

In the Arizona National Forests, volunteers maintained 15 miles of trails, rehabilitated 10 campground sites, improved wildlife habitat on 300 acres, and obliterated 2 miles of road, returning the land to its natural state; and

AmeriCorps volunteers improved paths and maintained roads in Bienville National Forest in Mississippi.

These accomplishments represent only some of the projects AmeriCorps participants have completed. Elsewhere across the Nation, AmeriCorps volunteers have performed emergency response work to mitigate the effects of floods, fires and earthquakes, cleaned-up our urban areas, increased disaster prevention efforts and worked with citizens to improve their quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues remember that the entire Nation reaps the benefits of the National Service Program.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 23, 1995]

CRIB DEATH FOR NATIONAL SERVICE

(By Mary McGrory)

The House Republicans' strangling of national service in its crib has to be seen not as a criticism of the agency's performance but simply as another expression of the party leadership's notion that no government program is worth a damn.

If they were going by performance, the Republicans might have to applaud AmeriCorps as a model enterprise. It is modestly funded, locally directed and dramatic evidence that American youth is not cynical or self-serving. AmeriCorps has had rave reviews from coast to coast for its 20,000 volunteers, who are doing things nobody else tackles, everything from helping to build housing for the poor and tutoring inner-city school pupils to cleaning polluted streams in Baltimore's watershed.

A case in point is Howard Hogin, a 1994 graduate of Georgetown University. He is living in a cramped barracks at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds. He spent September fighting forest fires in Idaho and much of the fall in helping build a riding ring for disabled children. Now he's trying to clean up Maryland's polluted steams. He hopes to pay off his college loans, AmeriCorps pays its workers a minimum wage and an annual \$4,725 toward college expenses.

Service is in Hogin's genes, and by his family's standards, he is a big success. His parents are both social workers and his ancestors experienced big trouble, like the Irish famine and the Holocaust. He says lots of his Georgetown classmates have the same impulse to leave the country, a better place but "just can't afford to do it."

Hogin is tactful about the mugging AmeriCorps suffered when the House cut \$416 million, or 72 percent, from its \$575 million budget. He was voted outstanding teenage Republican in his high school class. "I understand that we have tremendous deficits and the taxpayers are heavily burdened, but if we give up what is best about America, what kind of a legacy do we leave?"

No such considerations figured in the thinking of House Republicans. The rap on AmeriCorps was not just that it was a government program, it is Bill Clinton's favorite program. Said Rules Committee Chairman Gerald B.H. Solomon, "It's get-even time."

It is also get-nervous time for the rampaging Republicans. They are winning victory after victory on the floor, but they are losing in public opinion. They have long since maintained that they know exactly what Nov. 8 was about, that the country wanted government to be shrunk and ordinary people, especially the poor, to pull up their socks. But a recent Washington Post-ABC

poll shows that the public thinks Republicans have gone too far. And in his effort to save programs for the poor, Clinton has picked up some unexpected allies; the Roman Catholic bishops. They were reserved about him during the campaign because of his abortion rights stand. But they think now that pitiless Republicans pose a worse threat of increased abortions.

The Republicans' greatest tactical mistake was to meddle with the school lunch program, a popular and scandal-free operation that has helped many a hungry child get through the school day. In vain, the Republicans protested that they had not cut the funds but merely slowed the increase in the growth rate. Nonetheless, the ranks have begun to wince in the iron corset of the contract, and this week, 102 members rebelled against tax breaks for the rich.

The Democrats, who have been having their best week since the calamity of Nov. 8, were sporting "Save the Children" neckties on the House floor.

Eli Segal, the chief executive officer of the National Service Corps, has been summoned before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development and Veterans Affairs for a discussion of the 1996 budget, which since the House action stands at \$159 million, a sum that prohibits serious action.

He has been traveling the country inspecting the workers, deriving solace from moderate Republican governors who are keen about the corps' activities in conflict resolution, environmental cleanup, tutoring and other contributions to urban peace. They agree with him that pulling the plug after less than a year is bad practice. Segal's hope is that they will transmit their enthusiasm to their brother moderates in the Senate, which has become the haven for storm-tossed programs.

Republican Christopher Shays of Connecticut was the only member of his party to vote against the amendment that mortally wounded national service. He is a Peace Corps alumnus and believes passionately in the importance of youthful involvement.

"A colossal mistake," he calls his party's action. "I hope the president has the fortitude to veto the bill. I would support his veto."

REAL FOUNDER OF SPECIAL OLYMPICS HAPPY WITH SELECTION OF SHRIVER

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, if one were to say that President John F. Kennedy launched the Peace Corps, one would be right. But if one were to say that President John F. Kennedy thought up the Peace Corps, one would be mistaken. The author was Hubert Humphrey.

If one were to say that the nobly civil minded Eunice Kennedy Shriver brought her considerable talents to bear in order to launch the Special Olympics nationally, one would be right. But if one were to say that Ms. Shriver thought up the idea of a Special Olympics, one would be mistaken. Judge Ann McGlone Burke is the author of the idea.

As Judge Burke has generously said, she is happy that Ms. Shriver is being honored by the 1995 Special Olympics Silver Dollar Commemorative. But it is worthwhile too for all

Americans to know that Judge Burke should also be honored as the author.

REAL FOUNDER OF SPECIAL OLYMPICS HAPPY WITH SELECTION OF SHRIVER

(By Michel E. Orzano)

The woman who founded the Special Olympics in 1968 is pleased that the games for mentally and physically handicapped children and adults will be recognized with a commemorative coin.

But her portrait won't be the one on the 1995 Special Olympics silver dollar commemorative. That's because Anne Burke of Chicago—former Chicago physical education teacher, retired lawyer and judge—not Eunice Shriver Kennedy, is the real founder of the games.

The law authorizing the coin permits the striking of 800,000 silver dollars and each will bear a \$10 per coin surcharge going to the Special Olympics. The Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee rejected the idea of a portrait of a living American but Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin approved the design choice. Shriver will become the first living American woman to have her portrait on a coin and only the fifth living American to bear that distinction.

Chicagoan Burke, who now serves as special counsel on child welfare to Illinois Gov. Jim Edgar, told *Coin World* that she's pleased the program she started will benefit from the coin. But as far as the claim of founder goes, that resides with Burke.

In 1965, Burke, then Anne McGlone, was a young physical education teacher who taught mentally retarded youngsters in a special summer program sponsored by the Chicago Park District. By 1967, she said, there were 10 locations throughout the Chicagoland area with 150 children participating in the free program.

Burke said she knew at the time there were probably more people out there who could benefit from involvement in sports and other activities because there wasn't mandatory education for mentally retarded people. But, she said, she also knew families of mentally retarded children and adults were often very protective of them and shunned involvement in public programs.

But by the end of the summer of 1967, after Burke and participants put on the play "The Sound of Music," Chicago Park officials were so pleased with the response they sanctioned her idea of a sponsoring a citywide track meet for mentally retarded youngsters the following summer.

Once she was given the official green light, Burke turned her attention to planning the event that fall and winter. Burke said while refining the idea, a professor she was working with at Southern Illinois University suggested she contact the Joseph P. Kennedy Jr. Foundation to request funding for the proposed program.

Shortly thereafter, Burke wrote to Shriver, she said, who was living in Paris with her husband, Sargent Shriver, then ambassador to France. Burke said Shriver was intrigued with the idea and suggested a meeting in Washington, D.C.

After meeting with Shriver, Burke said she re-wrote the proposal including Shriver's suggestion to involve children from other states and re-submitted her funding request. The foundation responded with \$25,000 for the program. Burke invited Shriver to attend the 1st National Chicago Special Olympics, which were held July 20, 1968. Children from 23 different states participated that year and, as Burke notes, "The rest is history."

She said she is still actively involved with the Special Olympics program in the Chicago area. Her concern for children has always seemed to touch her professional life as a

teacher, mother and a lawyer. But she also acknowledges the contributions Shriver has made to Burke's original idea.

"Without the Kennedy Foundation the Games wouldn't be the Games. There is no other family with the charisma or the wherewithal to do this," Burke said. "[Shriver] deserves the recognition. What has happened has been incredible and it [who's portrait appears] really makes no difference now."

But Burke admits she is disappointed that Chicago, its park employees and the late Mayor Richard J. Daley, never have been recognized by the Kennedy Foundation nor Shriver for the innovation shown in planning and hosting those first Games.

"We took the chances," Burke said, describing the view of many at the time that such games might exploit the mentally retarded. "I think the other side [of the Special Olympics coin] should recognize Chicago, not anyone's name, just Chicago."

When asked if she planned to buy any of the commemoratives, Burke said she thought Shriver should give coins to each of the first participants and employees of the Chicago Park District who planned and hosted the first event.

THE BURKE CONNECTION

Dateline: The Chicago line . . . but it was Chicagoan Anne (McGlone) Burke, during her tenure at the Chicago Park District, who gave Shriver the idea for the Special Olympics in a written proposal, and who organized the first Special Olympics event, which was held in Chicago and attended by Mrs. Shriver. Shriver bit, and the rest is history.

Conclusion: Shriver should be honored for giving the Olympics a happy life, but it was Burke who gave it birth.

THE JOSEPH P. KENNEDY, JR.,
FOUNDATION,
Washington, DC, July 23, 1968.

Mrs. ANN BURKE,
Chicago Park District, 425 East 14th Boulevard,
Chicago, IL.

DEAR ANN: When the history of the Chicago Special Olympics is written, there will have to be a special chapter to recount the contributions of Ann Burke. You should feel very proud that your dedicated work with retarded children in Chicago has culminated in an event of such far reaching importance.

We all owe you a debt of gratitude, but I know that what means most to you is that the Olympics will continue and that children all over the country will benefit from your idea.

My warmest personal thanks.

Sincerely,

EUNICE KENNEDY SHRIVER.

THE JOSEPH P. KENNEDY, JR.,
FOUNDATION,
Washington, DC, January 29, 1968.

Miss ANNE MCGLONE BRUKE,
Chicago Park District, 425 East 14th Boulevard,
Chicago, IL.

DEAR MISS MCGLONE: Thank you so much for your letter of January 23d informing me about your plans to initiate a National Olympics for retarded children through the Chicago Park District. Both Mr. Shriver and Dr. Hayden have spoken to me about your project and I think it is a most exciting one. I sincerely hope that you are successful in launching it.

This is certainly a large undertaking and we know that you will need a great deal of assistance of many kinds. When you have been able to formalize your plans and put them into a written proposal the Kennedy Foundation will be very happy to send it out to the members of our physical education and recreation advisory boards for their review and comment. All requests to the Foun-

dation for funds in these areas are handled in this manner and I am sure that the suggestions from these people would be very helpful to you.

Once again, let me say how delighted I am to know of your plans. I will look forward to hearing from you again as they progress.

Yours sincerely,

EUNICE KENNEDY SHRIVER.

DIRECT LOANS WORK

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1995

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the March 13, 1995, issue of U.S. News & World Report includes an excellent article entitled, "The College Aid Face-Off." The article reports on the current debate in Congress on the future of the direct loan program as well as on major cuts in the student financial aid programs. With respect to direct loans the conclusions of the article are striking—direct loans work. Direct loans are simpler, faster and more efficient for student borrowers, student financial aid administrators and schools. In addition, direct loans save the taxpayers money. Opposition to direct loans comes from banks and other student loan middlemen who fear the loss of billions of dollars of profits and whose lobbying efforts are fueled by at least \$11.3 million in campaign contributions. The full text of the article follows, and I commend it to my colleagues.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 13, 1995]

THE COLLEGE AID FACE-OFF

(Clinton fights the GOP and bankers over what students get and who runs the loan business)

(By James Popkin and Viva Hardigg with Susan Headden)

Believe it or not, there is a group of Americans who truly delight in one of the things Bill Clinton has accomplished as president, who think that a government-run program that handles gobs of money is preferable to one run by the private sector and think that the paperwork created by public bureaucrats is easier to navigate than the forms devised by well-run corporations. They are the thousands of college students who got their loans last fall directly from the government instead of from banks. The verdict from Anthony Gallegos, a 22-year-old journalism major at Colorado State University: "It's the best thing since microwavable brownies."

But all is not entirely happy in loan land. Even though many students at 104 schools say they got their money with fewer hassles in a fraction of the time it usually takes and taxpayers might benefit because banks and middlemen didn't collect subsidies to make the loans, the direct-lending program is now the object of a bitter new battle in Washington. In fact, every major federal college aid program is considered a target in one form or another by the new Republican majority in Congress. The disputes have all the hallmarks of postmodern politics: None really centers on principle; almost everyone in Washington believes the government has a useful and morally defensible role to play in helping more kids get into college and pay for it. The fight so far centers on the spoils system—whether the public or private sector administers the program—and arcane federal budget accounting questions.

MILLIONS AFFECTED

Those are not inconsequential issues, because billions of dollars of profits (for banks) or potential savings (for taxpayers) are at issue. But the bigger fight will come as Congress deals with the budget. It will feature the first serious talk of major cuts in college loans and grants since the early days of the Reagan administration. "What is at stake is nothing less than access to higher education for millions of middle- and lower-income students at a time when public-college tuition is rising sharply," says Terry Hartle, a vice president of the American Council on Education. The biggest dispute could center on a plan circulating among Republicans to cut loan subsidies to needy students during their time in school—a move that might save \$9 billion over five years and could hit 6 million students with higher debt and payments.

This sets up a political showdown that Clinton is unusually pleased to face. He has called for increasing federal funds for college aid by 10 percent to \$35.8 billion as part of his middle-class "Bill of Rights," including expansion of many of the programs Republicans are eying for cutbacks. Clinton won major reforms in federal college aid initiatives in 1993 as part of his national service program, which he heralds as a cornerstone of his "New Covenant" to provide government help to those who help themselves. Asked if Clinton is willing to renegotiate any feature of the national service or college aid programs, one senior White House aide responded: "My guess is his answer is between 'No' and 'Hell, no.'" "A probable Clinton veto of any cuts in college aid means that these programs will survive intact for now, but there is still a good chance that his plans to expand them could be held up.

In coming weeks, the direct-lending program will grab the most attention. One of the reforms enacted in national service was the gradual phase-in of a system that would have the federal Government lend money to students directly rather than provide financial incentives and guarantees to coax banks into making the loans. Even though new workers will have to be hired by the Department of Education to run the program, it still saves considerable sums. That's why Clinton wants to accelerate its availability to all the nation's 7,000 eligible schools. But bankers and other firms that trade student loans for investors have aggressively battled the loss of this lucrative line of business and heatedly dispute Clinton's claim that the program saves money.

Their lobbying fueled by at least \$11.3 million in campaign contributions, has helped encourage Republican congressional leaders Rep. William Goodling of Pennsylvania and Sen. Nancy Kassebaum of Kansas to push legislation that would limit the expansion of the program to 10 percent of all student loans. Some moderate Democrats like Rep. Bart Gordon of Tennessee also support the move on the theory that the new lending program should be tested before it becomes the norm for all colleges. House Speaker Newt Gingrich wants to kill the program. He argues that Clinton's reforms vest too much power in the Government, especially because the lending program is run by the Department of Education, which has allowed fraud to flourish in aid programs for decades.

However, the first reports about direct lending are very positive. Students and college-based loan officers say funds are available to students in weeks rather than months. The paperwork is simpler, and college officials have to deal with only one federal office rather than many banks. "Being in direct loans has been almost a spiritual experience," says Kay Jacks, director of financial aid at Colorado State University. "It