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 short 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.