

business. How ingenuous can you get? Under the old loan system still being used by most schools, a student applies to a bank for a loan. Checking his or her qualifications is a loan guarantee agency, commonly run by state governments, but also by private enterprise. The agencies then issue a guarantee of repayment to the banks. The federal government pays banks subsidies to forgive part of the interest payments and pays fees to the guarantee agencies for their services.

If a student defaults on a loan, the bank is reimbursed—making student loans the safest loans a bank can make. Loan guarantee agencies are paid fees to hound defaulters. Is this not big government? Can this be free enterprise?

There's more. The old system created a secondary loan business, including the huge public-private Sallie Mae association based in Washington, and smaller ones, like one operated by the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. These groups make money by buying loans from banks and packaging them in large blocks for resale. They were created by Congress and the states to free money for more student loans, but as was said of some missionaries to Hawaii, Sallie Mae and its emulators came to do good and ended up doing well. They are big businesses with highly paid executives.

The direct loan program, a plan advanced by Sen. Paul Simon (D-Makanda), eliminated this entire pyramid. No government subsidy or risk-free lending for banks, no government payments to loan-guarantee agencies, no Sallie Maes with executives paid from profits extracted from government loan subsidies.

But odds are increasing that Congress this fall will stop the direct loan program in its tracks, led by the same people who claim they are trying to get government off our backs. And so far, it seems to be going down like a cold, sweet Coke on a hot summer's day.●

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK ACT

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am pleased to add my name as a cosponsor to S. 581, the National Right to Work Act. As a strong supporter of the right to work, I feel this legislation is vital.

We have spent the first part of this Congress fighting for freedom—the freedom from Government intervention, the freedom of speech, the freedom to choose your health care and even the freedom to succeed. This bill, though it does not add a single letter to Federal law, guarantees the freedom to work free of union imposition.

Why is this important? Americans have always been independent. No matter where they came from, they came to America to see their hard work pay off. And they are not afraid of hard work. This is especially true of Montanans.

But when a worker is forced to pay union dues in order to get a job or keep a job, they have lost part of their freedom. They may get some benefits from joining a union—I am not saying there is no role for unions here—but they lose the freedom to choose.

Mr. President, Congress created the law which allows union officials to force dues in any State back in 1935. Now we need to correct that. All we need to do is to repeal that portion of the National Labor Relations Act

[NLRA] which authorizes the imposition of forced union dues contracts on employees.

Nearly every poll taken on this issue over the last few decades has shown that about 8 out of 10 Americans are opposed to forcing workers to pay union dues. It is tough to get 8 out of 10 Americans to agree on anything. I think this is a call for action.

And if you look at job creation in States that have implemented right to work laws, it is hard to ignore the results. Hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs have been created in right-to-work States. And in forced-unionism States, hundreds of thousands of jobs have been lost.

I have supported this bill in the past and I truly believe that this is the year to finally make this change. Working men and women in Montana want the freedom to work and they are not alone. I urge my colleagues to listen to what their constituents are saying as well. If you do, you will feel compelled to join me and the other cosponsors in supporting the National Right to Work Act.●

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONTINUED FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR AMERICORP

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this month marks the start of a new class of AmeriCorps members who are dedicated to serving this Nation. As AmeriCorps celebrates its first successful year and the new class begins its service, I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate my support for continued Federal funding of this important national service initiative.

Over the past year, 20,000 AmeriCorps members worked in schools, hospitals, national parks, and law enforcement organizations to meet the most crucial needs of individual communities. AmeriCorps clearly helps to provide a more promising future for Americans by expanding educational opportunities for the young whole simultaneously improving the public services in hundreds of communities.

In my own State of Rhode Island, AmeriCorps has been particularly successful due to the efforts of Lawrence K. Fish, chairman of the Rhode Island Commission for National and Community Service. Mr. Fish challenged higher education institutions in Rhode Island to grant scholarships to AmeriCorps members. Many of our colleges and universities answered Mr. Fish's challenge and have begun lending their support in the form of college scholarships. His endeavor to expand AmeriCorps has offered more students access to an otherwise unaffordable education. Mr. Fish's exemplary work in Rhode Island serves as the quintessential example of building the natural bridge between public service and educational opportunities. In this regard, I ask that an opinion editorial by Lawrence Fish from the Providence

Journal of October 11 be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Providence (RI) Journal, Oct. 11, 1995]

THE CHALLENGE OF AMERICORPS

(By Lawrence K. Fish)

Not surprisingly, the debate in Washington over continued funding of the Corporation for National Service has become laser-focused on the politics of embarrassing President Clinton, and not on the people for whom AmeriCorps has been a ringing success.

And the reason is not surprising. It is that Washington, to the frustration of just about everyone outside the District of Columbia, just can't resist playing an inside-the-Beltway version of Gotcha! From the politicians to the pundits to the press, the emphasis remains on the politics of issues, not on the substance of issues or their impact on real people.

For whom has AmeriCorps been successful? It's been a success here in Rhode Island to the 250 AmeriCorps members who have signed up for this domestic Peace Corps and whose efforts, mostly in education, have made better, dramatically better, the lives of thousands of our neighbors. Giver and receiver have been enriched by the effort, and for that, Rhode Island is a better place.

Let me try to explain why AmeriCorps' success here in Rhode Island ought to serve as a model for programs in the 49 other states, and why that success and our promise for the future stand as far more compelling points in the debate than political one-upmanship.

AmeriCorps members have served in cities and towns from Woonsocket to Newport, bringing with them a wealth of desire, experience and cultural diversity. They have gotten results—good results that are measurable. You can see the results on paper and you can see them on the faces of children getting their first "A's" and in adults reading for the first time.

Rhode Island's AmeriCorps program has been very successful—and has been recognized as such. For the second straight year, after a very competitive process that pitted us against 49 other states, we received more AmeriCorps funding on a per capita basis than any other state. In this our second year Rhode Island will field 250 AmeriCorps members in eight programs that will touch the lives of thousands of our neighbors. Once again, they will work predominantly in education, because that's where many believe the greatest need is.

Linking public service and education, we approached the leaders of the state's colleges, universities and technical schools to see if they would accept our AmeriCorps challenge to inaugurate a public-private partnership from which they will get the lessons of service and commitment from AmeriCorps veterans and to which they will provide a quality education.

The Rev. Philip Smith of Providence College was the first to meet the challenge, and Vartan Gregorian of Brown was close behind. They were followed almost immediately by our other higher-education leaders—Bob Carothers of URI, Sister Therese Antone of Salve Regina, Bill Trueheart of Bryant, Roger Mandle of RISD, Jack Yena of Johnson and Wales and Ed Liston of CCRI. I mention them to dramatize that AmeriCorps runs cost-effective, successful, nonpartisan programs.

I accompanied the presidents of seven of the state's public and private colleges and universities to Washington for meetings on Capitol Hill and in the White House. There we outlined the Rhode Island Challenge to

Higher Education, a challenge to provide scholarships to AmeriCorps members that complement the stipends they receive for their year of service. The result is a win/win for both sides: Higher education gets the kind of committed students who are potential campus leaders; and AmeriCorps members pass through another gateway to opportunity.

The foundation for the Rhode Island Challenge to Higher Education was laid a year ago. Rhode Island's bipartisan congressional delegation, each member of which played a role in the passage of the legislation that brought about AmeriCorps, joined other dignitaries at Slater Junior High School in Pawtucket in AmeriCorps's debut. The setting, a junior high school in the heart of one of our older, struggling cities, provided a fitting backdrop for the Rhode Island AmeriCorps members and the educational programs they would serve.

In the year since, AmeriCorps members have farmed out across the state, serving as teachers' assistants in public schools, tutors in after-school mentoring programs, and teaching English as a Second Language and GED classes to adults. And they've had an impact, all because they are 100 percent behind keeping their end of a bargain to make AmeriCorps work the way in which Congress and the President intended.

Rhode Islanders would have been proud to have joined me and some of the presidents in the White House Cabinet Room recently when we introduced the Rhode Island Challenge to Higher Education to President Clinton. From the smallest state to the other 49 came the challenge for their colleges and universities to match our commitment of scholarships to AmeriCorps members.

Our hope, and that of AmeriCorps members around the country and others committed to public service, is that our Challenge to Higher Education can help overcome the cynicism that has come to mark the debate in Washington. •

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, first, I indicate there will be no further votes this evening.

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 186, submitted earlier by Senator DOLE and Senator DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 186) to authorize testimony by Senate employees and representation by Senate legal counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the U.S. Government is the defendant in a pending case in the U.S. Court of Federal Claims arising out of a dispute with a private real estate developer over the Government's procurement to lease a new headquarters building for the Securities and Exchange Commission. The plaintiff developer responded to the Government's request for proposals

by offering to build the SEC a new headquarters building in Silver Spring, MD. The plaintiff alleges in this lawsuit that the Government violated procurement law in connection with the SEC headquarters procurement.

The Government has determined that the group of individuals who may have relevant information about this case includes two employees on Senator SARBANES' staff. In addition to his interest in this matter arising out of the SEC's potential selection of a site in Maryland for its headquarters building, Senator SARBANES is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, which has oversight jurisdiction over the SEC.

Senator SARBANES would like the Senate to authorize the employees in his office to testify in response to the Government's request. This resolution would authorize them to testify with representation by the Senate legal counsel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Without objection, the preamble is agreed to.

So the resolution (S. Res. 186) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 186

Whereas, the defendant in *Triangle MLP United Partnership v. United States*, No. 95-430C, a civil action pending in the United States Court of Federal Claims, is seeking testimony at a deposition from Charles Stek and Rebecca Wagner, employees of the Senate who are on the staff of Senator Paul S. Sarbanes;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by administrative or judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate is needed for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288B(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent employees of the Senate with respect to subpoenas or requests for testimony issued or made to them in their official capacities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Charles Stek, Rebecca Wagner, and any other employee of the Senate from whom testimony may be required are authorized to testify and to produce documents in the case of *Triangle MLP United Partnership v. United States*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Charles Stek, Rebecca Wagner, and any other employee of the Senate in connection with the testimony authorized by this resolution.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES EMERGENCY LEAVE TRANSFER ACT OF 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 197, S. 868.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 868) to provide authority for leave transfer for Federal employees who are adversely affected by disasters or emergencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the bill (S. 868) was deemed read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 868

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Emergency Leave Transfer Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after subchapter V the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER VI—LEAVE TRANSFER IN DISASTERS AND EMERGENCIES

"§6391. Authority for leave transfer program in disasters and emergencies.

"(a) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) 'employee' means an employee as defined in section 6331(1); and

"(2) 'agency' means an Executive agency.

"(b) In the event of a major disaster or emergency, as declared by the President, that results in severe adverse effects for a substantial number of employees, the President may direct the Office of Personnel Management to establish an emergency leave transfer program under which any employee in any agency may donate unused annual leave for transfer to employees of the same or other agencies who are adversely affected by such disaster or emergency.

"(c) The Office of Personnel Management shall establish appropriate requirements for the operation of the emergency leave transfer program under subsection (b), including appropriate limitations on the donation and use of annual leave under the program. An employee may receive and use leave under the program without regard to any requirement that any annual leave and sick leave to a leave recipient's credit must be exhausted before any transferred annual leave may be used.

"(d) A leave bank established under subchapter IV may, to the extent provided in regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, donate annual leave to the emergency leave transfer program established under subsection (b).

"(e) Except to the extent that the Office of Personnel Management may prescribe by regulation, nothing in section 7351 shall apply to pay solicitation, donation, or acceptance of leave under this section.

"(f) The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations necessary for the administration of this section."