

in the RECORD this statement by A.J. Ferriter, a high school student from Thetford, VT, who was speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

For the last few months, I've been investigating lobbying in Vermont, and found, much to my surprise, and delight, a healthy lobbying system. The Disclosure Act purged many of the ills affecting lobbying within Vermont, by virtually stopping all underhand deals, while, at the same time, not infringing upon our rights as Vermonters and U.S. citizens.

Yet we should not be content; problems still plague our lobbying system. Fortunately, my investigations have brought me in contact with district Representatives and state Senators throughout Vermont, and without leading them on, each district Representative and state Senator I spoke with expressed one common concern: lobbying groups using tax dollars to support themselves. This is not a problem with profit-making organizations (which is businesses), because they support themselves. It is a problem among non-profit organizations . . . whose promoters are given the title, "advocate," instead of "lobbyist."

I am concerned with two issues in the way advocates use tax dollars. The first is the use of financial support. Although many groups use their funds properly, many do not. Instead of using tax dollars to support their cause, the money is used to support themselves. In other words, this money is given to these organizations to support more administrative positions, and more lobbyists. This money was given to aid a public cause, not to support lobbyists.

Tax dollars paying for lobbyists' salaries is an alarming issue. Even if the tax dollars are being used properly, "is it right," in the words of one state Senator, "to use our tax dollars against us?" I do not believe it is. Take for instance, community mental health, a group whose objectives I support. Hypothetically, though, let's say I don't. If I don't, then I am not going to want my money supporting their programs; and if I speak out against them, they will just use the money I pay the state in taxes to further support lobbyists to speak out against me. So the more I speak out, the more money I am eventually giving to lobbyists I'm speaking out against. This is not encouraging.

Now, I'm not saying I am completely adverse to advocates, and forcing them to have the same nominal status as lobbyists. If they did, they might not receive the necessary funds they need to stay alive and support the crucial issues that they promote. Yet, if these human service, non-profit groups were forced to have the same status as lobbyists who represent profit-making organizations, then our tax dollars would no longer be used to support their lobbyists.

I say, use our money to support their policies, but find donations or something else to support your lobbyists. I cannot stop the government from spending my money on programs I'm not in favor of, but I should be able to stop the practice of giving my money to support lobbyists, whether I agree with their views or not. I believe a line must be drawn somewhere. Thank you.

Congressman Sanders: Thank you very much, A.J. That's an interesting presentation, and it's an issue that's being dealt with in Congress, and in Montpelier as well. Let me ask you a question: if I represent the tobacco industry—we heard a presentation earlier about the problems of young people smoking—and I represent the large cigarette companies that have billions of dollars in resources, and I hire some of the most sophisticated lobbyists in the country to knock on the doors of members of Congress, or in the

statehouses throughout this country. I have plenty of money to do that, okay?

Answer. All right.

Congressman Sanders: And I don't get any taxpayer dollars to do that—I do that privately, all with the company's own money. Then on the other hand, we have a group of young people, say, who are concerned about the problems of smoking; they also want to lobby. One has billions of dollars in resources, the other side has very little money. How would you deal with that issue, so that both sides have a shot at having their voices heard?

Answer. Would it be all right if you . . . rephrase your question? I kind of got lost in there.

Congressman Sanders: Okay. Here's the problem that I want to throw at you: He represents (he doesn't really) but let's say hypothetically he's the head of a large tobacco company—Philip Morris—and he has billions of dollars in resources. He wants the U.S. Congress to not do anything to limit the ability of the tobacco companies to make a lot of money. We have another group of young people, who are concerned about the impact of smoking on the health of their friends. They also want to get involved in the political process. They certainly don't have the resources—how do you deal with that issue?

Answer. I mean, that's obviously a concern, that I feel is valid. But I feel like if the young students are going up [against] a tobacco giant here, they have to have some way of being able to gain support throughout their communities. I don't know if it would be sending letters out; I don't know if it's public speaking. I'm not sure what it would be, but it has to be something—obviously, they can't do it through money, and . . . you bring up a good argument to my case. But the thing is, the tobacco industries do have the money, and it's a basic right to be able to lobby for what you want; and so we cannot restrict that.

For these students, though, like I said . . . one of the problems, I think, with lobbying is that a lot of it is not made public. With some of the public hearings we've got happening in Montpelier, there will be, let's say, an issue on tobacco. And what will happen is that there will be a lobbyist within the room so that he can tell his friends to garner support for the lobbyists, and show up at the public meeting. And the meeting is only 24 or 48 hours later, so that way people don't advocate tobacco don't have the time to just pick up their stuff and find an argument to oppose the tobacco arguments.

Congressman Sanders: You make a good, an interesting point. A lot of members of Congress and the legislature feel resentful when publicly supported institutions then come and lobby them, and that's the point that you're making. The other side of the story is, that groups that do not need public support—like the tobacco industry, or the chemical companies—they have huge amounts of resources to lobby, and in many ways therefore have an unfair advantage in terms of people from the other point of view. So those are the two sides of that argument.

Answer. Yeah, like I said . . . in the speech, we have to support their cause, but I don't feel like—if I don't agree with what these youngsters are saying, I don't want to have my money going to support their lobbyists. Fine, the cause—I can't control that, but control the lobbyists.

RECOGNIZING THE HONORING IMMIGRANT AMERICANS DAY AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have the distinct pleasure of recognizing the 1996 Honor Immigrant Americans Day Award recipients from the Eight Congressional District in Virginia. These citizens were honored last month in northern Virginia.

The first annual Honor Immigrant Americans Day Awards banquet was hosted by the Organization of Chinese Americans. Founded in 1973, the Organization of Chinese Americans is a national nonprofit, nonpartisan advocacy organization that promotes equal opportunity for all Asian Americans. This group works tirelessly to end prejudice toward Asian Americans and ignorance of their unique culture.

The purpose of this celebration was to recognize the outstanding contributions that immigrant Americans have made to northern Virginia. The following citizens were awarded the Corporate Award for their outstanding achievements in both the workplace and in the community at large: Ms. Nettie B. Garcia of Inova Health System, for her innovative approach to Inova Health Systems and active volunteerism in the Hispanic community over the past 18 years; Chong Ja Park, registered nurse, for her outstanding achievement in passing the Virginia State nursing boards within 1 year of immigrating to the United States and for her interpreting skills; Madeline Li, BTG software developer, for her success in achieving senior level developer status; Margaret Turek, BTG software engineer, for her rapid advancement to the level of senior director of technical resources.

The following citizens received at-large awards for outstanding lifelong achievement in the community: Andres Burgoa, for his work in the American Embassy in Bolivia and the Defense Contract Audit Agency; Toa Quang Do, for his distinguished career as an entrepreneur, consultant, and community volunteer; Alam Hammad, Ph.D., business administration, GWU, for his efforts as a political activist, work on numerous political campaigns, and participation in the community.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to recognize these very distinguished immigrant American citizens. Their many accomplishments and contributions serve as an example of excellence to all Americans to strive to do better both in the workplace and in our communities. I extend my warmest congratulations and best wishes for the future to all of the 1996 Immigrant Americans Day Award recipients.

LAND CONVEYANCE

HON. J.D. HAYWORTH

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to convey 40 acres of U.S. Forest Service controlled land in Apache County, AZ, to the Alpine Elementary School District.

This 40 acres is needed by the Alpine Elementary School District to construct school facilities and related playing fields. The U.S. Forest Service has the authority, under the Townsite Act of 1958, to sell this acreage to the school district because no private lands exist for purchase. The school district is very willing to purchase these lands, however, the prohibitive costs of \$7,500 per acre prevents the district from buying the needed acreage.

Eight-five percent of Apache County is federally controlled land. As a result, school districts rely heavily on proceeds from timber harvesting. Unfortunately, with the continued success of extreme preservationist efforts to halt all logging in most Western States, the Alpine Elementary School District's revenues have fallen sharply. Without this conveyance, they would not be able to afford to construct any facilities after acquiring the land.

My legislation stipulates that the school district can only use this land for school facilities. In addition, the school district will bear the costs of performing a survey to determine the exact acreage and legal description of the property.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

STATEMENT BY PEOPLES ACADEMY STUDENTS ON COSTS OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by Bethany Carpenter, a high school student from Brattleboro, VT. She was speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

My name is Bethany Carpenter, and first of all I just want to say thanks for letting us come today.

"The children of today are the leaders of tomorrow." How many times has that phrase been stated in one form or another, it seems to carry no meaning anymore. But what a true statement it is. Sadly, this statement soon will not be truthful. Many of the leaders of tomorrow are losing the opportunity to become leaders due to the lack of support for a post-secondary education.

Over the past year, I have gone through the process of looking at colleges; choosing a select number to apply to; applying; waiting for responses; and most importantly, sending for financial aid. My top choice school is a small university in upstate New York specializing in theater arts and elementary education. Unfortunately, this school costs \$24,000/year. Therefore, I am forced to choose between my top choice school, which will better prepare me for my future career, or a somewhat large college in Central Vermont, which will cost less but will not provide me with the specialized education that my top choice would. To me, this is the most disappointing part of my application procedures.

The total post-secondary enrollment in this country has been rising rapidly in the past years, while the federal support for post-secondary students has been decreasing. High school students have been feeling more pressure to continue their education beyond their twelve years due to the lack of availability of high-paying jobs for high school

graduates. In today's high-paced world, those who have completed more years of schooling typically experience less unemployment than other workers.

In addition, workers' earnings are generally increased as their level of learning increases. In the latter half of the 1970's, the average male college graduate earned about 50% more than the average high school graduate. By 1994, the premium paid to males with college degrees had risen to 81%. Similarly, the average wage advantage of female college graduates over female high school graduates grew from about 41% to 77%. In 1994, the average earnings of male workers 18 years or older with a bachelor's degree was \$46,278, compared to that of high school graduates was only \$25,038. In the same year, the average earnings of female workers with a bachelor's degree was \$26,482, while that of a high school graduate was only \$14,995.

The increase in salaries for college graduates over the past 15-20 years shows the need for a post-secondary education in today's society. Federal support in the form of student aid reached a high in 1980, with 83% of aid awarded in federal funds. That support has dropped to 75% in 1993. The enrollment of post-secondary students increased from 8.6 million in 1970 to 12.1 million in 1980, and rose to approximately 15 million in 1993.

I have formatted a plan for tuition which will allow more students to attend college. The plan starts with the fact that the United States, in 1995, spent an estimated \$269.6 billion for our national defense, while only spending an estimated \$54.7 billion for education and training. This is less than one-fifth of the amount that is spent on the military, and this is a disgrace! In many countries, higher education is a right, not a privilege. For instance, a fundamental principle in Swedish higher education is that all students who need help to finance their studies should receive assistance from the central government. Can the United States say the same? If the United States government were to take \$69.6 billion of the national defense budget and put the money towards the education and training of America's future, this would open up worlds of possibilities for students, who would otherwise have to forfeit their dream for college.

If the government would make more money available to pay for the tuitions of students in need, more students would be able to afford the other expenses of college. My plan includes setting a basic fee for all students attending college, no matter what year they are in college or the college that they are attending. By doing this, the amount of money paid by any student or family would be lowered, their application process for colleges would also need to be reviewed, and many colleges would need to re-evaluate their expenses and costs. The individual state governments would then need to institute loan and grant programs for the students who would still need assistance paying the basic fee or living expenses while in college.

This plan would involve a major change in thinking and planning on the part of many people involved, but it is my hope that it will lead to a better, more fair educational system for future students. Therefore, it is with a mixture of hope and trepidation and a wish that you consider very carefully my original statement, that "the children of today are the leaders of tomorrow," but only if given the chances to achieve their goals. (Applause)

Congressman Sanders: Thank you. Bethany, that was an excellent and important statement. Let me ask you a question. You mentioned Sweden, and it's true, throughout Europe, and even in Canada, that the cost of higher education is much less because the

government plays a much more active role. Why do you think that's so, that other countries in Europe and Scandinavia, do that—make college more affordable for young people—and we don't do that in the U.S.?

Answer. Many of the other countries that I researched don't spend as much on their military, and these programs and other things like that, and they focus more on the fact that their youth (and even adults who want to continue their education) need to do that, and that that's more important than trying to set up a good army. So they institute a lot more loan, grant and financial aid programs.

Congressman Sanders: So they have a very different set of priorities than we do, is what you're saying.

Answer. A much different set of priorities.

ED LAWLOR TO RETIRE AS NJ LEAGUE PRESIDENT AFTER 42 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Ed Lawlor, president of the New Jersey Savings and Loan League, on his retirement.

As chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, it is with great pleasure but also a certain sense of loss that I congratulate Ed Lawlor on his retirement as head of the New Jersey Savings and Loan League.

Ed and the league have always been partners working for solutions as I've pushed for legislative solutions to the many challenges that have faced the thrift industry over the years. From Garn-St. German legislation in 1982 to the latest battle to recapitalize SAIF, I have worked closely with Ed and his relentless pursuit of good public policy has been invaluable.

As a battle-scarred veteran of the savings and loan debacle of the 1980's. I can say it was a relief to be able to turn to Ed for advice. Ed was a rare voice of reason and honesty in those tumultuous days. Let me say that through the darkest hours of the savings and loan industry, I have always been proud of the manner in which New Jersey institutions have conducted themselves. So many times New Jersey thrifts have been asked to foot the bill for those institutions in Texas, California, and Arkansas that caused the lion's share of the problems in the thrift industry.

One of Ed's greatest assets is his sense of perspective. We have here a man with more than four decades of service to New Jersey's thrift industry, 42 years to be precise. Ed's length of service has allowed him to see the broad picture and has put him in the position to gauge how this week's crisis or next week's will play in the long-term.

Most recently, Ed and I have worked together on legislation to recapitalize the Savings Association Insurance Fund and to shore up the FICO problem. I wish we had been successful in a resolution to this problem before his departure. But let me assure you that I will keep up the fight to see that we pass legislation that will once and for all ensure the continued profitability, safety, and soundness of the thrift industry.

Ed has been a trusted and reliable friend and confidant. I thank him again for his support and the exceptional help he and the