the great cuts in the math and science programs for public schools, whether you are talking about doing away with summer jobs, we totally zeroed that out, whether you are talking about what we did to the National Service Program, which was the program that allowed young people to work in their community and for that get credit for going on to school or get credit that would be relieving them from some of their student loans. That got really devastated. We had 511 kids that will be knocked out in my district on that alone.

So we are starting to get all these phone calls from young people saying well, what happened? My city tells me there will not be any summer jobs. And we say that is right. Zero means none.

I do not know what happens in the cities this summer. I certainly hope people find other ways to do it. But you know, you cannot keep telling kids to say "no" to things if there is nothing for them to say "yes" to. And if they do not think they can go on to school, and they are certainly going to think that as you see Pell grants reduced, the work study programs reduced, national service dissipated, and obviously we are taking in fewer and fewer young people in the military, so the Montgomery GI Bill is going to be less and less of an option for many, they are seeing doors slammed in their face every single day. And these young people are the stockholders in the 21st century. They are going to be the ones that provide either that this country has great leadership and continues to remain prominent on the world stage, or, if we do not have them educated, if we do not have them prepared to compete, they are the ones that are going to allow this country to sink.

So I think the one thing that we ought to be doing in this Congress is hold young people harmless from this debt and all these cuts we are making in order to provide tax cuts. I think we ought to do that because these young people did not cause this debt. They are going to inherit it, and they are going to need all the skills they can

have to be able to figure out how to deal with it. And I just find it absolutely amazing they are the first ones we are offering up as a sacrifice to the debt.

Every American home I know, when that family is in trouble economically, they sit at that kitchen table and they work that budget every way they know how to hold those children harmless as long as they possibly can from any economic downturn in the family. We all know the stories. We have all heard about our own families and the sacrifices they made to get us where we are.

I think it is outrageous that we go after the young people first. That is what we did in these first 100 days, and I hope it stops.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SAXTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CLINGER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

GUAM COMMONWEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a former academic administrator, I would like to add my words of strong support to the statement just made by the gentlewoman from Colorado. One of the most stirring things about America is the ability to get ahead, and you get ahead through higher education. The proposals from the other side of the aisle are unconscionable and put a heavy burden on our young people. I might add I received an e-mail from one of the students at college at the University of Guam that told me the proposal being advanced is like paying for a mortgage and not even seeing the house yet. It is paying for a mortgage in advance.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on an entirely different topic.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to Guam's guest to improve its relationship with the Federal Government through the establishment of the Commonwealth of Guam. On February

24 I introduced the Guam Commonwealth Act, H.R. 1056, which would create a commonwealth that would carry Guam into the next century and give Guam the tools to prosper economically in the global marketplace. Guam is confident of its future and Guam has achieved in recent years, through remarkable growth in its private sector, the self-sufficiency to make the new Commonwealth a viable political entity.

The people of Guam voted in plebiscites to improve their relationship with the United States by establishing a commonwealth based on mutual consent and that protects the right to self-determination for the indigenous people of Guam. It will ultimately be Congress' responsibility to respond to Guam's political aspirations. However, before Congress holds hearings on the draft Commonwealth Act, the administration should conclude its discussions with the Guam Commission on Self-Determination that have been ongoing for over a year. The result of these discussions would be useful to Congress in its deliberations on the many issues that the Commonwealth Act addresses.

And there is good reason to believe that these discussions will be helpful to the Commonwealth process. Last year, under the guidance of then-Governor, Joseph Ada, who chaired the Commission, the Guam Commission on Self-Determination had a significant breakthrough on mutual consent to the Commonwealth agreement—meaning, that any agreement between Guam and the United States cannot be changed without the mutual consent of both parties. With the recent elections on Guam, there is renewed optimism in the future. Gov. Carl Gutierrez and the newly reconstituted Commission, consisting of Judge Alberto Lamorena, Former Lt. Gov. Rudy Sablan, Mayor Frank Lizama, Senator Hope Cristobal, Senator Mark Forbes, Senator Francis Santos, Attorney David Lujan, and Youth Congress Speaker Roy Respicio, bring to the table a team committed to Guam and to our island's future.

These Commonwealth discussions have been recently put on hold because of the announced resignation of the President's Special Representative, Mr. I. Michael Heyman in February of this year. I had hoped that the administration would have moved expeditiously to find a replacement for Mr. Heyman.

Recently, I have been given assurances that this appointment would be given priority in the White House with the strong support of Secretary Babbitt, and that the nominee may be going through the necessary background checks. While I certainly appreciate the efforts of the administration, I must also point out our frustration with the valuable time that has been lost in the past 65 days.

Therefore, I call on the administration to redouble its efforts to finalize the appointment of a special representative. We have made important progress in these talks. But we must be

careful not to squander the opportunity that lies before us in resolving Guam's political status, and we must not lose the momentum that we once had.

The Guam Commission on Self-Determination and I are eager to see this process reach its conclusion. The people of Guam are ready to take their rightful place in the American community. We can only hope that the administration and the Congress share our commitment to improve the lives of the American citizens who live on our island.

□ 1845

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TALENT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

INTRODUCTION OF AGRICULTURE DISASTER ASSISTANCE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to provide disaster assistance to farmers who have no other access to disaster assistance. I am joined in this effort by my colleagues, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POMBO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. DOOLEY.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the central coast and northern California have been racked with flooding. My own district around the Monterey Bay area has been the worst hit with more than \$240 million in agriculture damage alone.

But whereas small businesses and individuals have recourse to private flood insurance, to FEMA emergency assistance, and to low-interest loans from the SBA, most of the agriculture in my district has access to none of this help.

Farmers who grow specialty crops—items like strawberries, artichokes, lettuce, and broccoli or flowers—are not eligible for Federal crop insurance. They are not eligible for FEMA assistance. They are not eligible for SBA loans.

This situation is inherently unfair. A businessman whose business is washed out can apply for emergency grants and loans. A farmer with the same in-

vestment cannot, simply because his business is agriculture.

Congress attempted to correct this hole in the safety net when in enacted the Non-Insured Assistance Program, or NAP. The purpose of NAP was to provide some assistance where none other was available. Unfortunately, even under this failsafe program, nearly 85 percent of affected farmers in my district are still not eligible for assistance.

The problem arises in three areas: the definition of family farm; the threshold on income that determines eligibility; and, the amount of planted area that must be affected.

In all these three cases, the criteria established looks reasonable on its face. But in real life, they deny access to aid to farmers who have suffered terrible crop losses.

For example, the farms in my district—like most other districts—are run like businesses. The product is produce. Farms that are held by and operated by a single family are considered family farms in the traditional sense. But the NAP definition is unclear on this point and implementation of programs that use this definition have erred on the side of not including these family farmers simply because not every member of the family works on the farm, even though the chief operating officer is a family member.

Another problem is that the NAP program disallows any farmer who has a gross income of \$2 million. Many, many farmers have much more than this tied up in their farms. But after all is said and done, their net income is far, far lower than \$2 million. But because the program looks at gross income and not net, these farmers are left uncovered.

Finally, there is confusion over how much land and crop must be affected before a farmer becomes eligible for assistance under NAP. As I understand it, 35 percent of the area must be affected by the disaster. But area is not clearly defined. Is it county? Is it acres? Is it statewide? Also, NAP requires that a producer lose 50 percent of his crop before he can be eligible for aid. But what if a farmer loses 100 percent of his first crop but not of the two or three others he would have planted later? Has he lost 100 percent of his crop or only 33? If the decision is that he has lost only 33 percent of his crop, he cannot receive aid under NAP, but again, without assistance, he will have no funds with which to rebuild his farm or plant the other crops.

Mr. Speaker, this is unfair. During times of emergency and disaster, this country has always risen to the occasion and provided relief to hurricane, flood, earthquake, drought, and fire victims, with one exception: farmers of specialty crops.

Well, the livelihood of a strawberry farmer who gets flooded out is just as disrupted as the livelihood of a restaurant owner who gets flooded out.