an increasing number of students are working more hours, often holding down two and even three jobs because they must make money while pursuing college credits.

Figures from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics show a significant increase in the proportion of full-time college students ages 16 to 24 who work, from 35 percent in 1972 to 51 percent in 1993. Full-time students now work an average of 25 hours a week.

The reasons for the rise are varied, but most observers blame the way tuition increases have outpaced inflation while financial aid, loans and grants have become more difficult to obtain.

''We have shifted so much of the financial burden to students [who] know they have to get that degree, that college is a life preserver, the difference between a comfortable life and a considerably rougher one,'' said Rick Kincaid, coordinator of student employment at the State University of New York at Brockport and editor of the Journal of Student Employment. ''So they work, and they struggle to do it all. It's really pretty grim.''

The trend has extended the time it takes students to obtain their degrees. It also has fueled fears among college administrators that students's academic and personal lives are suffering, though there is contradictory evidence on whether and how much grades fall when students work.

College presidents are using work statistics to buttress their pleas to Congress against cutting student loan funding.

''If we don't sustain the current aid program, students are going to have to work even more hours, and they'll be more likely to drop to part-time or just drop out,'' said David L. Warren, president of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.

Jeff Blundin, 23, a full-time student at College Park who works 40 hours a week, said he recently had to financially ''cut myself off from my parents so I could qualify for a loan.''

Blundin attends classes during the day, and at 5 p.m., he puts on a green apron and waits on tables at a restaurant in a nearby shopping center. After finishing his shift about midnight, he comes home to read, study and write papers. On Saturdays, he often works double shifts.

''I know my grades would be better if I could stop working, but I just don't have that luxury,'' said Blundin, who said he came to college resigned to the prospect of working long hours to pay for tuition, rent, books and other expenses. As for maintaining a social life or strolling under the elms discussing philosophy, Blundin said dryly, ''That would be great, but college hasn't been like that for a long time.''

Many parents ''start out planning to pay for college but lose their jobs, and then they just can't do it,'' said Patricia T. van der Vorm, executive director of the Career Center at American University.

Yomphana Adams, 20, a University of Maryland student, said her family recently had just such a ''run of bad luck,'' Her stepfather lost his job as an air traffic controller at Andrews Air Force Base, and her mother, who has poor English skills, also lost a manual labor job recently because her employer moved, she said.

Adams, like Blundin, has cut herself off financially from her parents in hopes of qualifying for loans.

''It's a gigantic Catch-22: Either you don't have enough money to make it or you make the money but then your grades stink,'' said Adams, who takes four classes, works 22 hours a week at the information desk at the student center and rises at 5 a.m. to catch a train to College Park from Baltimore. When she first came to the college, she worked as many as three jobs, including a stint as a telemarketer. Her grades dipped, ''and I became this massive introvert.''

''In high school, I graduated with a 3.5 [grade-point] average, and I was involved in all these clubs,'' she said. ''Coming here, I really had to learn how to manage my time. I go to sleep earlier than most people's grandparents.''

The student employment picture has changed so much in recent years that students laugh when they learn that school counselors traditionally recommend that students seek career-related (but lower-paying) internships and limit their work to 20 hours a week.

''Yeah, right—do they also 'recommend' that I eat nothing but Minute Rice and rob banks?'' asked Jason Putnam, 21, a full-time student at College Park, as he stocked the shelves of a College Park liquor store. Between that job and a side enterprise, doing automotive repairs for students, he figures he works 30 hours a week.

At College Park, there were so many complaints last year about how jobs were interfering with academics, prolonging college careers and making students' lives miserable, that President William E. Kirwan ordered a committee to study the problem.

''I see it all the time,'' said committee member Barbara Jacoby, director of commuter affairs and community service programs. ''I teach French from 2 to 4 on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and last semester this student came to me and said she needed to leave at 3:45 because it took her that long to get across campus to her car and make it in time for her shift at the restaurant at 4:30.

''This priority is just wrong. It's the kind of thing that really raises faculty ire,'' Jacoby said.

As a result of the study, the school is creating a Student Employment Center designed in part to advocate for students with off-campus jobs. The center might persuade employers, for instance, to adjust students' hours to coordinate better with class schedules and the academic calendar.

Acknowledging those problems represents a change for college administrators, who have been arguing for years that holding down a job during college enhances students' character, academic progress and future job marketability.

''Yes, students are working for the money, but they get so much more out of it. They learn job skills, improve their résumés, learn how to budget their time,'' said Dennis Chavez, director of the student employment program at Cornell University. In 1992, Chavez conducted a study of 4,500 students at 18 colleges and universities and found little difference in the grades of working and nonworking students. Kincaid said he'd seen studies ''that found that if a student gets a job, the first thing they reduce is the hours spent watching TV.''

University of Maryland officials agree that work is valuable, but they are trying to balance school and work demands and to steer students toward fewer hours and more on-campus and career-related jobs.

Many students there and at other U.S. colleges are taking advantage of programs in which their salaries from campus jobs are credited directly to their college tuition accounts. Lori Spevak, for instance, whose family income makes her ineligible for loans, is paying her $1,700-a-semester tuition primarily out of her 16-hour-a-week job driving a shuttle bus. One night a week, she doesn't sleep, working the graveyard shift. The 19-year-old sophomore from Bowie also works 20 to 25 hours selling musical instruments and sheet music at a Bowie store.

''I'm doing it right now to give my parents a break. My sister will be starting school, and they're going to have that expense,'' Spevak said.

Will she be able to keep up that pace and finish in four years? Spevak said she hopes to, but perpetual sleep-deprivation and granola-bar suppers sometimes get her down. Hers is the kind of situation that worries school officials.

''I know they need that paycheck,'' said John van Brunt, who directs the student counseling center. ''I know they've got to work, but if it undercuts their whole experience of school, what's the point?''

JAMES P. GRANT

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the world has lost one of the noblest of God's noblemen, James P. Grant, executive director of UNICEF until his untimely death on January 28.

UNICEF, I dare say, is the least controversial of all United Nations functions. There are many religions represented in the United Nations but none is represented better than the Sermon on the Mount when it comes to UNICEF. All thoughtful Americans will mourn the passing of Mr. Grant.

CROATIA ACTS TO REINVIGORATE PEACE PROCESS

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1995

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1991, in response to Serbian aggressions against the neighboring Republic of Croatia resulting in Serbian occupation of one quarter of Croatia, the international community put forward the Vance plan, a framework to work toward peace in the region. Since that time, more than 3 years ago, Croatia has continuously cooperated with the United Nations and, along with Bosnia, has accepted numerous peace initiatives. The Serbian side, on the other hand, has rejected repeated offers of peace and remains recalcitrant in progress toward further peaceful negotiations.

The Vance plan, confirmed by U.N. Resolution 724 and 740, had six major goals: First, the cessation of hostilities and demilitarization of regions where military conflict had taken place; second, the withdrawal of the Yugoslav Army from Croatia; third, the maintenance of public order by supervision of local police made up based on prewar ethnic percentages; fourth, the protection of minorities in these areas; fifth, the placement of military observers along Croatia's border with Bosnia and Herzegovina; and sixth, the facilitation of the return of displaced persons and refugees. Pursuant to the Vance plan, the United Nation created protection areas [UNPA's] in Serb-occupied areas of Croatia, and introduced a protection force [UNPROFOR] in those UNPA's in order to carry out the objectives of the Vance plan and reestablish peace in the region.

During the more than 3 years since the institution of the Vance plan, the Republic of

Croatia has renewed and extended the original 12-month mandate seven separate times. While some sort of public order has been maintained and the Yugoslav Army has partially departed, the UNPA's have not been demilitarized. Heavily armed Serbian paramilitary units remain, the local non-Serbian population continues to be expelled and in some cases killed, and it has not been possible for a single displaced person to return to these areas. According to the 1991 census, there were 261,942 non-Serbs in the UNPA's. Since the arrival of UNPROFOR at least 39,000 non-Serbs have been forced to flee, 347 have been killed, 26 women raped, and 1,618 tortured at the hands of the Serbian occupiers. This is an intolerable situation.

With the intransigence of the Serbs to engage in serious discussions of peace, Crotia's mandate renewals have amounted to no less than tacit U.N. support for the indefinite continued Serb occupation of Croatian lands seized by aggression. In real terms, the positive economic contributions of the U.N. presence in the occupied territories have actually provided support for the Serbian occupiers and proven a major hindrance to forcing the Serbs to the negotiating table.

In this light, I ask my colleagues to review Croatia's U.N. Ambassador Nobilo's discussion reprinted below about Croatia's refusal to renew the UNPROFOR an eighth time, and invite Members to take a good hard look at some of the causes of the deadlock and suffering which Crotia and Bosnia and Herzegovina have endured for too long. Moreover, my colleagues, this action by the Coratian Government is completely supported by the Croatian people as evidenced by two resolutions by the Croatian Parliament authorizing the Government's decision and a third binding the Government to this course.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1995]

CROATIA'S MOVE TOWARD PEACE

(By Mario Nobilo, Croatian Ambassador to the U.N.)

Last month, the Republic of Croatia decided to terminate the mandate of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in the occupied territories of Croatia. The decision is designed to reinvigorate the negotiating process and to reach a peaceful settlement of the territories, which are internationally-recognized as part of Croatia but illegally occupied by Serbia, with the cooperation of local Serbs.

Contrary to the views held by some, including speculation in The Post's editorial of Jan. 18 (''Another Balkan War?'') Croatia did not take this action in order to pursue war with the local Serbs or their patrons in Belgrade. Our objectives are the exact opposite.

The departure of UNPROFOR will shift the total cost of Serbian occupation from the international community to the Belgrade government. The $1 billion per year cost of maintaining UNPROFOR in Croatia has essentially become an ''occupation fee'' paid by U.N. member nations, including the United States, which itself contributes about $300 million.

The presence of UNPROFOR provides the occupying forces with economic sustenance through a continued stream of hard currency, through aid deliveries, through UNPROFOR-paid rents, through fuel brokering, and through infrastructure maintenance and development. UNPROFOR is probably the largest employer in the occupied territories.

Because Serbia is weakened from the effect of international sanctions, it cannot afford to fund both its activities in Bosnia and its support of Serbs occupying parts of Croatia. That makes it more likely that Serbia's President Milosevic will be compelled to work with the international community and Croatia to reach a negotiated settlement regarding Crotia's occupied territories.

It is clear that UNPROFOR is not a real deterrent to war, in Croatia or in Bosnia and Herzegovina. If Crotia were indeed intent on reintegrating its occupied territories by force, it could have done so already.

Croatia is further convinced that solving the problem of its occupied territories first can greatly improve the chances of a settlement in Bosnia along with the lines of the internationally-accepted Contact Group proposals. Here's why: A strong, reintegrated Croatia can better assist the Bosnian government through the Federation of Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats, thus forging a more effective balance of power in the region.

Additionally, without having to maintain a 15,000-troop presence in Croatia, UNPROFOR can transfer resources to Bosnia and Herzegovina, where they are badly needed. U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Boutros Ghali has recently called for an additional 7,000 UNPROFOR troops for Bosnia. He is unlikely to meet that need without tapping existing U.N. assets.

There are risks associated with our decision regarding UNPROFOR. But Mr. Milosevic and his dependents in Croatia's occupied territories have used U.N. soldiers as a buffer to reaching an expeditious settlement of a situation which could go unsolved for years to come under the current circumstances. Croatia views such a statement as far more dangerous than taking a pragmatic, albeit dramatic, action that we are confident will result in an accelerated peace in the entire region of southeastern Europe.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GRANTS ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. MARTIN R. HOKE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 728) to control crime by providing law enforcement block grants.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is designed to address the problem of inaccurate reporting of crime statistics.

We all know that many localities do not make crime data gathering a top priority. However, under this bill their financial award will be based on their reported data. I am sure we all agree on the importance of making sure accurate data is used when the Bureau of Justice Assistance calculates awards.

My amendment states that if the director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance believes that the reported rate of violent crimes for a local unit of government is inaccurate, he must investigate the methodology used by the locality to determine the accuracy of the submitted data. If he determines that the submitted data is inaccurate—for whatever reason—he is to use the best comparable data available instead.

The amendment places no additional burden on the localities and gives the director the discretion to determine which cases deserve investigation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a common sense amendment. Local units of government should not benefit financially—at the expense of other localities—for inaccurately reported crime data.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to explain my amendment. I urge its adoption.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 728, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. HOKE OF OHIO

Page 18, strike line 23 through ''poses'' on line 24, and insert the following:

''(c) UNAVAILABILITY AND INACCURACY OF INFORMATION.—

''(1) DATA FOR STATES.—For purposes''.

Page 19, after line 4, add the following new paragraph:

''(2) POSSIBLE INACCURACY OF DATA FOR UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—In addition to the provisions of paragraph (1), if the Director believes that the reported rate of part 1 violent crimes for a unit of local government is inaccurate, the Director shall—

''(A) investigate the methodology used by such unit to determine the accuracy of the submitted data; and

''(B) when necessary, use the best available comparable data regarding the number of violent crimes for such years for such unit of local government.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KAREN L. THURMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1995

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 138 on H.R. 7, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted ''no.''

SUMMARY OF RULES COMMITTEE VOTES

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1995, the House adopted a new rule, clause 2(l)(2)(B) of rule XI, which requires that committee reports on any bill or other matter include the names of those voting for and against on rollcall votes taken on any amendment and on the motion to report. During consideration of the rule on the first day of the 104th Congress, an explanation included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Chairman SOLOMON states:

It is the intent of this rule to provide for greater accountability for record votes in committees and to make such votes easily available to the public in committee reports. At present, under clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI, the public can only inspect rollcall votes on matters in the offices of the committee. It is anticipated that with the availability of committee reports to the public through electronic form the listing of votes in reports will be more bill-specific than earlier proposals to publish all votes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD twice a year.

Upon examining the Rules Committee report to accompany House Resolution 44, the rule for House Joint Resolution 1—balanced budget constitutional amendment, I found it lacking